Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2003-05 - 2003-06

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2003-05-01 through 2003-06-30

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 3,688

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 2

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 00:10:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430201013.21914.00000383@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66101

>The ARRL helps and represent all licensed radio amateurs, whether or
>not they become a member. ARRL acts for Hams when the Hams themselves are
>unable to.

It apparent you have been BRAIWASHED by ARRL.

2. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 00:11:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB066B9.8B9F814F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66103

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030430170652.18769.00000308@mb-m21.aol.com...
> > In article <b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't matter
> > >either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just heard
> > >this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for the
> > >newsgroup.
> > >Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district could
> > >theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough
> promotion
> > >for that to happen.....
> >
> > The 6th callsign district is getting fairly full of licensed amateurs.
> >
> > According to a K8 in here it isn't part of the United States.
> >
> > >A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating
> privileges
> > >allowed by the license that makes the difference.
> >
> > According to Jim Kelley in here, he said said the callsign "is what
> > we are!"
> >
> > That's fairly telling of personal opinions. Callsigns are a TITLE
> > surrogate. Titles are much beloved by the nobility. Callsigns
> > show that amateurs have conquered the ultimate peak in proving
> > manhood, proving genius level knowledge of radio, and are
> > generally superior to ordinary mortals. Always. :-)
>
> Gee Len over 21....thanks for the clarification...And for all these years I
> thought it was a means of identifying my station.

You'll have to excuse Leonard on this one, Dan. He isn't actually a particpant in amateur radio. He haunts the newsgroup because he's a wanna be.

Dave K8MN

3. Re: Public Service (yeah, it's another one..)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 00:12:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB06696.7090009@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66102

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> What public service activities, both in amateur radio and outside of amateur
> radio, do you participate in?? Any special experiences from doing so?
> Anything learned from it? Which activity was your most favorite? Which one
> was the least favorite?

Habitat for humanity walk
Multiple Sclerosis bike race
4H Horse events
March of Dimes walk/bike a thon

I've done these ever since getting involved in the ARS.

Just getting involved in Skywarn

I've enjoyed all of them. Don't know why more hams don't help their
communities.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4. Re: Rename Newsgroup

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 00:14:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB06715.1030201@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66104

mwb wrote:
> It seems like this newsgroup should be renamed
> 'rec.radio.amateur.bitchingandmoaning'. With some exception, I don't
> see much 'policy' discussed... just a lot of complaining and flaming.
> Sounds like 75 meters, or 14,313!

Start a relevant thread, Post under a real name, and see what happens!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 00:16:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430201629.21914.00000384@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66105

>I have a copy of the Extra Class study guide. Hate to sound like WA8ULX, but
>the Extra Class is question pool format, and can be learned in a day.

Why, because you hate to admit the truth about HamTesting. Testing now is a JOKE, and when the 5 WPM goes, it will be a BIGGER JOKE. The real Question that needs to be answered at this point, is why even have TESTING. The present written proves nothing. So why even force someone to memorize stuff that they dont understand, or will ever use.

6. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 00:25:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66106

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAFD3E7.659A9884@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Fact: Len wrote of "Tan Son Hut".
>
> Yes, he did.
>
> > Fact: I was never assigned at a place called "Tan Son Hut".
>
> Was the spelling -real- close to "Tan Son Hut?"

The place where I spent a great deal of my in country time was very
close to that spelling. It was not, however, spelled that way. By
Len's own standard, it was not close enough.

> > Fact: Len wrote of my moving boxes at a supply depot.
>
> You've never moved boxes while in the service?

I picked up my mail.

> You must have been very special when you were in Vietnam. Did you
> serve with Algore?

Al Gore wasn't in the Air Force.

> > Fact: I never moved boxes or even visited a supply depot in Viet Nam.
>
> I guess everything was FEDEX'd to you.

Keep guessing.

> Fact: moving boxes is a part of military life. I've moved boxes at a
> supply depot. I've moved boxes on and off airplanes. I've moved
> boxes at remote airfields.

Good for you. I didn't move boxes. I've never even been to a supply
depot. I operated radio equipment.

> Fact: my AFSC was not "box kicker."

We weren't discussing your AFSC.

> Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
> word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor

> behavior.

That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
enough for him.

> > > And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.
> >
> > No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.
>
> Do you also deny bringing it up?

That wasn't the issue, though you tried to make it into one.

> > > > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > > > did.
> > > > >
> > > > > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
> > > >
> > > > It was still his choice.
> > >
> > > ...and you were still the factor governing the decision.
> >
> > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.

Your words. His action.

> > > Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> > > said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> > > with operating on the ham bands.
> > >
> > > Grow up, Brian.
> >
> > Pffft! Quit throwing yourself to the floor and having tantrums,
> > David. Everyone's staring at you.

What tantrum, Brian? What floor? What staring?

Dave K8MN

7. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 00:51:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8pr7jclp1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66109

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8odnf$btubt$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
their
> level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
>
> If yes, why?
>
> If no, why?
>
> Have fun with this one as well.

How does one measure the level of representation anyone or
any organization has with the FCC?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

8. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:23:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430212341.27207.00000510@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66111

Although the Paul Harvey story is not "big media", Ham radio got the "big media" story today.

There was a significant story on amateur radio today. On WNPR public radio, they had a half-hour story on Ham radio. They mentioned making contacts, mobile operations, Hams helping with Columbia disaster.

This half-hour story, on Ham radio, by a credible news organization, was surely heard by many.

9. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:27:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304301727.61e997ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66112

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3EAFEBD7.C0E27E86@crosslink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote: ...
> >
> > It isn't my concern what happens in South Carolia disaster and
> > emergency services. ...
> >
> > The picture you paint of such facilities in South Carolina is not a
> > good one. If that is part of your local government, you should be
> > taking action in your community instead of arguing in an amateur
> > newsgroup.....
>
> Different strokes for different folks, Len. The reason I left SoCal
> decades ago is that the residents live in a "Hotel California" wherein
> all crimes are done by transients, all storms and diseases come up from
> Mexico and government not only takes care of everybody, but does it
> perfectly. By the same reasoning I'm sure California ACS works better
> than ARES. But please understand that back in America we still rely on
> ourselves instead of Government. We have volunteer fire and rescue
> squads, elected sheriffs and ARES/RACES volunteers to provide backup
> communications and we like it like that. If you're comfortable living
> where one town's (El Monte) SWAT team drives 20+ miles to Compton to
> murder an old man for living in a house a drug dealer once rented 25
> years before then be my guest but I'll stay in America even tho I have
> to do a few ARES/RACES drills in case I need to help the good old boys
> out some day.

Oh GAWD I wish I'd written that!

> Sincere 73, K3DWW

w3rv

10. PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:32:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB079A9.6B92E6CE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66114

Visit the url to see what kind of impact Power Line Carrier broadband
use could have on amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/files/C63NovPLC.pdf

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB031
ARLB031 FCC Now Accepting Comments in "Broadband Over Power Line"
Inquiry

ZCZC AG31
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 31 ARLB031
>From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT April 30, 2003
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB031
ARLB031 FCC Now Accepting Comments in ''Broadband Over Power
Line''Inquiry

The FCC released its Notice of Inquiry (NOI) on the deployment of
''Broadband over Power Line'' (BPL) technology on April 28 and now is
accepting comments. A form of carrier-current communication better
known as power line carrier (PLC), the technology has raised
concerns of substantial interference to the Amateur Radio HF bands.

BPL would couple high-frequency RF to parts of the power grid and
use existing power lines as the transmission medium to deliver
broadband and Internet access. In the NOI, the FCC acknowledges the
interference risk from BPL.

ARRL Lab Manager and RFI guru Ed Hare, W1RFI, has cautioned that
deployment of BPL could affect every amateur in communities where
it's employed with a significant increase in noise levels. More
information is on the Web at www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/.

The complete NOI is available on the FCC Web site. The FCC now is
accepting electronically filed comments via its Electronic Comment
Filing System ECFS Express page. To initiate a comment, click next
to ''Broadband over the traditional telephone network.''
NNNN
/EX

11. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:33:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JP_ra.1889$3f7.1550933@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66107

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8odng$btubt$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words,
> should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for
> each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working
> with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?
>
>
> If yes, why?
>
> If no, why?

No. Making the band plans a regulation would not be a good idea. Here's
why.
1) No flexibility to adjust to the communications needs on a real time
basis. Say you like HF SSTV and the frequency is not available (i.e. in use)
during any time you might have available to work this mode. Right now you
can simply move to an unused portion of the band.
2) Inhibits the development of and the use of new modes. Before a new mode
is conceived there is no reason to plan for it.
3) How would QRP and non-QRP stations communicate with each other if each
had to stick to their own portion of the band? It could lead to way too
much split frequency operation which in turn ties up to much of the band.

No doubt one could think of other drawbacks.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

12. Re: Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:33:29 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <JP_ra.158349$gK.254875@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 66113

Never inhaled ..... 73 Tom KI3R the "happy non-grumpy CW op"
"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EAFE271.4B05F6C8@crosslink.net...
> garigue wrote:
> >
> > Naw Vito .....I have 140 by 60 feet and worked the world many times over
> > ....I am moving to a new home with a 70by 80 ft lot and guess what
.....I
> > have a lot less grass to cut and more time for CW!
>
> Grass?? Isn't that what hippies used to smoke? Well I don't have any!
> That's my story and I'm sticking to it!
>
> 73, K3DWW

13. Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:37:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430213719.27207.00000512@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66115

>Contributions To Amateur Radio

None yet. I had designed circuits, but none of these could be considered contributions. Probably never, now that I am not in the EE field.

It would be interesting to hear about lenover21's contributions. Then someone might jump in and claim these are not "amateur" radio contributions.

14. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:41:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FX_ra.1891$3f7.1554616@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66108

Yes, do yourself a favor and put Len Over 21 on your blocked senders lists.
To borrow from an old Alka-Seltzer commercial: "Plop, Plop, Fizz, Fizz, O
what a relief it is!"

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0304301026.51b32188@posting.google.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:<BAD4DD88.17DFA%stewart@say.net>...
> > "Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>
> > I think this conversation is just about over. You're not even making
an
> > honest effort to discuss this issue. In one message you're talking about
> > reinstalling fallen antennas following a storm and in the next message
> > you've twisted that into having 911 dispatchers (and others) step down.
>
> You're slowly getting his real drift . . . no matter what you post
> he'll jump all over it and twist it sometimes to completely irrational
> extremes. The more you post your views or even facts the better he
> likes it, there is no end to his circles, you'll never "win" when you
> post anything positive about ham radio for one. This is one of few NGs
> in which his trolls gather any attention at all which is the only
> reason he lurks here. It's all juvenile gamesmanship on his part and
> nothing more.
>
>
> > You're reading things into my comments that simply don't exist. I've
tried
> > to remain as polite as possible during this discussion and there have
been
> > no implications (gratuitous or otherwise).
>
> I hope you learned your lesson about how far being polite to him gets
> you.
>
>
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> w3rv

15. Re: Elmering (still yet even another topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:42:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430214226.27207.00000514@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66116

>> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>>
>>>Have you "Elmered" someone into the hobby? If so, how many? Any special
>>>teaching techniques used or tips to share? If not, why?

I have an EE degree and I tried to start a new type of club. It would have been very "Elmer" focused. MA/Southern NH area. Anyone?

16. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:51:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430215117.27207.00000516@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66117

>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a single
>day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.

I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
memorized the questions and answers, not the material.

The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician license.
Many including non-EE children pass the Technician class license in a day.

The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If not,
it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if one just
memorizes the question pool.

17. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:52:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <J5%ra.1893$3f7.1557715@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66110

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430192429.26815.00000319@mb-m24.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
>
> > Obviously you've not opened the Extra Class study guide, Vipul.
>
> I have a copy of the Extra Class study guide. Hate to sound like WA8ULX,
but
> the Extra Class is question pool format, and can be learned in a day.
>

You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a single
day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.

> >Knowledge of Morse Code is required under international treaty, to which
> >the United States is signatory.
>
> And who came up with this Morse code requirement that requires one to
learn
> English?

Nobody said it had to be English. One can copy code without knowing the
language. Afterall military and commericial operators used to have to be
able to do 20wpm of random characters. No specific language at all.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

18. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:57:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB07F12.4000000@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66118

Vshah101 wrote:
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>
>>You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a single
>>day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.
>
>
> I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
> memorized the questions and answers, not the material.
>
> The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician license.
> Many including non-EE children pass the Technician class license in a day.
>
> The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If not,
> it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if one just
> memorizes the question pool.

Could you explain how you know what your talking about?

- Mike -

19. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 01:58:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430215811.26547.00000288@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66119

>You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a single
>day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.

Dee you dont have to memorize every Question, all you need to do is a few word associations, and a few memory tricks and its done. Dont believe it, it has been posted here by many that thats exactly what they did.

20. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 02:02:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430220206.26547.00000289@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66120

>The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If not,
>it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if one
>just
>memorizes the question pool.
>

I hate to agree with you, but you are right on. I took the EXTRA Test and it
was easier than I expected. Alot easier than the Novice I took years ago.
Actually the Extra was a joke as far as tests go.

21. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 02:19:31 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <Tu%ra.579$731.95280370@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66121
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030430170203.743$6l@newsreader.com...
> "PhilC" <philC@cranium.com> wrote:
> > Not at all let me know when you plan on doing it so I can record you for
> > nostaliga and evidance to send to Riley.
> >
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030430162103.340$Ev@newsreader.com...
> > > Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb> wrote:
> > > > http://www.upsitedown.co.il/anim/Upd-rest40.swf
> > > >
> > > > and then you can save it!
> > > >
> > > > BTW, is it 75 meter and CB Plussers or 75 and 20 meter GBs?
> > > >
> > > > If I load up the long wire,and use N8SUX as a call,will
> > > > I draw too much attention with my Collins? <g>
> > >
> > > --
> > > GO# 40
> > > ---
> > > --
> > > http://NewsReader.Com/
> > > 50 GB/Month
> >
> I'll send you a bag of fecal matter for DNA purposes too.
>
> Always glad to help.
>
> --
> GO# 40

Why would you won't to over-load
him on BS, he has enough of that already ;^)

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

22. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 02:40:08 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8q1e8obl0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 66122

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> Grow up, Brian.

Never gonna happen.

23. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 02:48:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430224831.26547.00000290@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66124

>Visit the url to see what kind of impact Power Line Carrier broadband
>use could have on amateur radio.
>
>Dave K8MN

And the cute part is ARRL will not be able to stop it. The people who want this have HUGH DEEP POCKETS of MONEY, and there going to get there way. The general Population want High Speed Access, and this new system will be able to provide it at an affordable price. I hope no one is stupid enough to believe that the Millions of people in this country, are going to let a bunch of Hams, dictate to them that they cant have this because the Hams might get some Interference.

24. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 02:50:56 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB08B8F.F9D80A8F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66125

```
>
> Drivers licenses are retested on regular basis? Where? No place I've been
> in the last 40 years.
>

California, every 12 years or sooner if you have an accident or tickets.
```

25. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 02:51:54 UTC
From: Hambone The Magnifico <daradiofuncrew@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eb08d53@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Scott" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb> wrote in message
news:3EB01A99.E42B67BB@yahoo.bomb...
> http://www.upsitedown.co.il/anim/Upd-rest40.swf
>
> and then you can save it!
>
> BTW, is it 75 meter and CB Plussers or 75 and 20 meter GBs?

It's your call - that's the best part!

26. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 02:54:33 UTC
From: Hambone The Magnifico <daradiofuncrew@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eb08d55@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66129
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"PhilC" <philC@cranium.com> wrote in message
news:YCKdnVldZfLspC2jXTWcpQ@comcast.com...
> Not at all let me know when you plan on doing it so I can record you for
> nostaliga and evidance to send to Riley.

.....as if he givesa flying ---- !

Oh well....OK...listen between 3.869 and
3.895 after 10:00 EST. Ya can't miss-'em!

PFHBLTTT!

27. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:02:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB08E2F.61717970@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66130

>
> The callsign of a person is like his name. Unique to that person alone.
> But alas in the great wisdom of the great FCC all that is trashed too.
>
> Lets go buy a dead mans call.
>

Well, my call used to belong to someone somewheres in upstate New York.
The FCC was recycling calls back in 1976 when I got my first license.
Had to go to an FCC field office in NYC to take the tech (general
written and 5wpm receive AND send). Since restructuring I figured
I might as well get the extra.

I've heard that Japan's FCC literally ran out of ham calls, and recycles
them within a few weeks of expiration/death. They have a much
smaller letter/number space to work with than USA has.

28. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:02:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430230240.26547.00000291@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66131

>Also I've only heard of this being done for the Techinician license.

I know alot who have done it, all the way to Extra, and dont have a Clue to this day what info they were tested on

>Again I know of no one who can memorize 384 or 665
>questions plus answers in one day.

You dont get the picture you dont have to memorize each and every Question.

>Just a single example should suffice. The Extra test
>covers phase angles. The Technician test does not.

So what, you dont have to know anything about Phase Angles to pass the Test. Tell you what im going to do, I will find me one of them sites that have the test on, I will copy a couple of the Questions and I will show you how its done.
If you know where I can find one of the sites let me know.

29. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:03:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB08E92.B0A1C8B8@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66132

>
> You'll have to excuse Leonard on this one, Dan. He isn't actually a
> particpant in amateur radio. He haunts the newsgroup because he's a
> wanna be.
>

Why "wanna be"? Just take the damn tests, Lenny. It ain't that
hard.

30. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:45:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2L0sa.1927$3f7.1594303@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66123

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430215117.27207.00000516@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a
single
> >day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.
>
> I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
> memorized the questions and answers, not the material.

Almost everyone who has been successful in the license in a day class has done some prior reading of the study guide. The classes that I have heard of specifically recommend that the people planning on attending the class do so. Also I've only heard of this being done for the Techinician license.

>
> The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician
license.

The Technician test is 35 questions chosen from a pool of 384 possible questions. The Extra exam is 50 questions chosen from a pool of 665 possible questions. There is also a major difference in the difficulty level of the material. Again I know of no one who can memorize 384 or 665 questions plus answers in one day.

> Many including non-EE children pass the Technician class license in a day.

See above. Those who are successful have done some study prior to the class.

> The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If
not,
> it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if one
just
> memorizes the question pool.

I don't know what pools you are looking at but you are wrong. The extra is more difficult. Just a single example should suffice. The Extra test covers phase angles. The Technician test does not. Plus the Extra is harder because they are drawing from a substantially larger question pool.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

31. Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:46:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB09907.CE220F04@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66135

Vshah101 wrote:

> It would be interesting to hear about lenover21's contributions. Then someone
> might jump in and claim these are not "amateur" radio contributions.

I can almost guarantee that the first person to jump in and say that
would be Leonard.

Dave K8MN

32. Re: Rename Newsgroup

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:48:56 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8q5eh$3uv$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66136

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> Start a relevant thread, Post under a real name, and see what happens!
>

That's CRAZY talk man.

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

33. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:51:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <tR0sa.1929$3f7.1595880@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66126

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430215811.26547.00000288@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a
single
> >day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.
>
> Dee you dont have to memorize every Question, all you need to do is a few
word
> associations, and a few memory tricks and its done. Dont believe it, it
has
> been posted here by many that thats exactly what they did.
>
>

The Tech pool is 384 questions. I simply can't believe that it can be done in a single day without some prior preparation. Those that I have known who succeeded had done some advance preparation as recommended by the sponsors of the one day class.

It's even more unbelievable when it's the Extra class as the pool is 665 questions.

Besides that, there is often a big discrepancy between what people claim to have done and what they actually did. One person who claimed to have passed "without studying" actually had done significant study. He just hadn't happened to use the published study guides. He had a background in electronics and communications and read the FCC rules pertaining to amateur radio. Therefore he did not need to use the published study guides but he had certainly studied the material. It just happened to be a different study approach than most people take.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

34. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 03:54:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <1U0sa.1930$3f7.1597215@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66127

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430220206.26547.00000289@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If
not,
> >it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if
one
> >just
> >memorizes the question pool.
> >
>
> I hate to agree with you, but you are right on. I took the EXTRA Test and
it
> was easier than I expected. Alot easier than the Novice I took years ago.
> Actually the Extra was a joke as far as tests go.

Any test is easy if you know the material. If you are like most of us, your first test is taken at a point in your life when you have little background in the subject. Thus even though you've studied it, it is still difficult as the whole field is new to a person. By the time you get to that Extra, you've accumulated a lot of experience and knowledge making it seem easier even when it is not.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

35. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 04:07:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <m41sa.1934$3f7.1601144@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66133

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430220206.26547.00000289@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If
not,
> >it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if
one
> >just
> >memorizes the question pool.
> >
>
> I hate to agree with you, but you are right on. I took the EXTRA Test and
it
> was easier than I expected. Alot easier than the Novice I took years ago.
> Actually the Extra was a joke as far as tests go.

Also when did you take the Extra test? There was a small window due to restructuring when people could take the Extra test that would normally have followed the Advanced test (the hardest of the whole lot) without having to take the Advanced test. However in 2002, the Extra test was revised to include the material of the old Advanced testing. So between the restructuring and the implementation of the new Extra question pool in mid 2002, the route from General to Extra was easier than before or after that window. That's because the Extra test before restructuring focused a lot on regulations including VE requirements and responsibilities since the "heavy" technical material had been in the Advanced test. The discrepancy created by the restructuring was corrected with the release of that new pool in 2002.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

36. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 04:08:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <o51sa.1935$3f7.1601617@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66134

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EB08B8F.F9D80A8F@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > Drivers licenses are retested on regular basis? Where? No place I've
been
> > in the last 40 years.
> >
>
> California, every 12 years or sooner if you have an accident or tickets.
>

Is that written test, driving test, or both?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

37. Re: Rename Newsgroup

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 04:13:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB09EFD.6020506@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66137

Unclaimed Mysteries wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>
>> Start a relevant thread, Post under a real name, and see what
>> happens!
>>
>
> That's CRAZY talk man.

heh, heh, my bad! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

38. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 04:43:14 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3EB0A5E2.E8E98BEB@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 66138
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Hambone The Magnifico wrote:
>
> Oh well....OK...listen between 3.869 and
> 3.895 after 10:00 EST. Ya can't miss-'em!

EST? Are you in Indiana?

> PFHBLTTT!

Well said. <:

39. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 04:43:22 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2lp$cg4h3$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66313

Not necessarily Dan, unless you have resorted to wearing those pants with
the elastic in the waistband, and wear them pulled up half way between your
bellybutton and your chest..... HI HI! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> See....told you I resembled that 'old fart' stuff.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

40. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 04:46:57 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2lq$cg4h3$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66321

Or.... 1 or 2 letter characters before a number representing the order of which state became a state and then 2 or 3 letter characters after that number?

For example, my call KC8PMX might be KC36PMX if Michigan was the 36th state to join the "union."

Don't worry... not serious about that, but it is some food for thought.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:6pEra.217$2I.57@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> Perhaps we should follow the telephone and increase the number of call
sign
> districts. With 100 districts, more folks can have a 1X2 or 2X1 call.
Gee,
> with a 6 digit number, we can have a 1 letter call sign! CQ dx cq dx cq
dx
> de W401236 W401236 W401236. Think of the possibilities! Of course, with
A,
> N, K, or W at the start, we could almost do with only 4 numbers in the
call.
> Maybe force the codeless techs to make do with a 1X1 call sign while the
> 'important' folks get just a single letter. Fact is that most folks can
get
> just about any single digit in their call now so it would appear that this
> thread is moot. Nice try, however, to come up with something different :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03
>
>

41. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:00:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501010044.18769.00000308@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66140

In article <b8pjngnpv1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030430170649.18769.00000305@mb-m21.aol.com...
>> In article <b8os3b$lf8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >As soon as the FCC goes to the next step. No license testing at
>all....we
>> >can ALL have a ham call. Boy that will be fun.
>>
>> That's the way it was before 1912 in the USA. :-)
>>
>> Are you striking for some retro time, like returning to the good old
>> days before World War One?
>
>Yeah buddy....bring up some that remotely connects and see how it flies.
>No....it is not like it was in 1912. From what I understand those folks
>were actually improving the state of the art.

Using solder to connect wires was "improving the state of the art"
in the primitive early days of radio. :-)

On-off keying was the overwhelming choice of communications
modes in 1912. There wasn't much choice at all back then.
Vacuum tubes were too new, too expensive, and extremely few
radio amateurs had rotary VLF generators to hook water-cooled
microphones to use early AM. On-off keying was king because
that was about the ONLY choice available.

90 years later a whole glob of hams keep pushing this "code"
stuff like it is the ultimate achievement in "improving the radio
art." :-)

>Now they are trashing the ham bands.

Who are "they," mister morseman? :-)

Did you forget your mental mood pills again?

42. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:00:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501010050.18769.00000309@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66142

In article <c2356669.0304300902.6a00a8fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

This is No. 3 in a set of replies to one long, Long, LONG critique by the right reverend n2ey...

>> Of course all of you "us" do. We've all been informed of your
>> "homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2. :-)
>
>I don't have a "homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2. Only a few of
>those exist, and they are used by their builder/designers.
>
>My K2 was built from a kit. I have never claimed otherwise. You seem
>to have a reading comprehension problem about that.

Of course, your highness. A thousand pardons.

>The K2 is not my only HF rig.

Then you have 7 other "rigs." How many of those were homebuilt from kits?

>I've designed and built at home three receivers and three
>transceivers, all HF, with crystal filters. That does not include the
>K2 or other nonhomebrew equipment.

Why do you have so many? You have two hands and two ears? You could only work two at a time assuming abidexterity. Are you ambidexterous, too?

>You don't seem to adapt too well to the amateur environment, though.

True...I am not a Believer in the cult of Morse nor do I worship at the Great Temple in Newington...nor do I believe that all standards and practices in hobby activities should be frozen to that of a half century ago.

>Your cost analysis methods are too narrowly focused.

True, I only think in terms of US money.

>The amateur requirement is for a transceiver, not just a receiver.

Are transmitters by themselves forbidden, your esteemed whatever?

>There is also
>the matter of performance, particularly unwanted-sideband rejection in
>reception.

"Unwanted sideband rejection?" In narrowband CW receivers?

>In simple direct-conversion designs, the phasing method has obvious
>advantages. But in a superheterodyne transceiver, more performance is
>expected.

If a direct conversion receiver works as well as a superheterodyne,
why must you demand a more complex design?

Bad thinking for an "electrical engineer" with an MS. Tsk, tsk.

>And if there is a cost example, why didn't the manufacturers convert
>to the phasing method long ago? The Gingell networks you promote have
>been around for over a quarter century.

I'm not "promoting" polyphase networks. :-)

Was your highness aware of the polyphase network of Gingell's
a quarter century ago?

>> As to "homebrew ladder filters" using separate quartz crystal units,
>> I've only done one of those.
>
>So you have only a tiny bit of experience with them.

Little, tiny, itsy-bitsy small, insignificant unworthy unmentionable
experience of total design from beginning to successful end to
your highness' magnificent, monumental, collosal kit building!

I bow to his highness...

>> Anyone doing that needs a stable, accurate frequency counter
>> AND stable generator; I designed and built my own counter
>
>That's nice. I did the same thing in 1975. My counter can also
>function as a "digital dial" for an HF receiver or transmitter, of
>almost any heterodyning scheme.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Mine was done in 1967. Why were you so late?
:-)

>> and
>> have both an HP 606 and HP 608 signal generator to use in my
>> workshop.
>
>And it took you all that time?

What "time" your serene highness? Those were a gift from a friend.

>> Such "homebrew (crystal) ladder filters" are NOT
>> weekender projects nor are they cheap to make for one-of hobby
>> applications.
>
>You're behind the times, Len.
>
>Microprocessor crystals are available in quantity for low prices. If a

>filter is intended for use in a receiver, it can be tested in the
>receiver and a simple fixed-frequency signal source used.

How many of those "microprocessor crystals" were available in
1970 or 1975? Were they cheap then? :-)

"Microprocessor crystals" are cheap now (just like NTSC and PAL
color burst quartz crystals)...but only because microprocessors
are plentiful and in wide use.

You've used hundreds of microprocessors, right? You have
fabricated many, many in your homedesigned projects, yes?
Of course you have, you are so "with the times!"

>If you don't have hardware, it's just an academic exercise.

How about a couple spare 16C84s from Microchip? You must
have dozens lying around staying "with the times." :-)

>> Try to stay focussed on the SUBJECT.
>
>Try a spellchecker ;-)

Any dictionary allows spelling of "focused" or "focussed" as
correct. Don't try to misdirect.

>> No, you apparently don't know.
>
>Yes, I do. You hate to admit that, however.

Know what? So far all you've mumbled in here is "you know"
all these things and have this ivy-covered MSEE certificate
and "work as an electrical engineer."

You can't do the simple math of the QEX Yoshida article yet
"you know" all those things simply by stating that.

>> Relatively easy to observe with the right test equipment. I have
>> the test equipment, the experience.
>
>But you haven't done it, have you?

Yes I have.

>Have any of these pahsing receivers exceeded 45 dB unwanted sideband
>rejection? 50 dB?

Would you mind taking your own spellchecker to task on the
word "pahsing?" Thank you.

Yes and yes to your questions.

As to how much exceedance, "you don't have the right to know!"
:-)

>> I don't "lecture endlessly." :-)
>
>Yes, you do.

Poor Jimmie, into delusions again. He knows everything so
anyone telling him something new is labelled "lecturing." :-)

>> >No, I want to actually BUILD something and put it on the air.

>> You should be able to
>> do that by yourself without help from others.
>>
>I have done it. Many times. Doesn't mean I have to reinvent the wheel,
>though.

How many HF "rigs" now...8? And you want to "actually BUILD
more?"

Buy another KIT, Jimmie, that won't tax your poor overworked
"wheel," er, brain. Build away.

>> Elecraft has some other products in kit form, several other
>> manufacturers do, too. Those would allow you to "build"
>> something and get it on the air.
>
>Been there, done that.

You've bought the entire Elecraft product line in kits? Amazing!

Yet you want to "BUILD" some more...tsk, tsk, tsk.

>But you haven't actually built any phasing-type HF SSB receivers that
>exceed 50 dB unwanted sideband rejection, have you?

Yes I have.

>But it can be done, and has been done, with crystal filters.

Yes it has.

>The truth hurts, doesn't it?

Not to me.

>Seems to me that you are the one emotionally linked, though.

Linked to what?

I'm not the one defending the Great Cult of Morse. :-)

>But you don't behave in an objective manner here.

I don't follow the Teachings of the Church of St. Hiram, therefore
I don't behave in a subjective manner like that of a Believer.

Yu gotta prolem wid dat. TS.

>You remind us of your CV at every opportunity.

Nope. :-) I'm not the one with the ivy-covered MS.

Is "CV" short for curriculum vitae? That refers to a whole life
experience. I gave a very short form of my job resume some
time ago in here.

>Because wideband SSB may be a good idea. Or it may be a bad idea.

Make up your mind.

>The law may be stifling innovation. Maybe it should be changed.

What "law?" ITU-R S25 isn't any "law."

Try to stay focussed. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Remember you have an
MS...you've repeated that more than once a month in here. :-)

>> So, tell us all about how you "homedesigned" that Elecraft K2?
>
>I have never claimed that.

No? Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are getting confused operating those 8
great HF "rigs" all at once. :-) Or is it 7? How many were kits?

>Can you show us a post where I claimed to have done so? I don't think
>you can. Which makes you either a liar or mistaken.
>
>Which is it?

A different option, Judge Judy. Get a better attorney or agent,
whichever is best. :-)

43. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:00:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501010053.18769.00000310@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66143

In article <c2356669.0304300902.6a00a8fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

Continuing a bit of Jimmie's "critique" of others without acknowledging a single fault of his own...

>> Can anyone understand geographic bias on your
>> part? [of course they can]
>
>You often see things that are not there. Len. You've repeatedly
>written things about others' posts which you have failed to prove.

Go back to Google and look at your own postings about the B&W network, where it was made, and so forth. That's just one example. There are others.

>> Concentrate on the analysis done by Yoshida in the QEX article.
>
>Why? You are not empowered to give orders.

You are the one with MSEE and have mentioned it often. Can't you do an analysis of the math? I thought you were this high-powered "real engineer" who does that at work.

>> Note: Wideband performance is part and parcel of possible
>> "Hi-Fi" SSB, aka wide audio modulation in radio.
>
>6 kHz is not "hi-fi" (an ancient '50s term) by any stretch of the
>imagination.

I wasn't restricting bandwidth to just 6 KHz (and certainly not "kHz"). The Gingell polyphase network can do wider bandwidth SSB. It is technically possible.

>> One of the Gang of Four has already stated in here that he "will
>> live forever."
>
>Who are "the Gang of Four"?
>
>I never claimed to be immortal.

Steamy Stalker did that in saying he would "live forever." :-)

That will be in Google too. :-)

>> That's evidentiary in a search of Google, is it not?
>
>Show us.

Go look for yourself. I can't do your homework for you. Google
is pretty much open-access to anyone with Internet access.

>> Then try to discuss the contents of Yoshida's QEX article, not his
>> apparent lack of QRZ listing.
>
>Why?

The mathematics is important by itself. That doesn't die with the
mathematician. Or have you changed your mind about that
non-relationship?

>You have built phasing-type SSB receivers and transceivers?

Yes.

>Did any of them exceed 45 dB unwanted sideband rejection? 50 dB?

Yes.

>> You want "proof" of that? :-) Go to the RSGB's Radio Communication
>> issue almost a year after the 1970s mention and look in Pat Hawker's
>> "Technical Topics" column.
>
>Why? Did any of them exceed 45 dB unwanted sideband rejection? 50 dB?

Not then. Came a lot closer than was possible with the Dome
network.

>I just asked some questions. You don't want to answer them.

I answered them. You didn't like the answers. Too bad.

>Perhaps
>you don't want to admit that those old designs did not do better than
>newer designs such as the KK7B R2.

Not having any hands-on experience with a "KK7B R2" (whatever
that is), I can't do any comparison. Is that one of the Elecraft
things you always mention? :-)

>Perhaps you don;t want to admit
>that parts and boards for those old designs are as hard to come by as
>the old B&W PSN network....

You need someone to layout parts for you and make PCBs? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. One-of-a-kind PCBs are easy to layout. Just
think in two dimensions. You can do it with 0.1 inch centers
full size using a vellum pad. Hand-paint resist (lacquer) after
drilling through-holes drilled with locations from the full-size
layout sheet. Etch in a small flat photo darkroom plastic
tray. Easy. I've done that about three dozens of times. No
fancy photo work needed, no pre-sensitized PCB stock..

Need a layout for a Gingell polyphase filter and modulator
circuit for an SSB exciter? Go to Harry's Homebrew website
(SM0VPO) and download a free GIF full-size pattern. All
ready to go. Schematic and all instructions there, too, mister
MSEE. Gosh, with all your claimed "electrical engineer"
experience at work, I thought you would know such things.

I guess not. Tsk, tsk.

>> [on the Tayloe Mixer...]
>> >Yet for some reason you did not include his callsign in your post.
>> >You included the callsign of everyone else mentioned. Perhaps you
>> >do not like to admit that the inventor is a 1x2 Extra.
>>
>> Misdirection on your part again, Jimmie. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
>Then WHY did you omit his callsign and include everyone else's?
>
>> Dan Tayloe wasn't born with his amateur radio callsign, was he?
>
>Nope. Neither were any of the other people you mentioned. But you
>omitted his callsign and included all the others.

Awwwww. Now ain't that such a badness!

Do you have a need to spank someone, Miss Manners?

>> The elegant innovation/invention of the Tayloe Mixer is applicable
>> to ANY radio-electronics situation involving heterodyning, not just
>> amateur radio. Dan Tayloe has much to his credit in invention
>> and innovation and much of that work is not just for ham radio.
>
>Nobody disputes that.

But you just LOVE to do all that "disputing" about some alleged
social gaffe about a callsign. You don't even read RF Design
magazine you could get free every month while "working as an
electrical engineer."

Neither the US Patent Office nor RF Design magazine identifies
the Tayloe Mixer by amateur callsign.

>But the FACT is that the first practical use of that innovation was in
>a high performance, CW-only, direct-conversion amateur radio
>transceiver.
>
>That fact really seems to bother you.

Not me. I'm not the one making all that fuss about an amateur
radio callsign. :-)

>> Try recognizing the PERSON, not the callsign, Jimmie.
>
>I recognize both. You suppress the callsign, even in an amateur radio

>newsgroup.

Callsigns don't write messages, Jimmie. PEOPLE write
messages.

>> I think I'm right in my assessment of you and your "qualifications."
>
>No, you're completely wrong. But you will never admit it, no matter
>what qualifications are presented. You've already demonstrated that
>behavior in here many times.

You mean I don't fall down and worship a god of radio that has an
amateur radio license grant?

Horrors! An infidel! Not one of the True Faith of Morse! :-)

Better call OHSA, have them send a hazmat team to investigate
your "electrical engineering" workplace. You might be inhaling
something very strange.

>This is an amateur radio newsgroup. In amateur radio, identification
>is primarily by callsign. Callsigns are unique, names are not. First
>names are
>used rather than last names in conversations and correspondence.

Oh, oh, the Miss Manners identity came out again! Quick, call
the shrinks.

Gosh, Jimmie, my little old Icom receiver isn't picking up this
newsgroup on HF ham bands.

>This simple convention really seems to bother you, Len. You want to impose
>your convention of last names and invented nicknames on others, rather than
>callsigns.

Awwwww.

Why do you even bother to make these long, Long, LONG replies to
a non-ham, Jimmie? :-)

You should be out there complaining to the Usenet gods, demanding
that infidels be BARRED from entry! These are Holy Ham Habitats!

You seem ultra-bothered by some words on a screen. Not good for
your psychological health to get so worked up. Remember Jim Fixx.

44. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:00:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501010057.18769.00000311@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66141

In article <c2356669.0304300902.6a00a8fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030426162044.16173.00000055@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030426082619.18821.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030425232756.18771.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> >>In article <c2356669.0304251111.2f81f2f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> >>(N2EY) writes:
>> >>>The phasing idea was kept alive by a few hams even before the
>> >>>developments of the past few decades. For example:
>> >>>
>> >>>QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
>> >>>Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
>> >>>meter receiver.
>> >>
>> >> Who are writing a reply to?!?
>> >
>> >What does that mean, Len?
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you've run out of comprehension skills, have you?
>
>Nope. It seems you have run out of proofreading skills, though.
>
>You wrote:
>
>"Who are writing a reply to?!?"
>
>which doesn't make much sense.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Who ARE you replying to? :-)

>Try to stay focused.
>>
>> You need to focus on who you are replying to.
>
>I'm replying to the newsgroup.
>Specifically, to a newsgroup posting.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you are very specifically targeting one individual.

If you were "replying to the newsgroup" the Reply To line should
have said something like "everyone" or "all" or non-specific
mention.

>> You live in the past too much.
>
>I'm not the one repeatedly citing his expired patents and
>half-century-old RTTY experience, Len - you are.

Tsk, tsk, tsk some more.

I actually GOT all that RTTY experience and GOT one patent.

The patent is in radio, by the way, not some mechanical thing.

Who is it that kept on with long, long posts about the "history"
of amateur radio regulations before 1955? Jimmie Miccolis did.

Lots of those. They are in Google.

>> Not only that, your resources
>> of information are too tightly bound to old ARRL publications.
>
>Says who?

Says I. You might mention a few things out of "Electric Radio"
(a non-newstand publication commonly called a "fanzine") but
your referfences are almost exclusively from ARRL publications.

You seem to ignore the RSGB and Radio Communications or
anything published in Australia or New Zealand...or the few ham
publications from Europe that get translated into English.

You are an ARRL syncophant. Rather transparent. Google
shows that.

>Do I sense some anti-ARRL bias in your postings?

You limit your personal information resources to just the ARRL.

>> There HAVE been "new" networks publicized for a quarter
>> century. RSGB publications has had them repeatedly.
>
>If they've been around for over a quareter century, they're not new.

But YOU don't know much about the Gingell polyphase network
so you try to cover that up with a lot of side-stepping and
misdirection.

>> "Recognized and published here" some 13 years after it appeared
>> in RSGB's Radio Communication magazine. :-)
>
>The 1988 Handbook reference I gave was not the first one. Just one I
>had handy.

Side-step, side-step, tipitty tapping. :-)

See? MUST have that ARRL reference! :-)

>> European amateurs were already trying out and (successfully)
>> using the Gingell polyphase network in SSB equipment before
>> it was "recognized and published" in the USA.
>
>That's nice. Nobody denies that.

But you need those ARRL cites just the same. You won't really
accept it unless ARRL publishes it as "proof." :-)

>You're wrong about that.

About what?

>> You keep promoting some old component manufactured
>> by a Pennsylvania company long ago...as if it were the final word on
>> state of the art.
>
>Where have I done that? Mentioning is not promoting. I used to have
>one of those networks, but sold it long ago.

You were PROMOTING it awhile back. That's in Google, too.

That came with a lot of boosterism for your local Pennsy "hood."

>And the Gingell network is hardly the "final word on state of the
>art".

A four-quadrature phase shift network by Gingell and finalized
in values by Yoshida is a LARGE JUMP over the Dome two-
quadrature network limited to just voice bandwidths. The Gingell
and Yoshida-value network is considerably more broadband than
previous attempts...and holds to much lower relative quadrature
error which improves unwanted sideband and carrier rejection.

The original thread opened with a discussion of whether or not
"high-fidelity" (presumably meaning wideband audio) SSB was
good for amateur applications.

I posted mentions of the 4-phase Gingell network to explain that
it was TECHNICALLY POSSIBLE to generate "Hi-Fi" SSB. It is
very technically possible with relatively loose-tolerance
components in the circuits and still good for unwanted sideband
and carrier rejection.

You jumped in with these long, Long, LONG "critiques" of my
post talking about OLD networks and concepts which could
NOT do wideband audio SSB. You've just not had that much
experience anywhere with the newer networks, won't do the
math to do an honest comparison. Don't try that "MSEE snow
job" again about "knowing better." You haven't shown anything
of newer techniques, only new snow.

You seem bent on acquiring many more pounds of flesh.

I might or might not handle all your "critique" in other replies.
That might ease the eyestrain for readers in here. :-)

Meanwhile, you really ought to use your free time more productively
than going into these long, Long, LONG postings. I'd suggest you
do some DX on HF with CW. It might make you feel better. :-)

45. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:01:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501010100.18769.00000312@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66139

In article <d22b54c3.0304301026.51b32188@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
>news:<BAD4DD88.17DFA%stewart@say.net>...
>> "Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> I think this conversation is just about over. You're not even making an
>> honest effort to discuss this issue. In one message you're talking about
>> reinstalling fallen antennas following a storm and in the next message
>> you've twisted that into having 911 dispatchers (and others) step down.
>
>You're slowly getting his real drift . . . no matter what you post
>he'll jump all over it and twist it sometimes to completely irrational
>extremes. The more you post your views or even facts the better he
>likes it, there is no end to his circles, you'll never "win" when you
>post anything positive about ham radio for one. This is one of few NGs
>in which his trolls gather any attention at all which is the only
>reason he lurks here. It's all juvenile gamesmanship on his part and
>nothing more.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Just who claimed "26 patents" in here? :-)

Kellie did. Poor guy kept trying that snow job for several days until a few of us checked out patent sites such as Delphion.

Turned out Kellie was co-inventor of just ONE patent. That one wasn't on radio or electronics. He retracted several days later by claiming "foreign applications" increased the number to 26.

Who hopped up and down insisting that US military vehicles in World War 2 used "28 Volt ignition systems" that could "power ARC-5 radios" directly? Kellie did. :-)

Several more exchanges and about two weeks later Kellie was still claiming that he was right...even though it's an old archived fact that most US military land vehicles used 6 VDC systems with a few later war models going up to 12 VDC. The 28 VDC system was common on US military aircraft before WW2.

"ARC-5" sets were designed for aircraft use. The US military had plenty of other land-vehicle-mounted radio systems. Most became surplus after WW2.

Then we get into the Tall Tales of Kellie shooting bears from the deck of an aircraft carrier for USN intelligence as a civilian working on catapults. Priceless! :-) :-) :-)

>I hope you learned your lesson about how far being polite to him gets
>you.

Yes, of course, all have seen how "polite" Kellie gets. :-)

It's either the hoagies or the soft pretzels with yellow mustard as
the cause of it in my opinion... :-)

46. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:20:29 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2ls$cg4h3$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66316

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8orug$162$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't matter
> > either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just heard
> > this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for the
> > newsgroup.
> > Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district could
> > theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough
> promotion
> > for that to happen.....
>
>
> Well we dang near ran out of W and K prefixes sometime back. Why do you
> think we have this alphabet soup of calls now?
>

Maybe they should start reissuing those calls that are listed as "available"
for vanity calls. There is a vanity call page linked to QRZ.COM that lists
thousands of calls available now. Maybe they should reissue those BEFORE
issuing any more sequentially issued callsigns?

> >
> >
> > A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating
> privileges
> > allowed by the license that makes the difference.
>
> You have been brainwashed by Incentive Licensing. The class is the thing.
> Bull crap.

No I haven't. It's no different that the licenses or certifications I do
currently hold. I respect and am proud of the priviliges and opportunities
and the things I am allowed to do with those certifications and licenses I
hold (outside of amatuer radio) The registration numbers on those are no
different than the callsign. Its the privileges/rights/responsibilities I
have earned that I respect and am proud of.

>
> The callsign of a person is like his name. Unique to that person alone.
> But alas in the great wisdom of the great FCC all that is trashed too.

Simply nothing more than symbolism and a form of registration of the masses
(masses in ham radio that is.)

>
> Lets go buy a dead mans call.

If the concept of never reissuing a call after a person has passed came to be, we would run out of calls eventually.... If that is your wish to do so.... feel free though.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

47. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:23:45 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2lt$cg4h3$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66315

Michigan does every four years. Written test albeit, as there is no road test except for getting the initial license. There probably should be in the beginning years of driving (while young) and at the tail end too when the reflexes and vision and reaction times obviously aren't as good.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Drivers licenses are retested on regular basis? Where? No place I've
been
> in the last 40 years.
>
> As for ham retesting. To prove what? Every ten years the test becomes
even
> more non relevant.....how would that help ham radios technical standards?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

48. Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:28:12 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2lu$cg4h3$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66314

Myself, I am looking into eventually getting some stuff published in the future but nothing major contributed at this point yet. Trying to identify something that "hasn't been done before" first.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430213719.27207.00000512@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >Contributions To Amateur Radio
>
> None yet. I had designed circuits, but none of these could be considered
> contributions. Probably never, now that I am not in the EE field.
>
> It would be interesting to hear about lenover21's contributions. Then
someone
> might jump in and claim these are not "amateur" radio contributions.

49. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:30:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8qbd5$dc3$0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 66144

Len Over 21 wrote:

> "E Pluribus Dum Dum."

Finally! His creed in a truly few words! We knew he could do it!

50. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:32:40 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2lv$cg4h3$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66320

> With the exception of antennas and propagation conditions, Hams are
usually not
> technical. However, in this technical area, Hams are often very skilled.

Hams are very technical in a variety of areas actually.... its the
mechanical side that a percentage probably lacks. Sure ya can build a
transciever but can't change the oil in the car or replace something simple
like an alternator.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

51. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:35:00 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m0$cg4h3$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66311

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB06205.6070100@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since
you
> > have had your license?
> > Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....
>
>
> One of the better social experiences was helping to track down a child
> who had become separated from her mother at an event. It was quite an
> experience trying to calm the mother. Fortunately the kid had just biked
> Waaay ahead, and we got the next ham who saw her to get her to stay put.
> Not much compared to a big disaster I guess, but the mother was quite
> happy that we were there to help.
>
> On a ham note, I just found out I placed third in my division in the
> NEQP. Not too bad for a (mostly)deaf guy! ;^)
>
> I suppose This isn't all that much, but then I've only been a ham for 4
> years now.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Hey not bad, and I am sure that mother was definitely happy. Hell... its a
start at least.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

52. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:37:35 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m1$cg4h3$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66317

Some type of CB term?? Not up on "cb lingo." Is there a ham radio
equivalent??

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB03645.AC756BF4@crosslink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > What's a 100-1??
>
> Prefer 100:1?
> 73, K3DWW

53. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:38:45 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8qbt5$f5q$0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 66145

Len Over 21 wrote:

> ARRL has consistently emphasized,
> spotlighted, practically underlined the role played by amateurs

> while carefully deemphasizing or outright omission all the work
> done by other non-amateurs during disasters and emergencies.
> That is NOT "news" by any journalistic standards. It is just
> self-serving propaganda designed to make amateurs feel "proud"
> of "their service" even though the vast majority have never
> participated whatsoever in any disaster or emergency. It paints
> an extremely biased, almost jaundiced view of activites done by
> those who engage in a hobby for recreational purposes.
>
> Such one-side propaganda is NEVER "honest."

Is this guy a *real* dumshit or what? He insists that the amateur radio press report in intimate detail on the workings of all other radio venues. Weird, at least.
"Journalism" indeed. Evidently his wife is a journalism professor this week. Last week he couldn't spell it right.

Ah well, What should anyone expect from a uninvolved troll whose only interest in life is in attempting to relieve his terminal boredom by trying (most unsuccessfully)
to trash a hobby he has long held in envy but could never join?

54. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:42:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m2$cg4h3$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66319

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430000811.13060.00000486@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >KC8PMX wrote:
> >> > Let the Novice class go, ...
> >> >
> >> > As far as semantics of naming of the license class, why not make the
> >> > following apply in the meantime?
> >> >
> >> > Extra Class=1st Class Amateur Radio license
> >> > Advanced Class=2nd Class " "
> >> > General Class=3rd Class " "
> >> > Tech with Code=4th Class
> >> > Tech w/o Code=5th Class
> >> > Novice Class=6th Class
>
> The "Class" name is wrong. This would make the dummies that just learned
code
> and not the technical material, "only" coders, higher "class".

If the code is the real issue, and is supposed to be "all-important" to ham
radio, then a system like that may support incentives to upgrade.

>
> >The way I look at it is, if a person wants the privileges they will earn
> >them.
>
> Not when an unfair, irrelevant barrier such as Morse code is put there.
Its
> unneeded bacause one can operate on HF without Morse code.

5 wpm is not a hard thing to achieve.... Just let yet another CSCE expire
and going to re-test again in June to get another one to sit on a shelf for
another year until I am in a position to enjoy the privleges that will allow
me to enjoy, that I currently cannot enjoy right now....

>
> How about a special test for the microwave bands, above say 2.4 GHz? Once
one
> passes this test, they can operate above this freq.

Yeah, it's called the No-code tech license currently available right now.
All amateur privileges from 50Mhz on up, all modes applicable to the bands
according to FCC rules or gentlemens' agreements.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

55. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:48:30 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m4$cg4h3$10@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66312

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430215117.27207.00000516@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a
single
> >day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.
>
> I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
> memorized the questions and answers, not the material.

If someone can memorize both the questions and answers for the complete test pool for the extra class, I think that is definitely an achievement in my book. That means word-for-word memorization.. Isn't that like something over 300+ questions???

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

56. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:50:07 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m5$cg4h3$11@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66306

Is that not representation is some form or another though??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:p1CdndRac5Se0y2jXTWcog@crocker.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b8odnf$btubt$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> > licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
> their
> > level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
>
>
> the arrl has no 'representation' on the fcc so the question is moot. they
> are just another group who submits petitions and comments.
>
>
>

57. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:52:07 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m6$cg4h3$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66307

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430185901.26815.00000312@mb-m24.aol.com...
> ARRL representation
>
> From: "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>
> >Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> >licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
their
> >level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
>
> No way. The ARRL helps and represent all licensed radio amateurs, whether
or
> not they become a member. ARRL acts for Hams when the Hams themselves are
> unable to. The other 75% are an unorganized group. Acting on their own,
the
> other 75% will not be as effective and will weaken the ARRL's position.

Acting as the devils advocate here.... who said it should be the ARRL then??
(Other than the business named ARRL to self-justify itself...)

>
> If one has a difference of opinion, they can bring this up to the ARRL. If
they
> are not happy with that, other groups can be formed.

Not if you are not a member.... you don't exist.

>
> Also, the ARRL represents a more balanced view, supporting all aspects. If
it
> were up to the current Hams, the hobby will be concentrated in a few
areas.
>

Such as??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

58. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 05:57:50 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m7$cg4h3$13@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66309

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB05FD9.9040307@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> > licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
their
> > level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
>
>
> hmmm, sounds about like how many people vote also! 8^(

Isn't that the case in most situations? :)

>
> If not the ARRL, then who would represent hams?
>

Actually, I would love to see another group step up to the proverbial plate.
A little bit of competition would be good to see the complacency change.
Instead of having the "We can do whatever we want" attitude currently held,
competition may actually make the ARRL accountable. After all, there is
more than one political party in the US, as well as there are more than just
ONE union (labor type) organization out there, and those are both groups
that are allegedly suppose to be representing thier respective groups.

> Things like band threats are real.
>

Yeah... due to lack of use.. Over 20,000Mhz of frequencies to use above
50Mhz and I bet less than .01% are actually being at least moderately used,
let alone heavily used.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

59. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 06:00:29 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8r2m8$cg4h3$14@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66308

> But if you're not involved in Amateur Radio, why should it even concern
> you that Morse Code exists in Amateur Radio? Notice I'm not arguing in
> defense of code (note my license class), simply extending an honest
question
> to a person I'm involved in a conversation with.
>
> However, after reading the above (your interest here is solely the
> elimination of the Morse Code test), I now have to wonder why we're now
> having this long, drawn out, discussion about emergency communications.
> There is almost no link between Morse Code and emergency communications
> today.
>

Most likely since there are many other forms of emergency communications out
there. Most emergencies are "localized" in nature, and in-state
communications seem to be the majority.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

60. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 07:58:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304302358.18c6dd19@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66146

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<FX_ra.1891$3f7.1554616@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> Yes, do yourself a favor and put Len Over 21 on your blocked senders lists.
> To borrow from an old Alka-Seltzer commercial: "Plop, Plop, Fizz, Fizz, O
> what a relief it is!"
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

AMEN!

w3rv

61. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 10:11:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD66B25.18045%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66147

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of
> the total amount of licensed hams as members,
> should they have an equal amount to that as their
> level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25%
> representation?

I suspect the FCC already considers that to some extent. However, I doubt anyone would give that consideration a specific weight. ARRL is the largest ham radio organization in the country. That alone makes their position on an issue worthy of serious notice and consideration.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

62. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 10:20:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD66D2D.18047%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66148

"Vshah101" wrote:

> No way. The ARRL helps and represent all licensed
> radio amateurs, whether or not they become a member.

Even as an ARRL member, I'm not totally convinced of that. I'm not even convinced ARRL always fully represents their own members.

> ARRL acts for Hams when the Hams themselves are
> unable to. The other 75% are an unorganized group.
> Acting on their own, the other 75% will not be as
> effective and will weaken the ARRL's position.

I would really like to see an alternative to the ARRL. Clearly, one organization cannot fully represent the diverse views of an entire population group. Furthermore, a second organization might strengthen our representation. For example, when the two agree, having a second organization back your position always strengthens that position. But, where hams disagree, they should have an alternative organization to represent their views.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

63. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 10:51:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305010251.61a64f98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66149

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<m41sa.1934$3f7.1601144@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030430220206.26547.00000289@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > >The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If
> not,
> > >it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if
> one
> > >just
> > >memorizes the question pool.
> > >
> >
> > I hate to agree with you, but you are right on. I took the EXTRA Test and
> it
> > was easier than I expected. Alot easier than the Novice I took years ago.
> > Actually the Extra was a joke as far as tests go.
>
> Also when did you take the Extra test? There was a small window due to
> restructuring when people could take the Extra test that would normally have
> followed the Advanced test (the hardest of the whole lot) without having to
> take the Advanced test. However in 2002, the Extra test was revised to
> include the material of the old Advanced testing. So between the
> restructuring and the implementation of the new Extra question pool in mid
> 2002, the route from General to Extra was easier than before or after that
> window. That's because the Extra test before restructuring focused a lot on
> regulations including VE requirements and responsibilities since the "heavy"
> technical material had been in the Advanced test. The discrepancy created
> by the restructuring was corrected with the release of that new pool in
> 2002.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee, Bruce held the Advanced license prior to Extra. In any event, he
passed the "heavy" technical stuff. The Extra used to be a cakewalk
with very little technical content. It was the code requirement that
was a barrier to Bruce.

64. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 10:54:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305010254.2d9fdc1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66150

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b8q1e8obl0@208.207.71.136>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >
> > Grow up, Brian.
>
> Never gonna happen.

Hit and Run DICK still can't bring a full thought together. Relying
on other to do his thinking, he runs in with a "me too" posting.

65. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 11:12:11 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns936E4944814B1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66301

<SNIP>

The callsign districts were once different than they are today. The 3rd district once included South Jersey (half a state, although it was a separate state, but that was before radio was invented) and Virginia. I once met a guy with a 3 call issued in Virginia, although to confuse matters he had moved to Maryland anyway. I think he's a silent key now, he was pretty old then. Actually, if the old boundaries of the 3rd district were reinstated it would be closer to the demographics.

Code test speeds will never go back up. Instead the code test will go the way of the horse and buggy, and soon. So get over it, people. Nobody's stopping anyone from using code.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

PS: I am a 20 wpm Extra, and I've been licenced 23 years (not all of them in this country).

66. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 11:14:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305010314.3b06d9f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66302

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAFD3E7.659A9884@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Fact: Len wrote of "Tan Son Hut".
> >
> > Yes, he did.
> >
> > > Fact: I was never assigned at a place called "Tan Son Hut".
> >
> > Was the spelling -real- close to "Tan Son Hut?"
>
> The place where I spent a great deal of my in country time was very
> close to that spelling. It was not, however, spelled that way. By
> Len's own standard, it was not close enough.

And there you have it. This whole thing over Dave's obtuseness.

> > > Fact: Len wrote of my moving boxes at a supply depot.
> >
> > You've never moved boxes while in the service?
>
> I picked up my mail.

I used to get boxes in the mail, too. One even had an ICOM HF radio
in it. Lotsa fun.

> > You must have been very special when you were in Vietnam. Did you
> > serve with Algore?
>
> Al Gore wasn't in the Air Force.

And I wasn't in the Army or Navy, yet I was assigned to them. Being
in the Air Force, you've probably never even seen a grunt.

> > > Fact: I never moved boxes or even visited a supply depot in Viet Nam.
> >
> > I guess everything was FEDEX'd to you.
>
> Keep guessing.
>
> > Fact: moving boxes is a part of military life. I've moved boxes at a
> > supply depot. I've moved boxes on and off airplanes. I've moved
> > boxes at remote airfields.

>
> Good for you. I didn't move boxes. I've never even been to a supply
> depot. I operated radio equipment.

I operated radio equipment as well, but my AFSC wasn't radio operator.
We couldn't find very many radio operators that could handle that
amount of traffic, so we had to deal with it on our own. The radio
ops were best suited for plugging in a patch cord to broadcast
automated rtty and fax products from one of our weather centrals via
10KW HF transmitters. They needed the ocassional reminder when the
feed went off-line.

> > Fact: my AFSC was not "box kicker."
>
> We weren't discussing your AFSC.

It would appear that you had very limited experiences while serving.
You were ordered not to operate amateur radio; you never touched a box
or did anything outside your AFSC. Must be the difference between the
conscription era and the all volunteer force.

> > Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> > throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
> > word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
> > behavior.
>
> That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
> you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
> enough for him.

We were discussing you, not Len. Fact stands. Now go put some salve
on that scrape.

> > > > And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.
> > >
> > > No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.
> >
> > Do you also deny bringing it up?
>
> That wasn't the issue, though you tried to make it into one.

If you weren't stationed at a snack bar, and if Len didn't bring it
up, why did you throw it in the ring when discussing where you were
stationed? Maybe you just spent a lot of time at the snack bar.

> > > > > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > > > > did.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
> > > > >
> > > > > It was still his choice.
> > > >
> > > ...and you were still the factor governing the decision.

> >
> > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.
>
> Your words. His action.

And so it is written.

> > > > Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> > > > said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> > > > with operating on the ham bands.
> > >
> > > Grow up, Brian.
> >
> > Pffft! Quit throwing yourself to the floor and having tantrums,
> > David. Everyone's staring at you.
>
> What tantrum, Brian? What floor? What staring?

Your spoiled, child-like behavior. Grow up, Dave.

67. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 11:37:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD67F4C.1804A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66303

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> You've labeled an Earthquake as "small, isolated" when
> it affects 10 million citizens, leaving them without
> electrical power. That's a very regional-biased
> description and depreciatory.

Len, I'm not going to sit here and argue with you over something this petty. I was clearly using those words in a relative sense - the Northridge earthquake was small and isolated compared to previous earthquakes in California or a hurricane effecting three states. Even the typical California resident would agree, so it is not a "regional-biased description." Enough said.

> You've made the claim that "commercial facilities fail."
> As a generality.

Following a disaster like I described, commercial facilities do fail.

> You've not, repeat NOT, shown that amateur facilities will
> succeed or even work better than commercial facilities in
> disasters.

When those commercial facilities fail, anything is better than nothing.

> You've stated that National Guard units are underequipped,
> late on the scene, and of little use.

Bull! I never claimed that Guard units are under-equipped. Anyone interested can read back over what I actually said for the truth.

As for the "late on the scene" nonsense, I described when they arrived during a specific event (in the Myrtle Beach area following Hurricane Hugo). Did you want me to lie about that? And I never complained about when they arrived - we were thrilled to see them.

I also never claimed National Guard units were "of little use." Instead, I said their communications equipment was of little use because most communications issues had already been resolved by the time they arrived. Furthermore, I said their equipment was useless for the types of communications problems experienced following Hurricane Hugo (fallen police/fire towers covering sections of the downtown area).

> You are following the many-years tone of ARRL "news," that
> of Sinning By Omission. ARRL has consistently emphasized,
> spotlighted, practically underlined the role played by
> amateurs while carefully deemphasizing or outright omission

> all the work done by other non-amateurs during disasters
> and emergencies. That is NOT "news" by any journalistic
> standards. (snip)

Obviously ARRL emphasizes, spotlights, and underlines the role played by Amateurs. It is an Amateur radio organization, covering Amateur radio operators, issues, and events. ARRL makes no more of a claim to be a news organization than any other organization representing a specific segment of this society. Why should this offend you? I hold many memberships in various organizations. The publications for those organizations always emphasize, spotlights, and underlines the activities of their own membership. Does that offend you too?

> It is just self-serving propaganda designed to make
> amateurs feel "proud" of "their service" even though
> the vast majority have never participated whatsoever
> in any disaster or emergency. It paints an extremely
> biased, almost jaundiced view of activites done by
> those who engage in a hobby for recreational purposes.

LOL. Not even worthy of a serious response.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

68. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 11:42:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD68050.1804C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66304

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> Impossible, Dwight! How many times have you heard
> the trite old expression "morse code gets through
> when nothing else will!" How many times have you
> heard the bus driver shouting that "morse code is
> an "effective, valuable skill?" :-)

You're not talking to "the bus driver" or anyone else who said those things. You're addressing me, so don't take your aggression towards them out on me.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

69. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 11:49:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD68206.1804E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66305

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> Yes, do yourself a favor and put Len Over 21 on
> your blocked senders lists. To borrow from an
> old Alka-Seltzer commercial: "Plop, Plop, Fizz,
> Fizz, O what a relief it is!"

I wish some of you guys would have said something before I got caught up
in an extended conversation with him. I've never paid too much attention to
him before, so was taken totally off guard by his nonsense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

70. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 12:13:17 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <xb8sa.13$1c.1@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66318

Working at our local EOC during the Sept 11th WTC event. It all came
together, no pissing contests between groups, etc.

Steve
N2UBP

71. Re: Public Service (yeah, it's another one..)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 12:15:49 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <Vd8sa.14$zd.6@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66310

County EC/RO ARES/RACES
County skywarn Coordinator for NWS
Band Booster parent for local HIgh School

Steve
N2UBP

--

>> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB06696.7090009@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > What public service activities, both in amateur radio and outside of
amateur
> > radio, do you participate in?? Any special experiences from doing so?
> > Anything learned from it? Which activity was your most favorite? Which
one
> > was the least favorite?
>
> Habitat for humanity walk
> Multiple Sclerosis bike race
> 4H Horse events
> March of Dimes walk/bike a thon
>
> I've done these ever since getting involved in the ARS.
>
> Just getting involved in Skywarn
>
> I've enjoyed all of them. Don't know why more hams don't help their
> communities.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

72. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 13:07:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501090728.08074.00000499@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66322

>It was the code requirement that
>was a barrier to Bruce.

Brian you are so Stupid, the Code was never the problem, the only reason I never took the EXTRA before was, I didnt need the EXTRA. As I have stated many times. I dont operate HF, the only BAND I operate is 6 Meters. I dont even have an HF ant, have no desire to get on HF. As of this date I have never used the EXTRA Privilages and probably never will. You refuse to except the real reason I took the EXTRA Test. I will state it again, maybe it will register this time. I took the EXTRA on a BET, you know this but you refuse to except the truth. Dee, Brian was to Stupid or to Lazy to get the General when it was 13 WPM, now hes to stupid or to lazy to even take the EXTRA Free handout TEST. I think the reason Brian will not even take the EXTRA test is because he knows he will never be able to pass it. He is Betting on getting another FREE Handout from the FCC.

73. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 13:16:47 UTC
From: Hambone The Magnifico <daradiofuncrew@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eb11e38@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Scott" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb> wrote in message
news:3EB0A5E2.E8E98BEB@yahoo.bomb...
>
>
> Hambone The Magnifico wrote:
> >
> > Oh well....OK...listen between 3.869 and
> > 3.895 after 10:00 EST. Ya can't miss-'em!
>
>
> EST? Are you in Indiana?

I'm almost next door to the Evansville Epopt...

Ain't I just so lucky to be so honored ?

>
> > PFHBLTTT!
>
>
> Well said. <:

"F-ck'em if they can't take a joke!"
- JR "Bob" Dobbs
www.subgenius.com

74. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 13:17:28 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0305010517.1ec4a8bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66324

"Idaho Irvin" X-No-archive: yes

> And the source of all your "facts" is?
>
> Irv

That's easy Irv. Your Mammy told me, you dumb ass!

75. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 14:47:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB13376.5F2DA7A8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66325

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAFD3E7.659A9884@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > Fact: Len wrote of "Tan Son Hut".
> > >
> > > Yes, he did.
> > >
> > > > Fact: I was never assigned at a place called "Tan Son Hut".
> > >
> > > Was the spelling -real- close to "Tan Son Hut?"
> >
> > The place where I spent a great deal of my in country time was very
> > close to that spelling. It was not, however, spelled that way. By
> > Len's own standard, it was not close enough.
>
> And there you have it. This whole thing over Dave's obtuseness.

No, this whole thing is over Len's several errors about a non-existent
place, a supply depot and moving boxes. He managed to get quite a bit
wrong in only a couple of sentences.

> > > You must have been very special when you were in Vietnam. Did you
> > > serve with Algore?
> >
> > Al Gore wasn't in the Air Force.
>
> And I wasn't in the Army or Navy, yet I was assigned to them. Being
> in the Air Force, you've probably never even seen a grunt.

I've seen plenty of 'em. I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.

> > > Fact: moving boxes is a part of military life. I've moved boxes at a
> > > supply depot. I've moved boxes on and off airplanes. I've moved
> > > boxes at remote airfields.
> >
> > Good for you. I didn't move boxes. I've never even been to a supply
> > depot. I operated radio equipment.
>

> I operated radio equipment as well, but my AFSC wasn't radio operator.
> We couldn't find very many radio operators that could handle that
> amount of traffic, so we had to deal with it on our own. The radio
> ops were best suited for plugging in a patch cord to broadcast
> automated rtty and fax products from one of our weather centrals via
> 10KW HF transmitters. They needed the ocassional reminder when the
> feed went off-line.

I didn't operate RTTY equipment. Keep guessing. I found that the
weather men could sometimes predict the weather.

> > > Fact: my AFSC was not "box kicker."
> >
> > We weren't discussing your AFSC.
>
> It would appear that you had very limited experiences while serving.

Keep guessing.

> You were ordered not to operate amateur radio; you never touched a box
> or did anything outside your AFSC. Must be the difference between the
> conscription era and the all volunteer force.

The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.

> > > Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> > > throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
> > > word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
> > > behavior.
> >
> > That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
> > you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
> > enough for him.
>
> We were discussing you, not Len. Fact stands. Now go put some salve
> on that scrape.

It'd have to first be a fact in order to stand. It isn't and it
doesn't.

> > > > > And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.
> > > > >
> > > > No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.
> > > >
> > > Do you also deny bringing it up?
> > >
> > That wasn't the issue, though you tried to make it into one.
>
> If you weren't stationed at a snack bar, and if Len didn't bring it
> up, why did you throw it in the ring when discussing where you were
> stationed?

I wasn't discussing where I was stationed.

> Maybe you just spent a lot of time at the snack bar.

You're reduced to guessing.

> > > > > > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > > > > > did.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It was still his choice.
> > > > >
> > > > ...and you were still the factor governing the decision.
> > >
> > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.
> >
> Your words. His action.
>
> And so it is written.

Actually, so you wrote and wrote and wrote silly comments much like
you're doing in the game you're attempting to play with me.

> > > > > Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> > > > > said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> > > > > with operating on the ham bands.
> > > >
> > > > Grow up, Brian.
> > >
> > Pffft! Quit throwing yourself to the floor and having tantrums,
> > David. Everyone's staring at you.
> >
> What tantrum, Brian? What floor? What staring?
>
> Your spoiled, child-like behavior. Grow up, Dave.

Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
tantrum, the floor or the staring?

Dave K8MN

76. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 14:55:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305010655.251b2e95@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66326

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EAFDC1C.84A0E950@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> >
> >
> > > > > I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
> > > > would translate that as "yer a wuss..."

Just to bust yer stones for sport sure James 'Ole Bean, but the real
wusses in this league are the "accomplished" dxers who are too chicken
to dive into the dx contests out where da rubber really hits da road.
Precious few dx contesters get into the game without having been a
dxer first. You ain't and that's that without prejudice.

(ya WUSS . . !)

> > on a plane well above the domestic contests. And ya have to be able to
> > accept the fact that yer gonna get reapeatedly pounded into the ground
> > like a bug even by yer buddies and still enjoy the brawl.
>
> Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member.

That guy has some "issues" well beyond ham radio.

> The CQ WW DX
> 'test is the ultimate whether one is a casual participant chasing new
> ones or is going for a big score.

Righto. One big advantage of the CQ is the number of expeditions which
get into it, lotta straight dxers go ape in the CQs and don't bother
turning in the logs, all they want is the cards. Whatever works works.

> > known I fully expect one of the neighborhood Big Guns to tell me to
> > turn my rcvr on next year.
>
> I haven't decided what to do for this year. I think my days of
> operating 45 out of 48 hours are behind me. .

That's getting to be a bigger and bigger discussion as the average age
of hams creeps upward. Back when I got into the game the ARRL contests
were spread over four weekends per year, 192 hours per year if ya did
both the phone and cw weekends. That's more hours than a salaryman
usually puts into the job per month, ridiculous by today's standards.

And hardly anybody complained. 'Cept a lotta xyl's . . Today there's a lot of grousing about restricting single ops to 30 hours max per contest. I'd certainly vote for that. I can see where all the contests could eventually boil down to maybe a couple sprints per year per dx contest at least for single ops.

> I lean more toward a single
> band effort on 160, 80 or 40m. That way I can get enough sleep

My all-time favorite haunt is 80cw with 75 right behind. I've never had the room for a decent 160 antenna or it would probably be my favorite. Snagging the really rare ones anywhere below 4 Mhz is in a class by itself in my opinion, the ultimate test.

Yeah, single-band entries are a very good idea, they greatly simplify life and yer focus. And you can get the sleep when the band is dead. Unless yer supposed to be supporting a club effort where all that matters is gross score.

> > Sick pups. Somebody would have to put a gun to my head before I'd
> > actually go on the air with a Drake 2B and a Johnson Ranger . . .
>
> Funny that you'd mention those two rigs. When I first got to
> Guinea-Bissau, I'd received my household goods surface shipment but my
> air freight had not arrived from the U.S. It contained my brand new
> Paragon. I'd sold its Drake TR-7 predecessor in Finland before leaving.
> The only rig I could put on the air during the first couple of weeks of
> operation was a Johnson Ranger and a Drake 2-B/2B-Q combo. It worked
> surprisingly well though I was putting out only 40 watts or so.

There was a bit of tongue-in-cheek on my part here, there was a time when I would have killed for a 2B/2BQ and a Ranger lashup. The 2B is a milestone radio and I'd love to have one, I've been needling k2sb for decades about selling me his pristine 2B/2BQ and he keeps telling me "maybe when you're old enough." Heh. The Ranger wasn't such a hot TX, had a major problem with it's drift-prone VFO. I always liked the little Johnson Navigator though. I did have a Valiant II and 75A4 station which did a great job. But you can keep yer mahogany-mounted 210s!

I'm all ate up with a new Field Day antenna design, weird thing but it might be a hot ticket for 20 & 15. A pair of half-wave phased verticals hung off the ends of an SOP half-wave dipole. Fell out a couple chats with n3rs. I have it up for discussion in dot antennas. More later.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

77. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 15:13:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305010713.3ed46977@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66328

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030430224831.26547.00000290@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >Visit the url to see what kind of impact Power Line Carrier broadband
> >use could have on amateur radio.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> And the cute part is ARRL will not be able to stop it. The people who want this
> have HUGH DEEP POCKETS of MONEY, and there going to get there way. The general
> Population want High Speed Access,

Reference please?

> and this new system will be able to provide
> it at an affordable price.

Ya mean like what happened to the rates after the trust-busters broke
up AT&T to promote competition? Ya mean like the way the cable
companies have reduced consumer costs when they entered the phone biz
in competition with the Bells? Yeah RIGHT!

> I hope no one is stupid enough to believe that the
> Millions of people in this country, are going to let a bunch of Hams, dictate
> to them that they cant have this because the Hams might get some Interference.

Hams are not the only users of the HF spectrum by a long shot and some
of those other users have DoD-deep pockets. Check what happened to PLC
in Japan when it was proposed.

w3rv

78. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:05:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501120510.27207.00000573@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66329

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/30/03 4:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430170653.18769.00000309@mb-m21.aol.com>

>>I have never claimed to be any sort of "military man", Len. Nor have I
>>claimed any military or military-related service of any kind.
>
> Ah, but you know all about "rear echelon" activites, don't you?

You never served in recent-era USMC, however YOU have made it your
business to try and tell this NG what is and isn't true about current USMC
policies or programs. Same for USN, USAF, and even Civil Air Patrol
missions...

So what's the difference? YOUR 'experience level' has been limited to
what you knew in 1950-something or what you can cut-and-paste here or read in a
magazine.

>>Nor have I claimed to be an "expert" on military matters.
>
> Sure you have. Google has many posts where you want to
> "correct" others military-related experiences or elevate certain
> ones above certain others. Especailly in times before your
> life existance.

"Correcting" someone based on archived or documentary evidence is not
claiming to be an "expert" Jim has never done this. You have been caught
lying again.

>>For some reason, my knowledge of military history, limited as it is, bothers
>>you a great deal. That's your problem, not my problem.
>
> Noooo, mighty warrior, it is YOUR problem.
>
> I did my US military service long ago.
>
> You've NEVER done any.

Ahhhhhhhhhh yes....The same military service in which you affiliate your
war stories with KIA's from the unit you joined....THREE YEARS and 500 mils
from the places they died.

Yeah, you lying, cowardly putz, we know aaaaaaaall about YOU "military
service".

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. The FRENCH were busy getting their colonial
> butts kicked in Southeast Asia when I was on active duty.
> I was in Northeast Asia.

Oh, now YOU are going to suggest that YOUR being on Active Duty was somehow mutually responsible for the Viet Minh's war with the French?

Maybe it WASN'T the United States Army you served in,,,?!?!

>I looked up the record of everyone in my General Election sample
> ballot. I didn't vote for Bush and Cheney. Get the picture or do you
> need more than a pound of flesh?

I get the pisctue...The loser voted FOR a loser.

>How have you been doing with 97.1.(e)? Stopped any wars yet
> with all that international goodwill?

Can YOU prove is HASN'T...?!?!

Steve

79. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:08:11 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305010808.42290432@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66330

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of April 30, 2003:

Novice - 34,679 (decrease of 14,650)
Technician - 254,333 (increase of 48,939)
Technician Plus - 69,433 (decrease of 59,458)
General - 140,662 (increase of 28,173)
Advanced - 83,690 (decrease of 16,092)
Extra - 103,908 (increase of 25,158)
Total - 686,862 (increase of 12,070)

73 de Jim, N2EY

80. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:10:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501121006.27207.00000575@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66331

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5/1/03 5:54 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0305010254.2d9fdc1a@posting.google.com>
>
>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<b8q1e8obl0@208.207.71.136>...
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> >
>> > Grow up, Brian.
>>
>> Never gonna happen.
>
>Hit and Run DICK still can't bring a full thought together. Relying
>on other to do his thinking, he runs in with a "me too" posting.

Why not, if it works?

In this case, it was appropriate. Like this one. I agree with Dick.
What more do I need to say?

Steve, K4YZ

81. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:13:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8rh34$5hi$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66332

Not yet Ryan...but I keep eyeballing those specials at Wally world...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8r2lp$cg4h3$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Not necessarily Dan, unless you have resorted to wearing those pants with
> the elastic in the waistband, and wear them pulled up half way between
your
> bellybutton and your chest..... HI HI! :)
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> >
> > See....told you I resembled that 'old fart' stuff.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

82. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:14:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8rh4mnsv1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66333

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EB08B8F.F9D80A8F@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > Drivers licenses are retested on regular basis? Where? No place I've
been
> > in the last 40 years.
> >
>
> California, every 12 years or sooner if you have an accident or tickets.
>

One more reason to not go there.

Dan/W4NTI

83. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:17:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8rham$3uv$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66334

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501010044.18769.00000308@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <b8pjngnpv1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030430170649.18769.00000305@mb-m21.aol.com...
> >> In article <b8os3b$lf8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> >> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >As soon as the FCC goes to the next step. No license testing at
> >all....we
> >> >can ALL have a ham call. Boy that will be fun.
> >>
> >> That's the way it was before 1912 in the USA. :-)
> >>
> >> Are you striking for some retro time, like returning to the good old
> >> days before World War One?
> >
> >Yeah buddy....bring up some that remotely connects and see how it flies.
> >No....it is not like it was in 1912. From what I understand those folks
> >were actually improving the state of the art.
>
> Using solder to connect wires was "improving the state of the art"
> in the primitive early days of radio. :-)
>
> On-off keying was the overwhelming choice of communications
> modes in 1912. There wasn't much choice at all back then.
> Vacuum tubes were too new, too expensive, and extremely few
> radio amateurs had rotary VLF generators to hook water-cooled
> microphones to use early AM. On-off keying was king because
> that was about the ONLY choice available.
>
> 90 years later a whole glob of hams keep pushing this "code"
> stuff like it is the ultimate achievement in "improving the radio
> art." :-)
>
> >Now they are trashing the ham bands.
>
> Who are "they," mister morseman? :-)
>
> Did you forget your mental mood pills again?

All of that stuff happened in the middle of the King Spark days eh? Imagine that. Guess 200 meters and down is wrong then. Course they must be...Len over 21 says so.

Hey Len...stick to what you know....not a damn thing about Amateur Radio.

Dan/W4NTI

84. Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:18:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501121856.27207.00000577@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66336

>Subject: Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/30/03 8:37 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430213719.27207.00000512@mb-m26.aol.com>

>>Contributions To Amateur Radio
>
>None yet. I had designed circuits, but none of these could be considered
>contributions. Probably never, now that I am not in the EE field.

Please cite the law, regulation or other requirement taht you be "in the
EE field" in order to make a contribution to Amatuer Radio, Vipul.

YOU are teh one who frequently cites a sole interest in "experimenting".
So...Now that you're not working in a shop with a bench full of test gear to
make it easy for you, you can't "design" anything?

>It would be interesting to hear about lenover21's contributions. Then someone
>might jump in and claim these are not "amateur" radio contributions.

Go to a hamfest (even if it IS against your family's wishes snickersnicker
giggle giggle) and find someone who has a box full of old "Ham Radio:
magazines. They can usually be had for a quarter a piece.

Lennie, unable to get the recognition he felt he deserved in the
professional trades, resorted to submitting his work to HR in the hopes that
his "Gee Whiz" lecturing would be looked upon with awe and wonder by the
unwashed masses of Amatuer Radio.

The work is interesting, but I doubt was exclusively his, although he was
the only by-line on the articles. (Those that I've seen...)

Other than this, Lennie's contributions to Amateur Radio are zero.

Steve, K4YZ

85. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:19:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8rhe3$51n$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66335

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EB08E2F.61717970@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > The callsign of a person is like his name. Unique to that person alone.
> > But alas in the great wisdom of the great FCC all that is trashed too.
> >
> > Lets go buy a dead mans call.
> >
>
> Well, my call used to belong to someone somewheres in upstate New York.
> The FCC was recycling calls back in 1976 when I got my first license.
> Had to go to an FCC field office in NYC to take the tech (general
> written and 5wpm receive AND send). Since restructuring I figured
> I might as well get the extra.
>
> I've heard that Japan's FCC literally ran out of ham calls, and recycles
> them within a few weeks of expiration/death. They have a much
> smaller letter/number space to work with than USA has.
>

Mine is also a recycled call. Similar story. Issued to me when I changed
districts, as was REQUIRED back in the 70s.

My point is BUYING a call. I think that is not so good. But everyone has
an opinion.

Dan/W4NTI

86. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:24:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8rhodolp1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66337

```
"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8r2ls$cg4h3$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b8orug$162$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > > Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't
matter
> > > either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just
heard
> > > this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for
the
> > > newsgroup.
> > > Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district
could
> > > theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough
> > promotion
> > > for that to happen.....
> >
> >
> > Well we dang near ran out of W and K prefixes sometime back. Why do you
> > think we have this alphabet soup of calls now?
> >
>
> Maybe they should start reissuing those calls that are listed as
"available"
> for vanity calls. There is a vanity call page linked to QRZ.COM that
lists
> thousands of calls available now. Maybe they should reissue those BEFORE
> issuing any more sequentially issued callsigns?
>
>
> > >
> > >
> > > A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating
> > privileges
> > > allowed by the license that makes the difference.
> >
> > You have been brainwashed by Incentive Licensing. The class is the
thing.
> > Bull crap.
>
```

> No I haven't. It's no different that the licenses or certifications I do
> currently hold. I respect and am proud of the priviliges and
opportunities
> and the things I am allowed to do with those certifications and licenses I
> hold (outside of amatuer radio) The registration numbers on those are no
> different than the callsign. Its the privileges/rights/responsibilities I
> have earned that I respect and am proud of.
>
>
> >
> > The callsign of a person is like his name. Unique to that person alone.
> > But alas in the great wisdom of the great FCC all that is trashed too.
>
> Simply nothing more than symbolism and a form of registration of the
masses
> (masses in ham radio that is.)
>
> >
> > Lets go buy a dead mans call.
>
> If the concept of never reissuing a call after a person has passed came to
> be, we would run out of calls eventually.... If that is your wish to do
> so.... feel free though.
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
I just dont like the buying a callsign bit. Whatever. And I have no
particular problem with re-issuing the calls.

You may not remember this...the issue of reissuing calls was brought up back
in the 70s. The FCC said they couldnt do that because of their 'program' in
the computer....hmmmmm.

May be the same answer now? Actually its likely more like there too lazy to
do the paperwork. Don't believe me? Then why do they charge for 'vanity'
calls ???

A guy asked me once what my call stood for (NTI) I told him it was me.

Dan/W4NTI

87. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:26:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8rhrf$4cn$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66338

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB066B9.8B9F814F@earthlink.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030430170652.18769.00000308@mb-m21.aol.com...
> > > In article <b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't
matter
> > > >either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just
heard
> > > >this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for
the
> > > >newsgroup.
> > > >Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district
could
> > > >theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough
> > promotion
> > > >for that to happen.....
> > >
> > > The 6th callsign district is getting fairly full of licensed
amateurs.
> > >
> > > According to a K8 in here it isn't part of the United States.
> > >
> > > >A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating
> > privileges
> > > >allowed by the license that makes the difference.
> > >
> > > According to Jim Kelley in here, he said said the callsign "is what
> > > we are!"
> > >
> > > That's fairly telling of personal opinions. Callsigns are a TITLE
> > > surrogate. Titles are much beloved by the nobility. Callsigns
> > > show that amateurs have conquered the ultimate peak in proving
> > > manhood, proving genius level knowledge of radio, and are
> > > generally superior to ordinary mortals. Always. :-)
> >
> > Gee Len over 21....thanks for the clarification...And for all these
years I
> > thought it was a means of identifying my station.
>

> You'll have to excuse Leonard on this one, Dan. He isn't actually a
> particpant in amateur radio. He haunts the newsgroup because he's a
> wanna be.
>
> Dave K8MN

Isn't that a pity? Is he too dumb to pass the code? hi hi

Dan/W4NTI

88. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:27:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8rhtiduv1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66339

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EB08E92.B0A1C8B8@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > You'll have to excuse Leonard on this one, Dan. He isn't actually a
> > particpant in amateur radio. He haunts the newsgroup because he's a
> > wanna be.
> >
>
> Why "wanna be"? Just take the damn tests, Lenny. It ain't that
> hard.
>
>

But that would be lowering himself to the 'morsemen' level. I think his
real problem is he tried to take the test several times over his long
life...and failed.

Dan/W4NTI

89. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:31:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305010831.38e59818@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66340

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030501010050.18769.00000309@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0304300902.6a00a8fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> This is No. 3 in a set of replies to one long, Long, LONG critique
> by the right reverend n2ey...

The reason my reply was long is that Len's post was even longer.

> >> Of course all of you "us" do. We've all been informed of your
> >> "homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2. :-)
> >
> >I don't have a "homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2. Only a few of
> >those exist, and they are used by their builder/designers.
> >
> >My K2 was built from a kit. I have never claimed otherwise. You seem
> >to have a reading comprehension problem about that.
>
> Of course, your highness. A thousand pardons.

You are therefore admitting that you have repeatedly written untruths
in that area.
>
> >The K2 is not my only HF rig.
>
> Then you have 7 other "rigs."

No. Some of my older projects were disassembled.

> How many of those were homebuilt from kits?
>
None. I do not include kits, converted surplus, manufactured or
restored rigs in the homebrew total. I've clarified that repeatedly,
but your reading comprehension seems to have missed it, Len.
>
> >I've designed and built at home three receivers and three
> >transceivers, all HF, with crystal filters. That does not include the
> >K2 or other nonhomebrew equipment.
>
> Why do you have so many?

Better parts were obtained and new ideas tried out.

> >Your cost analysis methods are too narrowly focused.
>

> True, I only think in terms of US money.
>
> >The amateur requirement is for a transceiver, not just a receiver.
>
> Are transmitters by themselves forbidden..?,

Transmitting without listening is poor amateur operating practice.
About the only applications for a "transmitter by itself" in amateur
radio are remote control systems and beacons.
>
> >There is also
> >the matter of performance, particularly unwanted-sideband rejection in
> >reception.
>
> "Unwanted sideband rejection?" In narrowband CW receivers?

Yes. Sometimes called the "audio image". I figured you would not be
familiar with that term, so I used "unwanted sideband".
>
> >In simple direct-conversion designs, the phasing method has obvious
> >advantages. But in a superheterodyne transceiver, more performance is
> >expected.
>
> If a direct conversion receiver works as well as a superheterodyne,
> why must you demand a more complex design?

I don't. The direct conversion designs presented do not work as well
as superheterodynes.

> >And if there is a cost example, why didn't the manufacturers convert
> >to the phasing method long ago? The Gingell networks you promote have
> >been around for over a quarter century.
>
> I'm not "promoting" polyphase networks. :-)

You've been touting them extensively. ;-) ;-)

> >> As to "homebrew ladder filters" using separate quartz crystal units,
> >> I've only done one of those.
> >
> >So you have only a tiny bit of experience with them.
>
> Little, tiny, itsy-bitsy small, insignificant unworthy unmentionable
> experience

Well, there you have it.

> >> Such "homebrew (crystal) ladder filters" are NOT
> >> weekender projects nor are they cheap to make for one-of hobby
> >> applications.
> >
> >You're behind the times, Len.
> >

> >Microprocessor crystals are available in quantity for low prices. If a
> >filter is intended for use in a receiver, it can be tested in the
> >receiver and a simple fixed-frequency signal source used.
>
> How many of those "microprocessor crystals" were available in
> 1970 or 1975?

Not many. There you go, living in the past.

> Were they cheap then? :-)

They are cheap now ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
> "Microprocessor crystals" are cheap now (just like NTSC and PAL
> color burst quartz crystals)...but only because microprocessors
> are plentiful and in wide use.

Why ask me a question if you are going to answer it yourself?
>
> >> No, you apparently don't know.
> >
> >Yes, I do. You hate to admit that, however.
>
> Know what? So far all you've mumbled in here is "you know"
> all these things and have this ivy-covered MSEE certificate
> and "work as an electrical engineer."

All you've done is point to others' articles, some going back a
quarter century, and question others' qualifications.
>
> You can't do the simple math of the QEX Yoshida article

Sure I can.
>
> >> Relatively easy to observe with the right test equipment. I have
> >> the test equipment, the experience.
> >
> >But you haven't done it, have you?
>
> Yes I have.

So you say.
>
> >Have any of these pahsing receivers exceeded 45 dB unwanted sideband
> >rejection? 50 dB?
>
> Yes and yes to your questions.
>
> As to how much exceedance, "you don't have the right to know!"
> :-)

That means 51 dB.
>

> >> >No, I want to actually BUILD something and put it on the air.
>
> >> You should be able to
> >> do that by yourself without help from others.
> >>
> >I have done it. Many times. Doesn't mean I have to reinvent the wheel,
> >though.
>
> How many HF "rigs" now...8?

At least 8 homebrew. Not counting kits, converted surplus,
restored/manufactured gear...

> And you want to "actually BUILD more?"

Sure. Why not?

> >But you haven't actually built any phasing-type HF SSB receivers that
> >exceed 50 dB unwanted sideband rejection, have you?
>
> Yes I have.

51 dB.
>
> >But it can be done, and has been done, with crystal filters.
>
> Yes it has.

Well, there you have it.

> >Seems to me that you are the one emotionally linked, though.
>
> Linked to what?

The phasing SSB method.

> >You remind us of your CV at every opportunity.
>
> Nope. :-) I'm not the one with the ivy-covered MS.
>
> Is "CV" short for curriculum vitae? That refers to a whole life
> experience. I gave a very short form of my job resume some
> time ago in here.

For the umpteenth time....

> >Because wideband SSB may be a good idea. Or it may be a bad idea.
>
> Make up your mind.

Why? It's a policy subject for discussion.

> >The law may be stifling innovation. Maybe it should be changed.
>

> What "law?"

Part 97.

> ITU-R S25 isn't any "law."

It's a treaty whose provisions are implemented by the FCC.
>
> >> So, tell us all about how you "homedesigned" that Elecraft K2?
> >
> >I have never claimed that.
>
> No?

No. Not once.

You have misquoted me. Perhaps you misunderstood, or made a mistake.

Or perhaps you are deliberately lying.

Either way you are writing untruths about another.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are getting confused operating those 8
> great HF "rigs" all at once. :-) Or is it 7? How many were kits?

None of the 8 were kits.
>
> >Can you show us a post where I claimed to have done so? I don't think
> >you can. Which makes you either a liar or mistaken.
> >
> >Which is it?
>
> A different option, Judge Judy.

In other words, you LIED.

Why am I not surprised?

90. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:35:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8ribg$m34$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66341

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8r2lv$cg4h3$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > With the exception of antennas and propagation conditions, Hams are
> usually not
> > technical. However, in this technical area, Hams are often very skilled.
>
> Hams are very technical in a variety of areas actually.... its the
> mechanical side that a percentage probably lacks. Sure ya can build a
> transciever but can't change the oil in the car or replace something
simple
> like an alternator.....
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

Actually from the non-ham Len over 21his lack of knowledge of Amateur Radios history is not surprising. Hams have contributed quite a lot into the technology we see today.

Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of repeaters.

Slow Scan TV....utilized on several of the early moon shots and on the deep space probes, such as voyager. Invented and perfected by ham radio.

And amongst many others the Internet you are reading this over comes from ham radio and PACKET radio linking.

Now-a-days we have much experimenting going on in the digital field within Amateur Radio.

Check out AMSAT for some cutting edge stuff.

Sorry Len.... your full of crap as usual.

Dan/W4NTI

91. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 16:39:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305010839.7d1bd6ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66342

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305010655.251b2e95@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAFDC1C.84A0E950@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > N2EY wrote:

> > > > > I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
> > > > > would translate that as "yer a wuss..."
>
> Just to bust yer stones for sport sure James 'Ole Bean, but the real
> wusses in this league are the "accomplished" dxers who are too chicken
> to dive into the dx contests out where da rubber really hits da road.
> Precious few dx contesters get into the game without having been a
> dxer first. You ain't and that's that without prejudice.

Never claimed to be a DXer....
>
> (ya WUSS . . !)
>
You made how many points in the last Field Day?

> > The CQ WW DX
> > 'test is the ultimate whether one is a casual participant chasing new
> > ones or is going for a big score.
>
> Righto. One big advantage of the CQ is the number of expeditions which
> get into it, lotta straight dxers go ape in the CQs and don't bother
> turning in the logs, all they want is the cards. Whatever works works.

Perhaps it's time for me to go for the gusto...

Your target is 300 Q's, you say?

>
> > > Sick pups. Somebody would have to put a gun to my head before I'd
> > > actually go on the air with a Drake 2B and a Johnson Ranger . . .
> > >
> > Funny that you'd mention those two rigs. When I first got to
> > Guinea-Bissau, I'd received my household goods surface shipment but my
> > air freight had not arrived from the U.S. It contained my brand new
> > Paragon. I'd sold its Drake TR-7 predecessor in Finland before leaving.
> > The only rig I could put on the air during the first couple of weeks of

> > operation was a Johnson Ranger and a Drake 2-B/2B-Q combo. It worked
> > surprisingly well though I was putting out only 40 watts or so.
>
> There was a bit of tongue-in-cheek on my part here, there was a time
> when I would have killed for a 2B/2BQ and a Ranger lashup.

Yeah, me too. They were once cheap - not any more!

> The 2B is a
> milestone radio and I'd love to have one, I've been needling k2sb for
> decades about selling me his pristine 2B/2BQ and he keeps telling me
> "maybe when you're old enough." Heh. The Ranger wasn't such a hot TX,
> had a major problem with it's drift-prone VFO. I always liked the
> little Johnson Navigator though.

Same VFO in both of 'em. Navigator has less other stuff in the box,
tho.

Dern things don't transceive - I gave that game up back in 79 when the
Southgate Type 5 went online. The K2 has dual VFOs...

> I did have a Valiant II and 75A4
> station which did a great job. But you can keep yer mahogany-mounted
> 210s!

I got some 24As and a few 27s that need a home...
>
> I'm all ate up with a new Field Day antenna design, weird thing but it
> might be a hot ticket for 20 & 15. A pair of half-wave phased
> verticals hung off the ends of an SOP half-wave dipole. Fell out a
> couple chats with n3rs. I have it up for discussion in dot antennas.
> More later.

Sounds like a "bobtail curtain"

73 de Jim, N2EY

92. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:42:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501124213.26815.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 66343

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/30/03 4:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430170650.18769.00000306@mb-m21.aol.com>

> A hobby activity involving radio does NOT directly affect public safety.

Sure it does.

An errant harmonic on HF can cause TVI and other BCI to private citizens.

Harmonics on 6 meters can also interfere with TV, broadcast and
aeronautical navaids.

"Freebanders", when allowed to roam at will, can plop down DIRECTLY on
Police, Fire and EMS channels, and have been known to do so. Sometimes their
being there is NO accident.

Jammed PS communications means a delay in getting what is needed to where
it's needed. RFI'd navaids means people get can hurt.

Potential for interference with Navaids, public safety communications and
general broadcast media is more than enough reason to maintain certain rules
and regulations on ANY "radio hobby" that involves transmitting.

Steve, K4YZ

93. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:46:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501124616.26815.00000360@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 66344

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/30/03 8:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430212341.27207.00000510@mb-m26.aol.com>

>Although the Paul Harvey story is not "big media", Ham radio got the "big
>media" story today.
>
>There was a significant story on amateur radio today. On WNPR public radio,
>they had a half-hour story on Ham radio. They mentioned making contacts,
>mobile
>operations, Hams helping with Columbia disaster.

Great.

>This half-hour story, on Ham radio, by a credible news organization, was
>surely
>heard by many.

I'll bet MORE people heard about Amateur Radio via Paul Harvey than heard about it on NPR, Vipul. Paul Harvey is a syndicated program heard on hundreds of stations world wide. NPR does NOT ahve the same distribution base as Mr.Harvey does.

And Mr Harvey IS a "credible news (organization)". NPR is also know for it's own very slanted and way-left-of-center policeies.

Steve, K4YZ

94. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:47:55 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305010847.62e8559c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66345

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8r2ls$cg4h3$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b8orug$162$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > > Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't matter
> > > either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just heard
> > > this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for the
> > > newsgroup.
> > > Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district could
> > > theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough
> promotion
> > > for that to happen.....
> >
> >
> > Well we dang near ran out of W and K prefixes sometime back. Why do you
> > think we have this alphabet soup of calls now?
> >
>
> Maybe they should start reissuing those calls that are listed as "available"
> for vanity calls. There is a vanity call page linked to QRZ.COM that lists
> thousands of calls available now. Maybe they should reissue those BEFORE
> issuing any more sequentially issued callsigns?

Good idea, Ryan, but in doing so the FCC would be cutting themselves
off from the only real revenue the ARS produces - vanity call fees.

> > > A callsign is just a callsign... that's it.

It can make a difference in operating situations. A short snappy
callsign has advantages over a long one, particularly in contests and
other competitive situations. I had a 2x3 call for ten years before I
got this one.

> > The callsign of a person is like his name. Unique to that person alone.
> > But alas in the great wisdom of the great FCC all that is trashed too.

Dan - do you think you are the very first person to hold your
callsign?
>
> Simply nothing more than symbolism and a form of registration of the masses
> (masses in ham radio that is.)

I'd say it's more than that.

Oddly enough, I'm the original holder of each of the three callsigns I
have had.

> > Lets go buy a dead mans call.
>
> If the concept of never reissuing a call after a person has passed came to
> be, we would run out of calls eventually.... If that is your wish to do
> so.... feel free though.

More important, we'd soon run out of the really desirable short calls.

73 de Jim, N2EY (sequentially issued in 1977)

95. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:51:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501125106.26815.00000361@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 66346

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/30/03 4:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430170701.18769.00000312@mb-m21.aol.com>

>> I apologize if what I wrote sounded like a threat, Len. There was no
>>threat intended. You said you've used your commercial license to help
>>others. Since you have an interest in helping others, and the USCGA has a
>>need for people with such skills, I took the opportunity to invite you to
>>join. That invitation still stands.
>
> Why the US Coast Guard Auxilliary?

Why NOT the Coast Guard Auxiliary, Lennie? Their record of public service is legion. You ARE in an area of significant USCGA activity, including aeronautical assets (USCGA has it's own flight program too). It's a very honorable and meaningful way to serve, if public service is REALLY what you'd like to do.

They'll also let you operate on HF without a Morse Code test. You can then use that as one more example of how you "operate" on HF without having taken "the test".

Steve, K4YZ

96. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:54:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501125408.01818.00000608@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66347

>Hams are not the only users of the HF spectrum by a long shot and some
>of those other users have DoD-deep pockets. Check what happened to PLC
>in Japan when it was proposed.
>
>w3rv

Just watch, this is a Done Deal, way to much Money involved in this.

97. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 16:57:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305010857.5c734fe0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66348

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030430170653.18769.00000309@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <20030430082647.18755.00000509@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030427153315.18755.00000313@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <20030427122609.18772.00000228@mb-m16.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>(N2EY)
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>>I say we let them have the kind of country they really want, as long as it
> >>>doesn't threaten the USA. How many Americans fought, died and were injured
> to
> >>>prop up Thieu's govt.? How much of a threat has Vietnam been since that
> govt.
> >>>fell a quarter century ago?
> >>
> >> How much of a military man was
> >
> >(N2EY)
> >
> >>? Where did he fight?
> >>
> >I have never claimed to be any sort of "military man", Len. Nor have I
> >claimed any military or military-related service of any kind.
>
> Ah, but you know all about "rear echelon" activites, don't you?

You mean like maintaining RTTY equipment in Japan? ;-)

No, I leave that to others.
>
> >Nor have I claimed to be an "expert" on military matters.
>
> Sure you have.

Where? Produce a post where I claimed to be an expert on military
matters.

> Google has many posts where you want to
> "correct" others military-related experiences or elevate certain
> ones above certain others.

Show us a post where I claim to be an expert, Len.

I have corrected some of your mistakes - but that doesn't make me an
expert.

Shall we take a look at how you respond to others' military
experience, and the high regard you have shown for others here who
have served? How about someone who served in the US Coast Guard as a
radio operator? (not me!)
>
> >For some reason, my knowledge of military history, limited as it is, bothers
> >you a great deal. That's your problem, not my problem.
>
> Noooo, mighty warrior, it is YOUR problem.

My knowledge isn't a problem.
>
> I did my US military service long ago.

Well, there you have it.
>
> You've NEVER done any.

Never claimed to, either.
>
> >Dan, W4NTI, served in Vietnam. He answered my question. (Thanks, Dan).
> >
> >You did neither.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. The FRENCH were busy getting their colonial
> butts kicked in Southeast Asia when I was on active duty.
> I was in Northeast Asia.

You mean Japan?

> >You might want to look up Vice President Dick Cheney's military service
> >record - particularly in the Vietnam era.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Why?

He used several student deferments to avoid military service. He's got
a lot of company among high-ranking Govt. officials, btw.

> I looked up the record of everyone in my General Election sample
> ballot. I didn't vote for Bush and Cheney.

oh dear - Len is a Nader Raider!

> Get the picture or do you need more than a pound of flesh?

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. How about explaining it
to us in plain English?

98. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 18:11:54 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1636A.D5644DEA@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66327

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> That is an extremely biased "opinion" which is untrue....

Biased? Absolutely. Untrue? Nope, you're just dodging the point.
>
> Such "charges" are disproven .....

I didn't say all crimes *ARE* perp'd by transients, etc.; rather that
this is what Hotel California residents need to believe to get thru the
night.
>
> >By the same reasoning I'm sure California ACS works better
> >than ARES.
>
> ... California ACS, the Greater Los Angeles
> emergency communications organizations have been
> PROVED BY EXAMPLE in many and varied examples.

I'm sure you believe that. It MAY even be true. ....
>
> >But please understand that back in America we still rely on
> >ourselves instead of Government.
>
> California is still a State within the Union and citizens of this
> state are also very much citizens of the United States of America.

As are Puerto Ricans, si?

> There are more citizens of the USA in California
> than any other state in the Union.

Ca is as culturally different as any foreign country. One example. If
you are arrested here you get to make a phone call and be arraigned
before a judge as soon as the courts open. But when a subordinate got
arrested for DWI the PRK kept him incommunicado and didn't let him see a
judge for 3 days. Then they kept him another two for 'processing' even
tho the Judge had only fined him. Reminded me of Mexico but he saw
nothing wrong with that cuz he was from Ca.
>
> Yes, everyone in the United States of America has seen your
> mythical country's "reliance on self" from the seasonal
> hurricane disasters where all the commercial facilities "fail"
> only to be miraculously "saved" by hobbyists. ...

Most Californians cannot even begin to grasp what I'm saying. Commercial facilities are just as reliable and as unreliable everywhere, even in Europe. Difference is, we aren't as reliant on them. Why? Like H.D. riders say "If you have to ask ...."

> citizens have seen/heard of the east-coast sniper randomly
> killing people in the east for at least a month of time, the
> mysterious eastern anthrax mailer who has yet to be
> identified, the schoolboy murderer/suicide ....

Yes, and the hillside strangler and ... But that's NOT the point. There's crime everywhere. Difference is San Diego police murdered more people than all of the above combined in 1978 alone and that's not counting criminals. They're so trigger happy two got into a gun fight over who'd drive the car! That wouldn't be tolerated in America, let alone encouraged like it is in the PRK.

> the double agents in the CIA and FBI who had done
> their work for years, CWO Walker of the USN doing his dirty
> deeds also for years selling secrets of US military
> cryptography to the USSR,

Wasn't Walker from California? If not, he must have been a transient, right?

> riots and fires in Jersey City, ...
and Watts and Compton and ....
> the crime rampant on the streets of NYC and ....
Frisco and LA and SD and ....

But that's just smoke and mirrors needed to maintain your illusions. Except for Oky City these were ALL perp'ed by criminals not police. you can't admit that else you'd have to admit to yourself that you could be their next victim and then you'd have to emigrate like I did. Check out eBay land sales - there're sites So.E. of El Paso wher you'd be safe.

> seasonal tornado devastation in the Midwest, flooding rivers....

Yes, there are natural disasters in parts of America. WE plan for them. You OTOH never know when you'll be murdered by the very folks you think protect you. "What" you say "not in de Hotel California! It's a lovely place ..."
>
> >We have volunteer fire and rescue squads,....
>
> That's nice. Enjoy being a separate "nation" of all amateurs.

We do! If any of our sheriffs acted like LAPD we'd send him to the PRK and elect somebody else. Like I said, different strokes ....
>
> >If you're comfortable living
> >where one town's (El Monte) SWAT team drives 20+ miles to Compton to
> >murder an old man for living in a house a drug dealer once rented 25
> >years before then be my guest but I'll stay in America even tho I have

> >to do a few ARES/RACES drills in case I need to help the good old boys
> >out some day.
>
> No problem. Feel comfortable on the highways with a couple
> of roving snipers randomly killing people in a couple states for
> months. Feel comfortable about the FBI killing the wife of a
> militant or burning down the Koresh kompound or destroying the
> Muraugh Building with homemade explosives.

There are two important differences. First, we caught the snipers and will kill them, but AFAIK neither ElMonte's SWAT team nor any San Diego cops who murdered people will ever see the death chamber. In fact, Californians treat them as heros. Second, we get to shoot back. FBI? We see FBI as 'California' because D.C. is so much like So.Central L.A.

> Now go out to your militia compound ....

Funny you should mention that. The Militia of The Lamb of God was at war with that of another S.D. church back in 78-79 and the Crips and Bloods were at it long before that. We even had what'd now be called a militia at beautiful downtown Compton Hi back in the 50's and now you have LAPD, CHP, and other lawless gangs. AFAIK there's nothing like that here.

What amazes me is Californians not only accept a police state, they LIKE it. For example, S.D. police shot a man dead in his own back yard without warning. He was sitting at a table legally cleaning a legally owned rifle.

There'd be a hue and cry for those cops' hides back here. If their boss didn't charge them he'd be on his way to PRK next election.

But Californians were quick to excuse the murder. "He shouldn't have had a gun" or "Prolly some transient"; anything to keep the illusion that *they* couldn't be next. That's prolly what the old man in Compton thot when El Monte SWAT blew his head off for having money. What's Ca's answer to that? Well he shoulda had his money in the bank so police couldn't steal it?? That's the cultural difference which makes California more like a banana republic.

Biased? You bet! Now y'all excuse me I gotta check my generator then go have coffee with bubba and the sheriff at the fire house ....

K3DWW

99. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 18:16:16 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <JDOdnThse9Ty-SyjXTWcog@crocker.com>
Source record: 66349

no, it acts as a petitioner, not a representative and as such technically
has no more weight than any other individual or group. in practice the fcc
probably looks more closely at what the arrl writes, but can not 'count
votes' as if they represented a fixed size group.

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8r2m5$cg4h3$11@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Is that not representation is some form or another though??
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> "David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:p1CdndRac5Se0y2jXTWcog@crocker.com...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b8odnf$btubt$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > > Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> > > licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
> > their
> > > level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
> >
> >
> > the arrl has no 'representation' on the fcc so the question is moot.
they
> > are just another group who submits petitions and comments.
> >
> >
> >
>
>

100. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 19:35:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305011135.65a280b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66350

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b8qbd5$dc3$0@208.207.71.146>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > "E Pluribus Dum Dum."
>
>
>
>
> Finally! His creed in a truly few words! We knew he could do it!

. . . frigging raving lunatic - he's getting worse by the day.

101. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 19:41:49 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86llxqa1z6.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 66251

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Ryan" == Ryan <Ryan> writes:

[...]

Dan> You have been brainwashed by Incentive Licensing. The class is
Dan> the thing. Bull crap.

Ryan> No I haven't. It's no different that the licenses or
Ryan> certifications I do currently hold. I respect and am proud of
Ryan> the priviliges and opportunities and the things I am allowed to
Ryan> do with those certifications and licenses I hold (outside of
Ryan> amatuer radio) The registration numbers on those are no
Ryan> different than the callsign. Its the
Ryan> privileges/rights/responsibilities I have earned that I respect
Ryan> and am proud of.

Out of curiosity, do you recite your registration numbers every ten
minutes while taking advantages of the privileges and opportunities
they afford you?

The purpose of callsigns are to identify radio operators and/or
stations. This is the same purpose of a person's name, so it is
natural that some people would consider callsigns to be nicknames and
precious to them. It's also natural for some people to feel that
callsigns, like family names, should be handed down to family
relatives when appropriate.

In the past decade, I've changed callsign districts four times.
Getting four different callsigns would have sucked, so I'm happy I
didn't have to change. As I mentioned earlier, I'm totally okay with
appending a district designator so that someone doesn't think the band
is open in the wrong direction or something.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+sXiEGPFSfAB/ezgRAlSGAKCtM89+2ocSLLeZNvO6jkSLcgy4pACg36Pu
5ObnoPoik2o9uR9inclMxhc=
=j+31
```

```
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

102. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 19:55:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305011155.639fb7fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66252

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since you
> have had your license?
> Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....

I have more "bests" than I can count, great hobby. But I have one
"worst" which still haunts me today. Early May 1956, the Hungarians
had revolted against their Soviet occupiers a few days earlier, the
Hungarian hams were all over the bands pleading for help from the
west. Which never came as the Soviets crushed the Hungarians with
tanks and the HAs disappeared from the bands overnight. Some made it
over the fence, many did not and were never heard again.

All I could do was sit in the shack and stare at my HQ-129. It was a
long, long time before any hams in the west worked any Soviet hams
again.

w3rv

103. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:20:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501162016.18769.00000388@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66254

In article <b8r2m4$cg4h3$10@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030430215117.27207.00000516@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> >From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>
>> >You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a single
>> >day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.
>>
>> I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
>> memorized the questions and answers, not the material.
>
>If someone can memorize both the questions and answers for the complete test
>pool for the extra class, I think that is definitely an achievement in my
>book. That means word-for-word memorization.. Isn't that like something
>over 300+ questions???

Where I live there are a large number of actors working for stage,
film, and television companies. A typical script for a one-hour
TV show is 60 to 70 pages of dialogue plus general directions of
actor's responses, positions, and activities in a scene. Shooting
time for a one-hour TV show is 5 to 6 days typically, if taken all
for one episode. That requires all actors to memorize their own
lines, plus the lines of other actors in the scene, plus all the
other script information at a rate of an average of about 10 pages
per day.

Few actors have the background experience to have been the
characters they portray so their normal work requires extensive
memorization...not just of lines, but moods, attitudes, body
language, particular expressions needed at certain times. In the
case of shows having a large amount of specific jargon (law or
medical shows) in dialogue, actors don't have the benefit of
experience even close to the field of their characters.

Memorization CAN be done on a large scale. It is proved in the
entertainment industry every day. That the public is unaware of
the memorization is a tribute to all the other entertainment industry
specialists who blend all the shooting together into a reasonably
believable show or episode or production.

104. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:20:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501162017.18769.00000389@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66255

In article <BAD66B25.18045%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>>
>> Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of
>> the total amount of licensed hams as members,
>> should they have an equal amount to that as their
>> level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25%
>> representation?
>
> I suspect the FCC already considers that to some extent. However, I doubt
>anyone would give that consideration a specific weight. ARRL is the largest
>ham radio organization in the country. That alone makes their position on an
>issue worthy of serious notice and consideration.

ARRL engages a lobbying service in DC as well as having a law
firm on retainer. Names, addresses, and fees required are listed
on ARRL Federal Income Tax forms. Those forms were available
as PDF files on a website from 2001 and some previous years.
ARRL's tax preparation was done by Arthur B. Andersen Co.

As far as I know, ARRL is the ONLY organization able to afford
both a lobby firm and a law firm IN the Washington, DC, area
solely for amateur radio. That enables them to exert more
influence by the minority membership of ARRL, compared to the
three-quarters of all licensed US amateurs who have no such
lobbying or law service of their own.

The FCC will accept any group for "ex parte" presentations in-
person. This was done by Carl Stevenson and Bill Sohl in
representing No Code International's viewpoint on NPRM 98-143.
Such ex parte presentations require the presenter to be IN
Washington at the FCC. That's an imposition on individuals and
small groups who cannot afford the services of lobbying
businesses or communications law firms.

Internet access is an "equalizer" of sorts on the ordinary citizens
who live some distance from DC and cannot afford representatives
there. This was proven by the large response on NPRM 98-143.
None of us have much knowledge of how the FCC handles
consideration of any matter by Internet communications. Paper
copies of comments are processed by someone, at least by
evidence of time-stamping reception of paper copies which
become digitized for the ECFS databases.

105. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:20:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501162018.18769.00000390@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66256

In article <b8rhtiduv1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3EB08E92.B0A1C8B8@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>> > You'll have to excuse Leonard on this one, Dan. He isn't actually a
>> > particpant in amateur radio. He haunts the newsgroup because he's a
>> > wanna be.
>>
>> Why "wanna be"? Just take the damn tests, Lenny. It ain't that
>> hard.
>
>But that would be lowering himself to the 'morsemen' level. I think his
>real problem is he tried to take the test several times over his long
>life...and failed.

I've never had any amateur radio examination nor tried to get one
in any country. There is no record anywhere of such figments of
your imagination. If you wish to propagate a LIE that I supposedly
did so, feel free. That won't absolve you of continuing a LIE with
you as the perpetrator.

I took an examination for a First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial)
Operator License in 1956 at the (then) FCC Field Office in Chicago,
Illinois, passing all required four parts (at that time). That required
travel of about 90 miles from my home town to Chicago. I was 23
and newly released from US Army active duty. No "Q&A" books
were studied for that test, no "question pools" were available for
memorizing the correct answers. I borrowed a loose-leaf notebook
of appropriate FCC regulations (loose-leaf format was then the
printing and distribution convention) and studied that for about a
week prior to the test. There was no snow on the ground on the
day of the test. I wore shoes and socks and took the train to
Chicago, the track being on approximately level ground common to
prarie conditions of northern Illinois. There were about three steps
up and down on the train car and there was a wide stairway to the
FCC office on an upper floor of the Federal Building in Chicago.
[no "walking barefoot in the snow uphill both ways" :-)]

There was some "QRM" during the test from a couple of Radio-
Telegraph (Commercial) Operator applicants taking their code
examination in the same room. In the middle of my test session
there was a fire drill in the Federal Building which caused much
grumbling from the FCC officials and examinees alike. There were

no coffee or drink machines in working order during that fire drill break but water fountains were working and restrooms were available for use. After the fire drill there was some sort of argument between an FCC official and one of the Radiotelegraph examinees and that examinee had to start over on his code test. Written test examinees had to sit on the standard oak office chairs at large over-comfortable-height standard issue federal office furniture common to the 1950s.

Written examination scoring of multiple-choice questions was done with an overlay sheet guide. The four required schematics were studied personally by FCC examiners. Mine passed but there was some discussion with one of the other two Radio-telephone examinees on one of his schematics' legibility. Inquiring as to my score on the test, the answer I received was a perfunctory "you passed." That was it. The license certificate was received via surface mail approximately two weeks later.

Oh, yeah, when I took that First 'Phone test, I'd already had two solid years of HF transmitter operations and maintenance followed by a year of microwave radio relay operations, maintenance, and supervision. Would you consider that FCC test some kind of "entry" into a "lifetime learning experience?" Or do I need to take an AMATEUR test now to prove my radio manhood? :-)

106. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:20:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501162020.18769.00000391@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66257

```
In article <b8rham$3uv$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030501010044.18769.00000308@mb-m25.aol.com...
>> In article <b8pjng$npv$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030430170649.18769.00000305@mb-m21.aol.com...
>> >> In article <b8os3b$lf8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> >> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >As soon as the FCC goes to the next step. No license testing at
>> >all....we
>> >> >can ALL have a ham call. Boy that will be fun.
>> >>
>> >> That's the way it was before 1912 in the USA. :-)
>> >>
>> >> Are you striking for some retro time, like returning to the good old
>> >> days before World War One?
>> >
>> >Yeah buddy....bring up some that remotely connects and see how it flies.
>> >No....it is not like it was in 1912. From what I understand those folks
>> >were actually improving the state of the art.
>>
>> Using solder to connect wires was "improving the state of the art"
>> in the primitive early days of radio. :-)
>>
>> On-off keying was the overwhelming choice of communications
>> modes in 1912. There wasn't much choice at all back then.
>> Vacuum tubes were too new, too expensive, and extremely few
>> radio amateurs had rotary VLF generators to hook water-cooled
>> microphones to use early AM. On-off keying was king because
>> that was about the ONLY choice available.
>>
>> 90 years later a whole glob of hams keep pushing this "code"
>> stuff like it is the ultimate achievement in "improving the radio
>> art." :-)
>>
>> >Now they are trashing the ham bands.
>>
>> Who are "they," mister morseman? :-)
>>
```

>> Did you forget your mental mood pills again?
>
>All of that stuff happened in the middle of the King Spark days eh? Imagine
>that. Guess 200 meters and down is wrong then.

That historical work ("200 Meters and Down") sins by omission in order to highlight amateur radio. Not my fault...but that is typical of the incomplete picture of the whole of radio history since 1896.

The first ever radio membership organization is the Radio Club of America, founded in 1909. That club still exists but long ago demphasized amateur involvement. That founding was 5 years before three New Englanders came up with a local club they called the American Radio Relay League. The RCA (not to be confused with the old RCA Corporation) has a number of history items on its website that may be of interest to more broad-minded amateurs. Those who wish to have their radio information selectively spoon-fed to them can stick with the publications from Newington.

Prior to World War One, the overwhelming type of radio transmitter of any kind was the on-off keyed damped-wave oscillation type called "spark" or the huge VLF rotary alternator type. There were a few cross-breeds between those two but they were few. While the three-element vacuum tube is marked as invented around 1908, it would be in the post-WW1 era when it became low enough in cost to be used by radio amateurs. Radio amateurs almost entirely used the "spark" transmitter type since rotary alternators were way too expensive for hobby applications.

In a rare pioneering effort, amplitude modulation was applied to a rotary alternator VLF generator in 1906 but required a water-cooled microphone used for relatively short periods. That was in the nature of an academic experiment. Radio communication anywhere prior to 1914 was by on-off transmitter keying codes for practically any user.

Radio receivers consisted of simple "diode" types having galena crystals or the iron-filing "coherer" elements as the diode equivalent. Very few, if any, radio amateurs had vacuum tube detector signal audio amplifiers prior to 1914. There were no beat frequency oscillators to make any adjustable audio tone for carrier-on conditions...a received "tone" was the spark-interrupter repetition period having a scratchy sound.

"Radio construction" for amateurs was mainly mechanical, the cheap way using flat wood structures (origin of the generic prototype name of "breadboard") with wires generally fastened together by wrapping around wood screws. Amateurs with fatter wallets could use metal structures that looked more "professional" in the style of the day. Soldered wire joints were actually not common prior to 1914. It was not unheard

of to use varnished round pressed-oatmeal containers as
coil forms.

Let's face it, early radio technology was PRIMITIVE. Any
improvement in construction represented a virtual plateau-
jump in advancing the state of the art of that day.

"Morse code" was already 70 years old in 1914. Variants of
morse codes had communications applications on landlines
worldwide for 52 years by the time of the first demonstration of
radio as a communications medium in 1896. The demonstrators
in 1896 were Marconi, an entrepreneur in Italy, and Popov, an
academician in Russia. Both used variants of morse codes.

>Course they must be...Len over 21 says so.

I wasn't there in 1896 or 1914 and didn't exist until 1932. My
references are many and varied sources of information from
the radio industry, academics, professional organizations and
membership societies not concentrating solely on or about
amateurism.

>Hey Len...stick to what you know....not a damn thing about Amateur Radio.

There are only a few "damning" things about amateur radio.
Most of amateur radio is quite good. It is a few of the much-later
participants who get off on wild tears of their imagination and
self-righteous pontificating about their hobby involvement.

US amateur radio is one of the most open and public hobby
activities in the United States. US civil radio regulations
specifically prohibit any form of communications mode intended
to hide or obscure communications content in amateur radio.
There is no secrecy in US amateur radio and anyone can over-
hear amateur transmissions with an appropriate receiver. There
are no US laws prohibiting reception of any amateur bands as
there are for the cellular telephone band.

There are an unfortunate few US radio amateurs who wish an
almost ultimate elitism and recognition for undeserved glory-of-
accomplishment in a hobby endeavor and undeserved honors
for achievement such to allow them to look down on others.
That's the damning part.

107. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:43:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501164312.27171.00000565@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66258

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/30/03 6:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430192429.26815.00000319@mb-m24.aol.com>

>> Obviously you've not opened the Extra Class study guide, Vipul.
>
>I have a copy of the Extra Class study guide. Hate to sound like WA8ULX, but
>the Extra Class is question pool format, and can be learned in a day.

IN A DAY...?!?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

RIIIIIIGHT!

>>Knowledge of Morse Code is required under international treaty, to which
>>the United States is signatory.
>
>And who came up with this Morse code requirement that requires one to learn
>English?

Huh...???

>>I already "operate" at 2.4Ghz, and WITHOUT a license...On the cordless
>>telephone, the baby monitor, the microwave oven...!
>
>Comercial products, such as TV, do not require a license to operate.
>Amateur radio operation, such as ATV, requires a license.

Noooooooooooo kidding...?!?!

>I don't know of any 2.4 GHz baby monitor.

That's probably because you don't pay attention to such things.

Steve

108. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:45:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501164528.27171.00000566@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66259

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/30/03 8:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430215117.27207.00000516@mb-m26.aol.com>

>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>>You can memorize several hundred of questions and their answers in a single
>>day???!!! Oh please, don't try pulling our legs that hard.
>
>I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
>memorized the questions and answers, not the material.

Yeah...if you take THAT test THAT day.

>The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician license.
>Many including non-EE children pass the Technician class license in a day.

But the subject was the EXTRA test.

>The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If not,
>it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if one
>just
>memorizes the question pool.

Then why haven't YOU passed the test?

Steve, K4YZ

109. How to change adress with FCC?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:53:05 UTC
From: markwgpsu@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501165305.21120.00000441@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66261

How do I change the address of my ameteur station?

I know there is a form but I don't know how to get it.

Thanks

Mark
KA3USN

110. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:53:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501165326.27171.00000567@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66260

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/1/03 3:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501162018.18769.00000390@mb-m14.aol.com>

>Would you consider that FCC
> test some kind of "entry" into a "lifetime learning experience?"
> Or do I need to take an AMATEUR test now to prove my radio
> manhood?

The FCC tests are not a survey of your "lifetime learning experience",
Lennie. It's a test to determine if you're qualified to be a Commission
licensee NOW.

Obviously at this point you are NOT qualified to be a Commission
licensee, at least in the Amateur Radio Service.

Thank God for small favors.

Steve, K4YZ

111. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:53:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305011253.3c1db159@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66262

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8r2m7$cg4h3$13@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB05FD9.9040307@adelphia.net...
> > Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > > Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> > > licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
> their
> > > level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
> >
> >
> > hmmm, sounds about like how many people vote also! 8^(
>
> Isn't that the case in most situations? :)
>
> >
> > If not the ARRL, then who would represent hams?
> >
>
> Actually, I would love to see another group step up to the proverbial plate.
> A little bit of competition would be good to see the complacency change.
> Instead of having the "We can do whatever we want" attitude currently held,
> competition may actually make the ARRL accountable. After all, there is
> more than one political party in the US, as well as there are more than just
> ONE union (labor type) organization out there, and those are both groups
> that are allegedly suppose to be representing thier respective groups.

It's been tried at least a couple times in the past and those groups
quietly folded, ya gotta pay attention to the lessons of history. Most
hobby interests are typically supported by "one party" organizations,
we're just another one. Beyond that I don't think it would be in the
best interest of the hobby to dilute whatever voice the ARRL does have
in the regulatory field.

>
>
> > Things like band threats are real.
> >
>
> Yeah... due to lack of use.. Over 20,000Mhz of frequencies to use above
> 50Mhz and I bet less than .01% are actually being at least moderately used,
> let alone heavily used.....

We'd have a helluva lot fewer Mhz available if the ARRL didn't fight
tooth and nail every single time some commercial popped up looking for

more >30 Mhz bandwidth. Give the devil his due.

w3rv

112. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 20:59:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8s1rhqop1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66263

```
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501162020.18769.00000391@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <b8rham$3uv$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030501010044.18769.00000308@mb-m25.aol.com...
> >> In article <b8pjng$npv$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> >> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030430170649.18769.00000305@mb-m21.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <b8os3b$lf8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> >> >> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >As soon as the FCC goes to the next step. No license testing at
> >> >all....we
> >> >> >can ALL have a ham call. Boy that will be fun.
> >> >>
> >> >> That's the way it was before 1912 in the USA. :-)
> >> >>
> >> >> Are you striking for some retro time, like returning to the good
old
> >> >> days before World War One?
> >> >
> >> >Yeah buddy....bring up some that remotely connects and see how it
flies.
> >> >No....it is not like it was in 1912. From what I understand those
folks
> >> >were actually improving the state of the art.
> >>
> >> Using solder to connect wires was "improving the state of the art"
> >> in the primitive early days of radio. :-)
> >>
> >> On-off keying was the overwhelming choice of communications
> >> modes in 1912. There wasn't much choice at all back then.
> >> Vacuum tubes were too new, too expensive, and extremely few
> >> radio amateurs had rotary VLF generators to hook water-cooled
> >> microphones to use early AM. On-off keying was king because
> >> that was about the ONLY choice available.
> >>
> >> 90 years later a whole glob of hams keep pushing this "code"
> >> stuff like it is the ultimate achievement in "improving the radio
> >> art." :-)
```

> >>
> >> >Now they are trashing the ham bands.
> >>
> >> Who are "they," mister morseman? :-)
> >>
> >> Did you forget your mental mood pills again?
> >
> >All of that stuff happened in the middle of the King Spark days eh?
Imagine
> >that. Guess 200 meters and down is wrong then.
>
> That historical work ("200 Meters and Down") sins by omission in
> order to highlight amateur radio. Not my fault...but that is typical
> of the incomplete picture of the whole of radio history since 1896.
>
> The first ever radio membership organization is the Radio Club of
> America, founded in 1909. That club still exists but long ago
> demphasized amateur involvement. That founding was 5 years
> before three New Englanders came up with a local club they
> called the American Radio Relay League. The RCA (not to be
> confused with the old RCA Corporation) has a number of
> history items on its website that may be of interest to more
> broad-minded amateurs. Those who wish to have their radio
> information selectively spoon-fed to them can stick with the
> publications from Newington.
>
> Prior to World War One, the overwhelming type of radio trans-
> mitter of any kind was the on-off keyed damped-wave oscillation
> type called "spark" or the huge VLF rotary alternator type. There
> were a few cross-breeds between those two but they were few.
> While the three-element vacuum tube is marked as invented
> around 1908, it would be in the post-WW1 era when it became
> low enough in cost to be used by radio amateurs. Radio
> amateurs almost entirely used the "spark" transmitter type since
> rotary alternators were way too expensive for hobby applications.
>
> In a rare pioneering effort, amplitude modulation was applied to
> a rotary alternator VLF generator in 1906 but required a water-
> cooled microphone used for relatively short periods. That was in
> the nature of an academic experiment. Radio communication
> anywhere prior to 1914 was by on-off transmitter keying codes
> for practically any user.
>
> Radio receivers consisted of simple "diode" types having galena
> crystals or the iron-filing "coherer" elements as the diode
> equivalent. Very few, if any, radio amateurs had vacuum tube
> detector signal audio amplifiers prior to 1914. There were no
> beat frequency oscillators to make any adjustable audio tone
> for carrier-on conditions...a received "tone" was the spark-
> interrupter repetition period having a scratchy sound.

>
> "Radio construction" for amateurs was mainly mechanical,
> the cheap way using flat wood structures (origin of the
> generic prototype name of "breadboard") with wires generally
> fastened together by wrapping around wood screws. Amateurs
> with fatter wallets could use metal structures that looked more
> "professional" in the style of the day. Soldered wire joints
> were actually not common prior to 1914. It was not unheard
> of to use varnished round pressed-oatmeal containers as
> coil forms.
>
> Let's face it, early radio technology was PRIMITIVE. Any
> improvement in construction represented a virtual plateau-
> jump in advancing the state of the art of that day.
>
> "Morse code" was already 70 years old in 1914. Variants of
> morse codes had communications applications on landlines
> worldwide for 52 years by the time of the first demonstration of
> radio as a communications medium in 1896. The demonstrators
> in 1896 were Marconi, an entrepreneur in Italy, and Popov, an
> academician in Russia. Both used variants of morse codes.
>
> >Course they must be...Len over 21 says so.
>
> I wasn't there in 1896 or 1914 and didn't exist until 1932. My
> references are many and varied sources of information from
> the radio industry, academics, professional organizations and
> membership societies not concentrating solely on or about
> amateurism.
>
> >Hey Len...stick to what you know....not a damn thing about Amateur Radio.
>
> There are only a few "damning" things about amateur radio.
> Most of amateur radio is quite good. It is a few of the much-later
> participants who get off on wild tears of their imagination and
> self-righteous pontificating about their hobby involvement.
>
> US amateur radio is one of the most open and public hobby
> activities in the United States. US civil radio regulations
> specifically prohibit any form of communications mode intended
> to hide or obscure communications content in amateur radio.
> There is no secrecy in US amateur radio and anyone can over-
> hear amateur transmissions with an appropriate receiver. There
> are no US laws prohibiting reception of any amateur bands as
> there are for the cellular telephone band.
>
> There are an unfortunate few US radio amateurs who wish an
> almost ultimate elitism and recognition for undeserved glory-of-
> accomplishment in a hobby endeavor and undeserved honors
> for achievement such to allow them to look down on others.

> That's the damning part.

Tell me Len....do you get nosebleed because of having your nose up your own ass so long?

Dan/W4NTI

113. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:06:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8s280$f54$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66264

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501162018.18769.00000390@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <b8rhtiduv1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> >news:3EB08E92.B0A1C8B8@ix.netcom.com...
> >> >
> >> > You'll have to excuse Leonard on this one, Dan. He isn't actually a
> >> > particpant in amateur radio. He haunts the newsgroup because he's a
> >> > wanna be.
> >>
> >> Why "wanna be"? Just take the damn tests, Lenny. It ain't that
> >> hard.
> >
> >But that would be lowering himself to the 'morsemen' level. I think his
> >real problem is he tried to take the test several times over his long
> >life...and failed.
>
> I've never had any amateur radio examination nor tried to get one
> in any country. There is no record anywhere of such figments of
> your imagination. If you wish to propagate a LIE that I supposedly
> did so, feel free. That won't absolve you of continuing a LIE with
> you as the perpetrator.
>
> I took an examination for a First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial)
> Operator License in 1956 at the (then) FCC Field Office in Chicago,
> Illinois, passing all required four parts (at that time). That
required
> travel of about 90 miles from my home town to Chicago. I was 23
> and newly released from US Army active duty. No "Q&A" books
> were studied for that test, no "question pools" were available for
> memorizing the correct answers. I borrowed a loose-leaf notebook
> of appropriate FCC regulations (loose-leaf format was then the
> printing and distribution convention) and studied that for about a
> week prior to the test. There was no snow on the ground on the
> day of the test. I wore shoes and socks and took the train to
> Chicago, the track being on approximately level ground common to
> prarie conditions of northern Illinois. There were about three steps
> up and down on the train car and there was a wide stairway to the
> FCC office on an upper floor of the Federal Building in Chicago.
> [no "walking barefoot in the snow uphill both ways" :-)]
>
> There was some "QRM" during the test from a couple of Radio-

> Telegraph (Commercial) Operator applicants taking their code
> examination in the same room. In the middle of my test session
> there was a fire drill in the Federal Building which caused much
> grumbling from the FCC officials and examinees alike. There were
> no coffee or drink machines in working order during that fire drill
> break but water fountains were working and restrooms were
> available for use. After the fire drill there was some sort of
> argument between an FCC official and one of the Radiotelegraph
> examinees and that examinee had to start over on his code test.
> Written test examinees had to sit on the standard oak office
> chairs at large over-comfortable-height standard issue federal
> office furniture common to the 1950s.
>
> Written examination scoring of multiple-choice questions was
> done with an overlay sheet guide. The four required schematics
> were studied personally by FCC examiners. Mine passed but
> there was some discussion with one of the other two Radio-
> telephone examinees on one of his schematics' legibility.
> Inquiring as to my score on the test, the answer I received was
> a perfunctory "you passed." That was it. The license certificate
> was received via surface mail approximately two weeks later.
>
> Oh, yeah, when I took that First 'Phone test, I'd already had
> two solid years of HF transmitter operations and maintenance
> followed by a year of microwave radio relay operations,
> maintenance, and supervision. Would you consider that FCC
> test some kind of "entry" into a "lifetime learning experience?"
> Or do I need to take an AMATEUR test now to prove my radio
> manhood? :-)
>
>

No Len you don't have to take the AMATEUR test. In fact you don't have to do anything. And I didn't say for a FACT that you failed a Amateur test. I said 'I THINK I KNOW ... etc.

You are a world-class asshole ain't ya Lennie me boy? Ever been in a redneck bar with that attitude?

Dan/W4NTI

114. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:08:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8s2bi$2a6$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66265

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501125408.01818.00000608@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >Hams are not the only users of the HF spectrum by a long shot and some
> >of those other users have DoD-deep pockets. Check what happened to PLC
> >in Japan when it was proposed.
> >
> >w3rv
>
> Just watch, this is a Done Deal, way to much Money involved in this.

Since the lines are not shielded. It seems to me that a large amount of RF
properly applied could, shall we say, 'disrupt' the link.

Dan/W4NTI

115. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:12:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.he7w1oe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66266

On Thu, 1 May 2003 11:14:18 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>>> Drivers licenses are retested on regular basis? Where? No place I've
>>> been in the last 40 years.

>> California, every 12 years or sooner if you have an accident or tickets.

>One more reason to not go there.

I held a California Driver License from 1957 to 2000, and after
the initial vision, written, and road tests only had to take a
vision and written test twice for renewal - once because I
renewed four days into the grace period and once by "random
selection". All the rest of the renewals were strictly by mail
with no re-exams.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

116. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:12:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.he7wq3f.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66267

On Thu, 1 May 2003 11:24:49 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>You may not remember this...the issue of reissuing calls was brought up back
>in the 70s. The FCC said they couldnt do that because of their 'program' in
>the computer....hmmmmm.

This was after the call sign sale scandal, and "they" were
scared stiff of doing anything but sequential issuance lest it
be misinterpreted as granting "special privileges".

>May be the same answer now? Actually its likely more like there too lazy to
>do the paperwork.

Do not confuse lack of staff with laziness. Processing staff
vacancies at the Gettysburg License Center have not been filled
as they occur AFAIK.

>Don't believe me? Then why do they charge for 'vanity' calls ???

For the same reason that they are called "vanity calls" rather
than "preferred calls" or "requested calls" -- that's what the
legislation that The Congress passed and forced upon the
Commission requires, the same legislation that mandates renewal
and license fees for other radio services. It came about
in an era when The Congress saw a "cash cow" in anything that
any Federal agency did for its regulated public.

Unless thnigs have changed, the Commission does not keep one
cent of the money - it goes into the U.S. Treasury's General
Fund, just like the money collected from monetary penalties
(forfeitures) and proceeds from the spectrum auctions.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

117. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:14:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501171409.26399.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66268

>Since the lines are not shielded. It seems to me that a large amount of RF
>properly applied could, shall we say, 'disrupt' the link.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Thats what Im gearing up for right now DAn, I have a couple neighbors I cant stand

118. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:23:50 UTC
From: Kevin Muenzler <wb5rue@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eb19067$1_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 66269

"Gordon A Langstaff" <veryniceguy@clomp.com> wrote in message
news:LlYpa.605532$3D1.330423@sccrnsc01...
> Tell us something we don't already know. This ng is nothing but a
> cesspool.
>
> GAL N6RUE

Another "RUE" Welcome to the road-club.

Kevin, WB5RUE

119. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:36:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011336.136a0efe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66270

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030501121006.27207.00000575@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 5/1/03 5:54 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0305010254.2d9fdc1a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:<b8q1e8obl0@208.207.71.136>...
> >> Dave Heil wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > Grow up, Brian.
> >>
> >> Never gonna happen.
> >
> >Hit and Run DICK still can't bring a full thought together. Relying
> >on other to do his thinking, he runs in with a "me too" posting.
>
> Why not, if it works?
>
> In this case, it was appropriate. Like this one. I agree with Dick.
> What more do I need to say?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, tail-ending DICK suits you.

What more do you need to say? For starters, you forgot your
trademark, maniacal "BWHAHAHAHAHA..." laugh.

120. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 21:55:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011355.427c9cde@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66271

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB13376.5F2DA7A8@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAFD3E7.659A9884@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > Fact: Len wrote of "Tan Son Hut".
> > > >
> > > > Yes, he did.
> > > >
> > > > > Fact: I was never assigned at a place called "Tan Son Hut".
> > > >
> > > > Was the spelling -real- close to "Tan Son Hut?"
> > >
> > > The place where I spent a great deal of my in country time was very
> > > close to that spelling. It was not, however, spelled that way. By
> > > Len's own standard, it was not close enough.
> >
> > And there you have it. This whole thing over Dave's obtuseness.
>
> No, this whole thing is over Len's several errors about a non-existent
> place, a supply depot and moving boxes. He managed to get quite a bit
> wrong in only a couple of sentences.

Another example of Dave's obtuseness.

> > > > You must have been very special when you were in Vietnam. Did you
> > > > serve with Algore?
> > >
> > > Al Gore wasn't in the Air Force.
> >
> > And I wasn't in the Army or Navy, yet I was assigned to them. Being
> > in the Air Force, you've probably never even seen a grunt.
>
> I've seen plenty of 'em.

But in all your time in the Air Force you never moved a box.

I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
> father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.

Algore was a grunt in Vietnam. But you didn't see him because you
were in the Air Force. But you say that you saw plenty of grunts.
And you say that you saw Algore's father. If Algore's father wasn't
in the Air Force, was he one of the grunts you saw?

> > > > Fact: moving boxes is a part of military life. I've moved boxes at a
> > > > supply depot. I've moved boxes on and off airplanes. I've moved
> > > > boxes at remote airfields.
> > >
> > > Good for you. I didn't move boxes. I've never even been to a supply
> > > depot. I operated radio equipment.
> >
> > I operated radio equipment as well, but my AFSC wasn't radio operator.
> > We couldn't find very many radio operators that could handle that
> > amount of traffic, so we had to deal with it on our own. The radio
> > ops were best suited for plugging in a patch cord to broadcast
> > automated rtty and fax products from one of our weather centrals via
> > 10KW HF transmitters. They needed the ocassional reminder when the
> > feed went off-line.
>
> I didn't operate RTTY equipment. Keep guessing.

OK. You didn't operate RTTY equipment, and you (say you) didn't
operate amateur radio equipment either. Why were you there again?

I found that the
> weather men could sometimes predict the weather.

When they were on duty. They're only on duty sometimes. They do get
time off to go hang out in snack bar like the other personnel.

> > > > Fact: my AFSC was not "box kicker."
> > >
> > > We weren't discussing your AFSC.
> >
> > It would appear that you had very limited experiences while serving.
>
> Keep guessing.

You had no experiences?

> > You were ordered not to operate amateur radio; you never touched a box
> > or did anything outside your AFSC. Must be the difference between the
> > conscription era and the all volunteer force.
>
> The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.

Sure. People were trying to get into the Air Force to avoid
conscription.

> > > > Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> > > > throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
> > > > word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
> > > > behavior.

> > >
> > > That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
> > > you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
> > > enough for him.
> >
> > We were discussing you, not Len. Fact stands. Now go put some salve
> > on that scrape.
>
> It'd have to first be a fact in order to stand. It isn't and it
> doesn't.

Fact stands.

> > > > > > And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Do you also deny bringing it up?
> > > >
> > > That wasn't the issue, though you tried to make it into one.
> > >
> > If you weren't stationed at a snack bar, and if Len didn't bring it
> > up, why did you throw it in the ring when discussing where you were
> > stationed?
>
> I wasn't discussing where I was stationed.

That was the context. What did you think we were discussing when you
brought up the snack bar?

> > Maybe you just spent a lot of time at the snack bar.
>
> You're reduced to guessing.

Just another sign of your obtuseness.

> > > > > > > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > > > > > > did.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It was still his choice.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > ...and you were still the factor governing the decision.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.
> > > >
> > > Your words. His action.
> > >
> > And so it is written.
>
> Actually, so you wrote and wrote and wrote silly comments much like

> you're doing in the game you're attempting to play with me.

David, you're the one who cannot bring himself to say what he means.
Everything has become so cryptic, couched, and circular that its a
real chore just to try to understand you. Maybe if we resorted to
Q-signals we might do better.

QTH Snackbar?

> > > > > > Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> > > > > > said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> > > > > > with operating on the ham bands.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Grow up, Brian.
> > > > >
> > > > > Pffft! Quit throwing yourself to the floor and having tantrums,
> > > > > David. Everyone's staring at you.
> > > >
> > > What tantrum, Brian? What floor? What staring?
> >
> > Your spoiled, child-like behavior. Grow up, Dave.
>
> Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
> tantrum, the floor or the staring?

Your spoiled, child-like behavior, David.

121. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 22:12:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011412.53df3c56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66272

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b8ribg$m34$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b8r2lv$cg4h3$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > > With the exception of antennas and propagation conditions, Hams are
> usually not
> > > technical. However, in this technical area, Hams are often very skilled.
> > >
> > > Hams are very technical in a variety of areas actually.... its the
> > > mechanical side that a percentage probably lacks. Sure ya can build a
> > > transciever but can't change the oil in the car or replace something
> simple
> > > like an alternator.....
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF/MFR
> > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > >
> > >
> >
> Actually from the non-ham Len over 21his lack of knowledge of Amateur Radios
> history is not surprising. Hams have contributed quite a lot into the
> technology we see today.

OK, Dan, go for it. Name the Ham behind each of the technologies
below. Also state their occupation at the time of their
contributions.

> Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of
> repeaters.

(This space intentionally left blank so that Dan can answer)

> Slow Scan TV....utilized on several of the early moon shots and on the deep
> space probes, such as voyager. Invented and perfected by ham radio.

(This space intentionally left blank so that Dan can answer)

> And amongst many others the Internet you are reading this over comes from
> ham radio and PACKET radio linking.

(This space intentionally left blank so that Dan can answer)

> Now-a-days we have much experimenting going on in the digital field within
> Amateur Radio.
>
> Check out AMSAT for some cutting edge stuff.
>
> Sorry Len.... your full of crap as usual.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

122. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 22:31:24 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501183124.04723.00000370@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66275

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/28/03 7:33 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EADBABB.9DC1E307@earthlink.net>
>
>No CW Test wrote:
>>
>> >> > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were
>> >> > stationed.
>> >>
>> >> No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called
>> >> "Tan Son Hut".
>> >
>> >Do you think he might have been one character off
>> ...
>> >?
>> >
>> Impossible.
>>
>> Len doesn't make mistakes.
>
>He may make miscalculations.

Impossible. A miscalculation is a mistake,
by definition. Since Len does not make
mistakes, he therefore does not make
miscalculations. QED. SOP. LSMFT

>He likely thought his
>anti-League,
>anti-amateur radio,
>anti-children,
>anti-morse testing
>views would be
>embraced by some significant percentage of readers.

For him to think that would be a mistake
would it not? Len does not make mistakes.

>He likely didn't
>count on his
>condescent,
>pontification and
>lack of interpersonal skills
>alienating a large number of the particpants in this forum. His

>reception has likely been somewhat cooler than the one he >envisioned.

Or perhaps he is getting precisely the response he wants.

>The jeers and tomatoes must make Len feel like
>Susan Sarandon at VFW
>convention.

Some people like any attention they can get.
Even negative attention.

123. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 22:32:55 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns936EBCAE836A2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66276

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
news:b8r2lq$cg4h3$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:

> Or.... 1 or 2 letter characters before a number representing the order
> of which state became a state and then 2 or 3 letter characters after
> that number?
>
> For example, my call KC8PMX might be KC36PMX if Michigan was the 36th
> state to join the "union."
>
>
> Don't worry... not serious about that, but it is some food for
> thought.....
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
> ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:6pEra.217$2I.57@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
>> Perhaps we should follow the telephone and increase the number of call
>> sign districts. With 100 districts, more folks can have a 1X2 or 2X1
>> call. Gee, with a 6 digit number, we can have a 1 letter call sign!
>> CQ dx cq dx cq dx de W401236 W401236 W401236. Think of the
>> possibilities! Of course, with A, N, K, or W at the start, we could
>> almost do with only 4 numbers in the call. Maybe force the codeless
>> techs to make do with a 1X1 call sign while the 'important' folks get
>> just a single letter. Fact is that most folks can get just about any
>> single digit in their call now so it would appear that this thread is
>> moot. Nice try, however, to come up with something different :)
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim AA2QA
>>
>>
>>
>> ---
>> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>> Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

>>
>>
>
>

It's against ITU rules - although that never stopped the FCC before. The ITU lays down the following, very roughly speaking -

Ham and experimental calls - prefix + 1 digit + 1 to 3 letters
Aircraft - prefix + '-' + 1 to 3 letters (see what I mean?)
Everything else - Prefix + 1 to 3 letters

Ships can optionally use their name as a callsign, and stations that are fixed or land mobile are not supposed to be issued a call unless their signals can cross international borders.

The ITU definition of a prefix is not the same as in the WPX contest, e.g. in my call (N3KIP) the prefix is really 'N', not 'N3'.

The FCC aleady issues the wrong format calls to aircraft, issues calls to stations that shouldn't have any, and issues all kinds of calls that don't fit any of these formats. So, I guess issuing wierd non-ITU ham calls wouldn't be too big a departure for them anyway, ROTFL!

73 de Alun, N3KIP

124. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 22:59:26 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1A6CD.D273DD9A@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66253

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Some type of CB term?? Not up on "cb lingo." Is there a ham radio
> equivalent??
>
> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB03645.AC756BF4@crosslink.net...
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> > >
> > > What's a 100-1??
> >
> > Prefer 100:1?
> > 73, K3DWW

Sorry Ryan, it's a math notation for a ratio (100 to 1) - in this case
100 CBrs per ham were we to try to use "their" channels.

125. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 23:20:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KYhsa.2286$3f7.1860910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66273

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8r2m4$cg4h3$10@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
>
> If someone can memorize both the questions and answers for the complete
test
> pool for the extra class, I think that is definitely an achievement in my
> book. That means word-for-word memorization.. Isn't that like something
> over 300+ questions???
>

The Extra pool is 665 questions. You don't need to memorize word for word
just enough key words that you have the answers paired correctly with the
questions so you don't get confused between similar questions. However even
on that basis, 665 is too many to learn in a single day. One might be able
to do it with a photographic memory but few are so blessed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

126. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 23:21:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305012316270.361@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66278

On Thu, 1 May 2003, Vshah101 wrote:
> I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
> memorized the questions and answers, not the material.
>
> The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician license.

It's not. The extra test has 50 questions while the others have only 35.

> Many including non-EE children pass the Technician class license in a day.

I don't know many children who have electrical engineering degrees! :-)

> The material for the Extra may be harder, IF one actually learned it. If not,
> it looks like the Extra test is actually easier than the Technician if one just
> memorizes the question pool.

Since there are more questions to memorize, I must disagree. The percentage of correct answers remains at 75%, with the fractional number of questions truncated, but more questions means more correct answers needed.

As for the THEORY behind the questions, the former part which was the advanced test pool is the hardest. The old element 4B part was easy because it didn't really stand alone, but had element 1C to go with it for the actual license upgrade (code medical waivers notwithstanding).

127. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 23:26:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <p2isa.2292$3f7.1862449@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66274

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8r2m6$cg4h3$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030430185901.26815.00000312@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > ARRL representation
> >
> > From: "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> >
> > >Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> > >licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
> their
> > >level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
> >
> > No way. The ARRL helps and represent all licensed radio amateurs,
whether
> or
> > not they become a member. ARRL acts for Hams when the Hams themselves
are
> > unable to. The other 75% are an unorganized group. Acting on their own,
> the
> > other 75% will not be as effective and will weaken the ARRL's position.
>
> Acting as the devils advocate here.... who said it should be the ARRL
then??
> (Other than the business named ARRL to self-justify itself...)
>

No one has said it needs to be the ARRL. It's simply that there is no other organization large enough in members, organized enough to be effective and widespread enough across the country to be able to achieve any results. It is a de facto representative not de jure. Other groups may try but they are just too small to have much impact.

>
> >
> > If one has a difference of opinion, they can bring this up to the ARRL.
If
> they
> > are not happy with that, other groups can be formed.
>
> Not if you are not a member.... you don't exist.

Then become a member. ARRL is the organization with the most impact and if you choose not to be a member, you are choosing to not be heard.

>
> >
> > Also, the ARRL represents a more balanced view, supporting all aspects.
If
> it
> > were up to the current Hams, the hobby will be concentrated in a few
> areas.
> >
>
> Such as??
>

Here Vshah goes off into his personally created, artificial distinction between hams and amateurs. He fails to realize that those who do belong to ARRL are probably split in the same percentages in their interests as those who are not members.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

128. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 23:31:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <f7isa.2295$3f7.1864040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66277

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAD68206.1804E%stewart@say.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > Yes, do yourself a favor and put Len Over 21 on
> > your blocked senders lists. To borrow from an
> > old Alka-Seltzer commercial: "Plop, Plop, Fizz,
> > Fizz, O what a relief it is!"
>
>
> I wish some of you guys would have said something before I got caught up
> in an extended conversation with him. I've never paid too much attention
to
> him before, so was taken totally off guard by his nonsense.
>

We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments. He
prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

129. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 23:32:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1AEA1.F725E675@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66279

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB13376.5F2DA7A8@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:

> > >
> > > And there you have it. This whole thing over Dave's obtuseness.
> >
> > No, this whole thing is over Len's several errors about a non-existent
> > place, a supply depot and moving boxes. He managed to get quite a bit
> > wrong in only a couple of sentences.
>
> Another example of Dave's obtuseness.

Mistakes on Len's part and silliness on your part do not translate to my
being obtuse.

> > > > > You must have been very special when you were in Vietnam. Did you
> > > > > serve with Algore?
> > > >
> > > > Al Gore wasn't in the Air Force.
> > >
> > > And I wasn't in the Army or Navy, yet I was assigned to them. Being
> > > in the Air Force, you've probably never even seen a grunt.
> >
> > I've seen plenty of 'em.
>
> But in all your time in the Air Force you never moved a box.

I don't recall ever moving a box as part of my duties.

> I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
> > father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.
>
> Algore was a grunt in Vietnam.

So? My sister lives in L.A. Do you know her?

> But you didn't see him because you
> were in the Air Force.

Really? I thought I didn't see him because I had no idea who he was.
To this day, I have no idea where he spent his time. I have some
friends in Columbus. Do you know them? Have you ever seen them?

> But you say that you saw plenty of grunts.

I DID say that, didn't I?

> And you say that you saw Algore's father. If Algore's father wasn't
> in the Air Force, was he one of the grunts you saw?

No, he was busy being a senator from Tennessee. I saw him in West Palm
Beach.

> > I didn't operate RTTY equipment. Keep guessing.
>
> OK. You didn't operate RTTY equipment, and you (say you) didn't
> operate amateur radio equipment either. Why were you there again?

I was on a year's holiday, all expenses paid. They even provided my
clothing and meals.

> I found that the
> > weather men could sometimes predict the weather.
>
> When they were on duty. They're only on duty sometimes. They do get
> time off to go hang out in snack bar like the other personnel.

During the times they were on duty, they could sometimes predict the
weather. During the monsoon season their predictions were much more
accurate.

> > > It would appear that you had very limited experiences while serving.
> >
> > Keep guessing.
>
> You had no experiences?

I haven't related my experiences to you.

> > > You were ordered not to operate amateur radio; you never touched a box
> > > or did anything outside your AFSC. Must be the difference between the
> > > conscription era and the all volunteer force.
> >
> > The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.
>
> Sure. People were trying to get into the Air Force to avoid
> conscription.

I don't have a problem with anyone who did so. Those who entered under
those circumstances traded two years of their lives for four years of
their lives. Are you trying to make an issue of it?

> > > > > Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> > > > > throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled

> > > > > word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
> > > > > behavior.
> > > > >
> > > > That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
> > > > you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
> > > > enough for him.
> > > >
> > > We were discussing you, not Len. Fact stands. Now go put some salve
> > > on that scrape.
> > >
> > It'd have to first be a fact in order to stand. It isn't and it
> > doesn't.
>
> Fact stands.

Oh fact stands all right. You just didn't have one.

> > > > > > > And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Do you also deny bringing it up?
> > > > >
> > > > That wasn't the issue, though you tried to make it into one.
> > > >
> > > If you weren't stationed at a snack bar, and if Len didn't bring it
> > > up, why did you throw it in the ring when discussing where you were
> > > stationed?
> > >
> > I wasn't discussing where I was stationed.
>
> That was the context. What did you think we were discussing when you
> brought up the snack bar?

I wasn't discussing where I was stationed. I wasn't discussing what I
did in Viet Nam. What I did was address one of Len's typical (as
outlined in N2EY's accurate profile) attempts at a slam.

> > > Maybe you just spent a lot of time at the snack bar.
> > >
> > You're reduced to guessing.
>
> Just another sign of your obtuseness.

Your guessing is my "obtuseness"?

> > > > > > > > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > > > > > > > did.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It was still his choice.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > ...and you were still the factor governing the decision.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.
> > > > >
> > > > Your words. His action.
> > > >
> > > And so it is written.
> >
> > Actually, so you wrote and wrote and wrote silly comments much like
> > you're doing in the game you're attempting to play with me.
>
> David, you're the one who cannot bring himself to say what he means.

I've said quite precisely what I mean. What I haven't done is write
what you'd like me to write. That scenario isn't likely to take place.

> Everything has become so cryptic, couched, and circular that its a
> real chore just to try to understand you. Maybe if we resorted to
> Q-signals we might do better.
>
> QTH Snackbar?

There's a pretty good example of what I mean above. ZBM-2.

> > > > > > > Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> > > > > > > said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> > > > > > > with operating on the ham bands.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Grow up, Brian.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Pffft! Quit throwing yourself to the floor and having tantrums,
> > > > > > David. Everyone's staring at you.
> > > > >
> > > > > What tantrum, Brian? What floor? What staring?
> > > >
> > > Your spoiled, child-like behavior. Grow up, Dave.
> >
> > Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
> > tantrum, the floor or the staring?
>
> Your spoiled, child-like behavior, David.

I ask a valid question and I get another unrelated partial sentence as a
response.

Dave K8MN

130. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-01 23:42:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1B0E6.E1F75746@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66280

No CW Test wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/28/03 7:33 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EADBABB.9DC1E307@earthlink.net>
> >
> >No CW Test wrote:
> >>
> >> >> > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were
> >> >> > stationed.
> >> >>
> >> >> No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called
> >> >> "Tan Son Hut".
> >> >
> >> >Do you think he might have been one character off
> >> ...
> >> >?
> >> >
> >> Impossible.
> >>
> >> Len doesn't make mistakes.
> >
> >He may make miscalculations.
>
> Impossible. A miscalculation is a mistake,
> by definition. Since Len does not make
> mistakes, he therefore does not make
> miscalculations. QED. SOP. LSMFT

Len should learn a term used by the Marines: BOHICA--Bend Over, Here It
Comes Again.

> >He likely thought his
> >anti-League,
> >anti-amateur radio,
> >anti-children,
> >anti-morse testing
> >views would be
> >embraced by some significant percentage of readers.
>
> For him to think that would be a mistake
> would it not? Len does not make mistakes.

I think I see the flaw in your thinking. Len does not ADMIT to
mistakes.

> >He likely didn't
> >count on his
> >condescent,
> >pontification and
> >lack of interpersonal skills
> >alienating a large number of the particpants in this forum. His
> >reception has likely been somewhat cooler than the one he >envisioned.
>
> Or perhaps he is getting precisely the response he wants.

If so, he's one masochistic geezer.

> >The jeers and tomatoes must make Len feel like
> >Susan Sarandon at VFW
> >convention.
>
> Some people like any attention they can get.
> Even negative attention.

Aside from folks like his faithful defender in Ohio, negative attention
is about the only kind he gets.

Dave K8MN

131. Re: How to change adress with FCC?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:17:27 UTC
From: Aspiring Elmer <elmer@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <qOisa.44$Sp3.27@fed1read01>
Source record: 66281

Mark the info is at URL:
http://www.arrl.org/fcc/forms.html

--

73 From AC6V
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm
FM Beginners Book http://ac6v.com/FM101.htm
"MarkWGPSU" <markwgpsu@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501165305.21120.00000441@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
> How do I change the address of my ameteur station?
>
> I know there is a form but I don't know how to get it.
>
> Thanks
>
> Mark
> KA3USN

132. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:26:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501202658.18769.00000430@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66282

In article <b8s280$f54$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>You are a world-class asshole ain't ya Lennie me boy? Ever been in a
>redneck bar with that attitude?

I've never been in a bar that had redneck radio amateurs.

Is that your favorite hang-out? :-)

133. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:26:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501202658.18769.00000429@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66285

In article <b8ribg$m34$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
>news:b8r2lv$cg4h3$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
>> > With the exception of antennas and propagation conditions, Hams are
>> usually not
>> > technical. However, in this technical area, Hams are often very skilled.
>>
>> Hams are very technical in a variety of areas actually.... its the
>> mechanical side that a percentage probably lacks. Sure ya can build a
>> transciever but can't change the oil in the car or replace something simple
>> like an alternator.....
>>
>> --
>> Ryan, KC8PMX
>> FF/MFR
>> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
>> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>Actually from the non-ham Len over 21his lack of knowledge of Amateur Radios
>history is not surprising. Hams have contributed quite a lot into the
>technology we see today.
>
>Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of
>repeaters.

BZZZT! Wrong answer, Dan. Sorry.

Cellular telephones can be traced back to the first "handie-talkies"
designed by Motorola back in WW2. First two-way radio that
could be held in one hand. Motorola followed that with the SCR-300
"walkie-talkie" during WW2, low VHF range two-way backpack.
The follow-on designs available just after WW2 and used in the
Korean War (AN/PRC-9 as one example of three) had an adapter
cable and box to couple two sets for unattended repeater use.
A whole family of radio relay equipment was operational with the
US military at the end of WW2 that was specifically designed for
unattended repeater use, including multiple-site linking.

ATT may have had the very first pocket-size paging receiver, the
Bell System's "Pageboy" about 1960, a simple VHF receiver with
vibrating audio-range reeds for tone decoding. [was written up in
technical detail in the Bell System Technical Journal in one issue
about 1961] About a decade later the first of the portable, mobile

telephone radios appeared, rather bulky, and with conventional handsets, suitable only for use within vehicles. These were VHF range, not the cordless phone variety used indoors.

Meanwhile, Motorola and others designed and made VHF and UHF handheld two-way radios that featured sub-audible audio signalling for business, utility, and public safety radio use. Many pagers were also designed and made, smaller than the Pageboy. Some of those radio user networks had unattended repeater stations. Several system concepts were built and studied beginning in the 1970s that utilized much digital signalling and control from any site...which eventually morphed into the UHF cellular concept employed in the USA and elsewhere today.

Today's "cell phone" owes its existance to several areas of technology: Development of efficient solid-state RF amplifiers centered on 1 GHZ; Very Large Scale Integrated Circuits of low power demand to handle all the digital functions and control needed in a single small IC package; efficient batteries and charging system to enable long use.

>Slow Scan TV....utilized on several of the early moon shots and on the deep
>space probes, such as voyager. Invented and perfected by ham radio.

BZZZT! Wrong again, Dan.

The very first ever television was already "slow-scan." Those were mechanical and their ultimate mechanical form was done by Scotsman John Logie Baird in the UK. The invention of the iconoscope enabled all-electronic television cameras and after WW2 the image orthicon (big studio equipment) and vidicon (small portable cameras) allowed better imaging. All invented and perfected by commercial interests well before we had a space program such as Mercury.

The first "moon shot" (literally) unmanned vehicles that impacted the moon used small vidicon cameras of conventional higher scan rates; receiving equipment was improved at terrestrial stations to enable capturing and storing individual scan frames. The early deep space probes used highly-modified camera vacuum tubes to study a very wide spectrum above and below human visual range. Later models used semiconductor camera ICs for lighter weight and less power consumption. All designed and built by NASA's contractors.

>And amongst many others the Internet you are reading this over comes from
>ham radio and PACKET radio linking.

AOL doesn't use "ham radio links," works over POTS (Plain Old Telephone System). Inter-exchange cable and fiber linking of the telephone system is done by high-speed digital systems, notably the "T-1 Carrier" running at 1.544 MBPS with many many voice

channels carried in "packets." T-1 and other similar carrier systems can be carried on microwave radio and many such links exist in both telco and other business use.

The "packet" concept probably has more of an origin in microwave radio relay systems using various forms of pulse modulation. Two examples are the AN/TRC-5 and AN/TRC-6 military relay systems operational in the late 1940s. The TRC-6 was in low X-band and came with its own tower. By 1950 General Electric had a 24 voice channel radio relay system on 1.8 GHz for commercial users followed shortly by Philco with a similar C-band system, also 24 channels. The Bell System laboratories did extensive research into many forms of packetized high-speed time multiplexing in the early 1950s and the T-1 Carrier is just one example.

While not "packet" in form the USN contract time-division MUX of 1952 for putting 4 TTY channels into one voice-bandwidth circuit utilized synchronization and framing pulses. The military and commercial "torn-tape" TTY relay system that began before WW2 is the ancestor of "packet" message relay systems. By the time of AUTODIN the TTY relay system had eliminated the human link in relaying, going directly to electronic relaying. Today's DSN (Digital Switched Network) for government and the military can handle everything the Internet can handle.

I don't believe that direct Internet interface of amateur repeaters to commercial ISPs is in line with the definition of AMATEUR radio, that of "an activity without pecuniary compensation." Perhaps you know of an ISP operating as a purely non-profit organization? :-)

>Now-a-days we have much experimenting going on in the digital field within
>Amateur Radio.

Yes, automatic position reporting on amateur VHF-UHF radio using GPSS data input. Without GPS there's no data. GPSS began as the USN's NAVSTAR in 1970.

Embedded microcontrollers in just about every ready-built amateur transceiver, receiver, transmitter, automatic antenna tuner, all designed and manufactured by non-amateurs...adapted by some amateurs for their own use.

Adaptation of microcontrollers in amateur radio of limited relative experimentation enabled by the Microchip PIC line and the Basic STAMP family, picking up what was done by ordinary, non-amateur hobbyists involved in robotics.

Automatic Link Establishment such as on SHARES network... oops, sorry, that is government communications on HF, very little done in amateur radio. Strike ALE. Or drink it.

There is Digital Signal Processing or DSP for true brick-wall audio filtering...following already-done DSP in the commercial area of electronics. DSP above audio in amateur radio equipment was designed and produced by profit-making companies first. The same for SDR or Software Defined Radio.

>Check out AMSAT for some cutting edge stuff.

Check out TAPR (Tucson Amateur Packet Radio) for more practical digital experimentation...such as the "world's most accurate clock" using the GPSS as the source.

>Sorry Len.... your full of crap as usual.

Sorry, Dan. You are the one with mental constipation.

If all you read about radio is from QST, your mental constipation will become terminal.

134. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:26:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501202659.18769.00000431@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66283

In article <b8s1rhqop1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Tell me Len....do you get nosebleed because of having your nose up your own
>ass so long?

No...anatomically impossible.

Whose ass did you have your nose up? :-)

135. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:26:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501202659.18769.00000432@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66284

In article <d22b54c3.0305011135.65a280b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<b8qbd5$dc3$0@208.207.71.146>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > "E Pluribus Dum Dum."
>>
>> Finally! His creed in a truly few words! We knew he could do it!
>
>. . . frigging raving lunatic - he's getting worse by the day.

It's not nice to talk about Dick Carroll like that...

136. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:44:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501204410.24076.00000514@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66286

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
>doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments. He
>prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.

Lenover21 seems to have alot of valid arguments. Just because you disagree does not mean the arguments are not valid.

137. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:48:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501204801.24076.00000515@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66287

From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>What should anyone expect from a uninvolved troll whose only interest
>in life is in attempting to relieve his terminal boredom by trying (most
>unsuccessfully)
>to trash a hobby he has long held in envy but could never join?

What reason could someone never join?
The Technician class license is so easy even children can pass it in one day.

What could be any possible reason for envy of a hobby?

138. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 00:52:55 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501205255.24076.00000516@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66288

From: "Dee D. Flint"

>You don't need to memorize word for word
>just enough key words that you have the answers paired correctly with the
>questions

Exactly. Thats the way to pass the test. Also, alot of the questions are
similar, just rephrased, which makes it even easier.

>However even
>on that basis, 665 is too many to learn in a single day.

Yes, this would probably need two days. One day for Technician, Two days for
Extra. And I mean almost anyone, not just those with great memorization skills.

139. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 01:05:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501210522.24076.00000517@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66289

From K4YZ:
>Then why haven't YOU passed the test?

Theres that irrelevant Morse code test I would have to take first. I don't want to learn Morse code.

140. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 01:12:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501211259.24076.00000518@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66290

From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" kc8pmx@diamondcs.net

>5 wpm is not a hard thing to achieve.
Yes, but it does take months of effort. Learning this realtime encoding skill doesn't get me much. For me, the benefit is small compare to the effort.

141. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 01:21:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501212127.24076.00000519@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66291

From Brian Kelly:
>> Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member.
>That guy has some "issues" well beyond ham radio.

For what, observing that Ham radio is not for a certain group of EEs?

>One big advantage of the CQ is the number of expeditions which
>get into it, lotta straight dxers go ape in the CQs and don't bother
>turning in the logs, all they want is the cards.

And this is not an example of a cult?

>Today there's a
>lot of grousing about restricting single ops to 30 hours max per
>contest.

How can anyone do the same thing over and over again (like a contest)?

142. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 01:43:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1CD71.7010303@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66292

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB05FD9.9040307@adelphia.net...
>
>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>>>Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
>>>licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
>>
> their
>
>>>level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?
>>
>>
>>hmmm, sounds about like how many people vote also! 8^(
>
>
> Isn't that the case in most situations? :)
>
>
>>If not the ARRL, then who would represent hams?
>>
>
>
> Actually, I would love to see another group step up to the proverbial plate.
> A little bit of competition would be good to see the complacency change.
> Instead of having the "We can do whatever we want" attitude currently held,
> competition may actually make the ARRL accountable. After all, there is
> more than one political party in the US, as well as there are more than just
> ONE union (labor type) organization out there, and those are both groups
> that are allegedly suppose to be representing thier respective groups.

I'd agree with that. A little competition is always a good thing. I
don't think they do bad as the only game in town, but it is hard to
repreesent all hams, because we all know they have lots of different
opinions.

>>Things like band threats are real.
>>
> Yeah... due to lack of use.. Over 20,000Mhz of frequencies to use above
> 50Mhz and I bet less than .01% are actually being at least moderately used,
> let alone heavily used.....

Now that's something I would expect the more savvy of the technicians
to do. In my own case, I'm not interested in the higher bands very much,

beyond repeater access. But that may change some day.

- Mike KB3EIA -

143. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:13:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011813.2875f43e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66293

```
Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns936EBCAE836A2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> news:b8r2lq$cg4h3$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
>
> > Or.... 1 or 2 letter characters before a number representing the order
> > of which state became a state and then 2 or 3 letter characters after
> > that number?
> >
> > For example, my call KC8PMX might be KC36PMX if Michigan was the 36th
> > state to join the "union."
> >
> >
> > Don't worry... not serious about that, but it is some food for
> > thought.....
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
> > ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:6pEra.217$2I.57@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> >> Perhaps we should follow the telephone and increase the number of call
> >> sign districts. With 100 districts, more folks can have a 1X2 or 2X1
> >> call. Gee, with a 6 digit number, we can have a 1 letter call sign!
> >> CQ dx cq dx cq dx de W401236 W401236 W401236. Think of the
> >> possibilities! Of course, with A, N, K, or W at the start, we could
> >> almost do with only 4 numbers in the call. Maybe force the codeless
> >> techs to make do with a 1X1 call sign while the 'important' folks get
> >> just a single letter. Fact is that most folks can get just about any
> >> single digit in their call now so it would appear that this thread is
> >> moot. Nice try, however, to come up with something different :)
> >>
> >> 73 from Rochester, NY
> >> Jim AA2QA
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> ---
> >> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
```

> >> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> >> Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
>
> It's against ITU rules - although that never stopped the FCC before. The
> ITU lays down the following, very roughly speaking -
>
> Ham and experimental calls - prefix + 1 digit + 1 to 3 letters
> Aircraft - prefix + '-' + 1 to 3 letters (see what I mean?)
> Everything else - Prefix + 1 to 3 letters
>
> Ships can optionally use their name as a callsign, and stations that are
> fixed or land mobile are not supposed to be issued a call unless their
> signals can cross international borders.
>
> The ITU definition of a prefix is not the same as in the WPX contest, e.g.
> in my call (N3KIP) the prefix is really 'N', not 'N3'.
>
> The FCC aleady issues the wrong format calls to aircraft, issues calls to
> stations that shouldn't have any, and issues all kinds of calls that don't
> fit any of these formats. So, I guess issuing wierd non-ITU ham calls
> wouldn't be too big a departure for them anyway, ROTFL!
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Alun, I hope Steve isn't reading this. "The FCC must follow all treaties."

144. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:16:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011816.f10cfb7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66294

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030501183124.04723.00000370@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/28/03 7:33 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EADBABB.9DC1E307@earthlink.net>
> >
> >No CW Test wrote:
> >>
> >> >> > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were
> >> >> > stationed.
> >> >>
> >> >> No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called
> >> >> "Tan Son Hut".
> >> >
> >> >Do you think he might have been one character off
> ...
> >> >?
> >> >
> >> Impossible.
> >>
> >> Len doesn't make mistakes.
> >
> >He may make miscalculations.
>
> Impossible. A miscalculation is a mistake,
> by definition. Since Len does not make
> mistakes, he therefore does not make
> miscalculations. QED. SOP. LSMFT
>
> >He likely thought his
> >anti-League,
> >anti-amateur radio,
> >anti-children,
> >anti-morse testing
> >views would be
> >embraced by some significant percentage of readers.
>
> For him to think that would be a mistake
> would it not? Len does not make mistakes.
>
> >He likely didn't
> >count on his
> >condescent,

> >pontification and
> >lack of interpersonal skills
> >alienating a large number of the particpants in this forum. His
> >reception has likely been somewhat cooler than the one he >envisioned.
>
> Or perhaps he is getting precisely the response he wants.
>
> >The jeers and tomatoes must make Len feel like
> >Susan Sarandon at VFW
> >convention.
>
> Some people like any attention they can get.
> Even negative attention.

Mr. Smug is the master of not making mistakes. It's what makes him so smug.

145. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:24:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011824.e60bb79@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66295

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030501090728.08074.00000499@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >It was the code requirement that
> >was a barrier to Bruce.
>
> Brian you are so Stupid, the Code was never the problem, the only reason I
> never took the EXTRA before was, I didnt need the EXTRA. As I have stated many
> times. I dont operate HF, the only BAND I operate is 6 Meters. I dont even have
> an HF ant, have no desire to get on HF. As of this date I have never used the
> EXTRA Privilages and probably never will. You refuse to except the real reason
> I took the EXTRA Test. I will state it again, maybe it will register this time.
> I took the EXTRA on a BET, you know this but you refuse to except the truth.
> Dee, Brian was to Stupid or to Lazy to get the General when it was 13 WPM, now
> hes to stupid or to lazy to even take the EXTRA Free handout TEST. I think the
> reason Brian will not even take the EXTRA test is because he knows he will
> never be able to pass it. He is Betting on getting another FREE Handout from
> the FCC.

All this would be true if only someone was willing to accept your
truck stop banter. You are a moron and buffoon. Your every post
bears this out. 10-4?

Not only was the Morse 20wpm exam a barrier to you, but the English
language provides its own challenges you have yet to overcome. Best
of luck to you in 2004.

146. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:33:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011833.4d93d506@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66296

"Kevin Muenzler" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3eb19067$1_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> "Gordon A Langstaff" <veryniceguy@clomp.com> wrote in message
> news:LlYpa.605532$3D1.330423@sccrnsc01...
> > Tell us something we don't already know. This ng is nothing but a
> > cesspool.
> >
> > GAL N6RUE
>
> Another "RUE" Welcome to the road-club.
>
> Kevin, WB5RUE

Kevin, this isn't the road-club. Its either rec.radio.amateur.policy,
or its
rec.radio.amateur.childishharguments. I don't think the other "rue"
got it changed over yet.

Brian

147. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:37:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011837.4d192c2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66297

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030501171409.26399.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Since the lines are not shielded. It seems to me that a large amount of RF
> >properly applied could, shall we say, 'disrupt' the link.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Thats what Im gearing up for right now DAn, I have a couple neighbors I cant
> stand

Whoop-de-doo. Don't forget that local LE can put CBers in jail.

148. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:41:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305011841.77b4e419@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66298

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0305010839.7d1bd6ad@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305010655.251b2e95@posting.google.com>...

> > Precious few dx contesters get into the game without having been a
> > dxer first. You ain't and that's that without prejudice.
>
> Never claimed to be a DXer....

. . . that's what I said.

> > (ya WUSS . . !)
> >
> You made how many points in the last Field Day?

Three, one was a one-pointer ssb contact. How many ssb contacts did
you say you made last year with your K2?

I've operated in SS, FD *and* the dx contests cw *and* phone. Ahem . .
!

> > Righto. One big advantage of the CQ is the number of expeditions which
> > get into it, lotta straight dxers go ape in the CQs and don't bother
> > turning in the logs, all they want is the cards. Whatever works works.
>
> Perhaps it's time for me to go for the gusto...

'bout time.

> Your target is 300 Q's, you say?

Given decent condx and antennas for three bands 300 q's should be
achievable w/100w. If condx are anything like they were early this
week I'll rent a couple flicks and forget the whole thing.

> > "maybe when you're old enough." Heh. The Ranger wasn't such a hot TX,
> > had a major problem with it's drift-prone VFO. I always liked the
> > little Johnson Navigator though.
>
> Same VFO in both of 'em. Navigator has less other stuff in the box,
> tho.

The Navigator was noticably more stable than the Ranger probably due
to all that "extra stuff" in the Ranger.

> Dern things don't transceive - I gave that game up back in 79 when the
> Southgate Type 5 went online. The K2 has dual VFOs...

Transcieve is handy but it's not an end-all. Split receive is very handy when dxing, I had three receive freqs . . 1966? The 75A4 and the T4/R4 combo. That was some ears. The new rigs like the MP are even slicker, fulltime dual receive via stereo headsets.

> I got some 24As and a few 27s that need a home...

The Delaware County SPCA is on Sandy Bank Road in Media.

> > I'm all ate up with a new Field Day antenna design, weird thing but it
> > might be a hot ticket for 20 & 15. A pair of half-wave phased
> > verticals hung off the ends of an SOP half-wave dipole. Fell out a
> > couple chats with n3rs. I have it up for discussion in dot antennas.
> > More later.
>
> Sounds like a "bobtail curtain"

Completely different critter. Got a lotta senior antenna gurus scratching their heads. First-pass modeling by one of 'em indicates more or less omnidirectional low angle 2.71 dB gain with the flattop at 45 feet. The low angle is not particularly good news for FD but we'll see what falls out of more comprehensive modeling.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

149. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:41:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011841.12d5439e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66299

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305011155.639fb7fc@posting.google.com>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> > What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since you
> > have had your license?
> > Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....
>
> I have more "bests" than I can count, great hobby. But I have one
> "worst" which still haunts me today. Early May 1956, the Hungarians
> had revolted against their Soviet occupiers a few days earlier, the
> Hungarian hams were all over the bands pleading for help from the
> west.

We encouraged them to revolt. We would help. Then we didn't.

Which never came as the Soviets crushed the Hungarians with
> tanks and the HAs disappeared from the bands overnight. Some made it
> over the fence, many did not and were never heard again.
>
> All I could do was sit in the shack and stare at my HQ-129. It was a
> long, long time before any hams in the west worked any Soviet hams
> again.

Steve doesn't want the liberators of Iraq to get on the air.

150. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:45:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011845.38536100@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66300

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030501124616.26815.00000360@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 4/30/03 8:23 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030430212341.27207.00000510@mb-m26.aol.com>
>
> >Although the Paul Harvey story is not "big media", Ham radio got the "big
> >media" story today.
> >
> >There was a significant story on amateur radio today. On WNPR public radio,
> >they had a half-hour story on Ham radio. They mentioned making contacts,
> >mobile
> >operations, Hams helping with Columbia disaster.
>
> Great.
>
> >This half-hour story, on Ham radio, by a credible news organization, was
> >surely
> >heard by many.
>
> I'll bet MORE people heard about Amateur Radio via Paul Harvey than heard
> about it on NPR, Vipul. Paul Harvey is a syndicated program heard on hundreds
> of stations world wide. NPR does NOT ahve the same distribution base as
> Mr.Harvey does.
>
> And Mr Harvey IS a "credible news (organization)". NPR is also know for
> it's own very slanted and way-left-of-center policeies.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What is Paul Harvey's call sign?

My most frequently heard reaction to "ham radio" is, "Isn't that like CB?"

didit

151. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:51:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011851.4a518de0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66201

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305010655.251b2e95@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAFDC1C.84A0E950@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > >
> > >
> > >
> > > > > I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
> > > > > would translate that as "yer a wuss..."
>
> Just to bust yer stones for sport sure James 'Ole Bean, but the real
> wusses in this league are the "accomplished" dxers who are too chicken
> to dive into the dx contests out where da rubber really hits da road.
> Precious few dx contesters get into the game without having been a
> dxer first. You ain't and that's that without prejudice.
>
> (ya WUSS . . !)

"burst yer stones for sport" ???

Is that anything like knocking someones "DICK" in the dirt?

(rest of the hick nomenclature snipped)

I'll be forever amazed of anyone telling me they are an engineer.
I'll rank them right up there with TV Evangelist and Rodeo Clown.

152. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:51:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501225142.24076.00000522@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66202

From: "Ryan, KC8PMX"

>> Also, the ARRL represents a more balanced view, supporting all aspects. If
>it
>> were up to the current Hams, the hobby will be concentrated in a few
>areas.
>>
>
>Such as??

Hams focus on contesting, CW, antennas. ARRL can expand the areas of
experimentation.

153. Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 02:53:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305011853.3b369300@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66203

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030501121856.27207.00000577@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 4/30/03 8:37 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030430213719.27207.00000512@mb-m26.aol.com>
>
> >>Contributions To Amateur Radio
> >
> >None yet. I had designed circuits, but none of these could be considered
> >contributions. Probably never, now that I am not in the EE field.
>
> Please cite the law, regulation or other requirement taht you be "in the
> EE field" in order to make a contribution to Amatuer Radio, Vipul.

Larry thinks you have to be a new no code Tech to make a lasting
contribution to amateur radio.

154. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 03:07:04 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501230704.24076.00000523@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66204

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>Here Vshah goes off into his personally created, artificial distinction
>between hams and amateurs. He fails to realize that those who do belong to
>ARRL are probably split in the same percentages in their interests as those
>who are not members.

Yes, they are split in the same percentages, whether or no they belong to the ARRL. That still does not change the difference between Hams and amateurs. I did not say Hams did not belong to the ARRL.

It is not artificial distinction. The poll results show which areas Hams are most interested in. More Hams are interested in Antennas and CW than troubleshooting, electronics theory.

This is shown in the various surveys. The interests are further shown in the local clubs, their newsletters, and Hams at Hamfests in several states.

And there is an element of tradition in Ham radio. For example, in code class, they not only teach the code, but the various "additional vocabulary" in the example paragraph. These conventions are not required, yet some people have the desire to use them. These are <some of the> conventions of Ham radio, which mainly experimenters may not use.

Some of the new EEs or hobbyists may be discouraged by the focus of most of the current clubs.

155. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 03:10:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501231027.24076.00000524@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66206

From: "David Robbins" k1ttt@arrl.net
>no, it acts as a petitioner, not a representative and as such technically
>has no more weight than any other individual or group.

Also, funds are involved. They sponser some programs to encourage certain goals. I do not agree with all of their programs, but most of them seem to be for a good cause.

An organization can do this, while individuals or just local clubs may not be able to.

156. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 03:10:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501231042.01745.00000424@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66205

>Don't forget that local LE can put CBers in jail.
>

Did that already happen to you?

157. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 03:13:00 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030501231300.24076.00000525@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66207

From: "Ryan, KC8PMX"

>Actually, I would love to see another group step up to the proverbial plate.
>A little bit of competition would be good to see the complacency change.
>Instead of having the "We can do whatever we want" attitude currently held,
>competition may actually make the ARRL accountable. After all, there is
>more than one political party in the US

What don't you like about the ARRL and what could they do differently?

158. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 03:31:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8soq1cdg0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 66208

Brian wrote:

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030501121006.27207.00000575@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 5/1/03 5:54 AM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0305010254.2d9fdc1a@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > >news:<b8q1e8obl0@208.207.71.136>...
> > >> Dave Heil wrote:
> > >>
> > >> >
> > >> > Grow up, Brian.
> > >>
> > >> Never gonna happen.
> > >
> > >Hit and Run DICK still can't bring a full thought together.

So far Slim hasn't done anything here that *requires* more than a small piece of a
thought to handle easily.

> Relying
> > >on other to do his thinking, he runs in with a "me too" posting.
> >
> > Why not, if it works?
> >
> > In this case, it was appropriate. Like this one. I agree with Dick.
> > What more do I need to say?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Steve, tail-ending DICK suits you.
>
> What more do you need to say? For starters, you forgot your
> trademark, maniacal "BWHAHAHAHAHA..." laugh.

Wih subject matter like Slim, laughter is the order of the day. Comedy Central.

159. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 03:47:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8sppcdin0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 66209

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <b8s1rhqop1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Tell me Len....do you get nosebleed because of having your nose up your own
> >ass so long?
>
> No...anatomically impossible.

Not for you, it isn't.

160. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 03:51:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8spvmdin1@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 66210

Brian wrote:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns936EBCAE836A2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> > news:b8r2lq$cg4h3$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
> >
> > > Or.... 1 or 2 letter characters before a number representing the order
> > > of which state became a state and then 2 or 3 letter characters after
> > > that number?
> > >
> > > For example, my call KC8PMX might be KC36PMX if Michigan was the 36th
> > > state to join the "union."
> > >
> > >
> > > Don't worry... not serious about that, but it is some food for
> > > thought.....
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF/MFR
> > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
> > > ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > > news:6pEra.217$2I.57@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> > >> Perhaps we should follow the telephone and increase the number of call
> > >> sign districts. With 100 districts, more folks can have a 1X2 or 2X1
> > >> call. Gee, with a 6 digit number, we can have a 1 letter call sign!
> > >> CQ dx cq dx cq dx de W401236 W401236 W401236. Think of the
> > >> possibilities! Of course, with A, N, K, or W at the start, we could
> > >> almost do with only 4 numbers in the call. Maybe force the codeless
> > >> techs to make do with a 1X1 call sign while the 'important' folks get
> > >> just a single letter. Fact is that most folks can get just about any
> > >> single digit in their call now so it would appear that this thread is
> > >> moot. Nice try, however, to come up with something different :)
> > >>
> > >> 73 from Rochester, NY
> > >> Jim AA2QA
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>

> > >> ---
> > >> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > >> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > >> Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> >
> > It's against ITU rules - although that never stopped the FCC before. The
> > ITU lays down the following, very roughly speaking -
> >
> > Ham and experimental calls - prefix + 1 digit + 1 to 3 letters
> > Aircraft - prefix + '-' + 1 to 3 letters (see what I mean?)
> > Everything else - Prefix + 1 to 3 letters
> >
> > Ships can optionally use their name as a callsign, and stations that are
> > fixed or land mobile are not supposed to be issued a call unless their
> > signals can cross international borders.
> >
> > The ITU definition of a prefix is not the same as in the WPX contest, e.g.
> > in my call (N3KIP) the prefix is really 'N', not 'N3'.
> >
> > The FCC aleady issues the wrong format calls to aircraft, issues calls to
> > stations that shouldn't have any, and issues all kinds of calls that don't
> > fit any of these formats. So, I guess issuing wierd non-ITU ham calls
> > wouldn't be too big a departure for them anyway, ROTFL!
> >
> > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> Alun, I hope Steve isn't reading this. "The FCC must follow all treaties."

Won't matter, it's incorrect.

161. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 04:02:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1EDC2.55B2DA0E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66211

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
> >What should anyone expect from a uninvolved troll whose only interest
> >in life is in attempting to relieve his terminal boredom by trying (most
> >unsuccessfully)
> >to trash a hobby he has long held in envy but could never join?
>
> What reason could someone never join?
> The Technician class license is so easy even children can pass it in one day.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Now you've done it, Vipul. Len doesn't want to do
anything which can be accomplished by mere children. Len is a
PROFESSIONAL. :-) :-)

Dave K8MN

162. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 04:04:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1EE4E.47B7E430@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66212

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" kc8pmx@diamondcs.net
>
> >5 wpm is not a hard thing to achieve.
> Yes, but it does take months of effort. Learning this realtime encoding skill
> doesn't get me much. For me, the benefit is small compare to the effort.

Months of effort? For five words per minute? Aren't you the guy who
claims that the written exams are so easy that anyone can memorize
everything in a day? For a sharp kid like you, learning morse shouldn't
take over a week or two.

Dave K8MN

163. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 04:12:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1F008.9FC80755@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66213

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From Brian Kelly:
> >> Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member.

How could you memorize all the material for the written exams when you keep screwing up simle attribution. I wrote the above. Brian Kelly did not.

> >That guy has some "issues" well beyond ham radio.
>
> For what, observing that Ham radio is not for a certain group of EEs?

> >One big advantage of the CQ is the number of expeditions which
> >get into it, lotta straight dxers go ape in the CQs and don't bother
> >turning in the logs, all they want is the cards.
>
> And this is not an example of a cult?

No, this is not an example of a cult. You could visit the Krishna folks about ten miles down the road from me. You'd have to do it fast as they've just filed for bankruptcy.

> >Today there's a
> >lot of grousing about restricting single ops to 30 hours max per
> >contest.
>
> How can anyone do the same thing over and over again (like a contest)?

Have you reviewed your posting habits here? How can you write the same things over and over (like in a newsgroup)?

Ever have a real job? How did you stand doing the same things over and over (like real work)?

Do you play tennis? How could you stand it (like sport)?

Dave K8MN

164. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 04:13:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1F07E.D9794B85@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66214

Brian wrote:
>
> nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030501183124.04723.00000370@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> > >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > >Date: 4/28/03 7:33 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <3EADBABB.9DC1E307@earthlink.net>
> > >
> > >No CW Test wrote:
> > >>
> > >> >> > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were
> > >> >> > stationed.
> > >> >>
> > >> >> No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called
> > >> >> "Tan Son Hut".
> > >> >
> > >> >Do you think he might have been one character off
> > ...
> > >> >?
> > >> >
> > >> Impossible.
> > >>
> > >> Len doesn't make mistakes.
> > >
> > >He may make miscalculations.
> >
> > Impossible. A miscalculation is a mistake,
> > by definition. Since Len does not make
> > mistakes, he therefore does not make
> > miscalculations. QED. SOP. LSMFT
> >
> > >He likely thought his
> > >anti-League,
> > >anti-amateur radio,
> > >anti-children,
> > >anti-morse testing
> > >views would be
> > >embraced by some significant percentage of readers.
> >
> > For him to think that would be a mistake
> > would it not? Len does not make mistakes.
> >
> > >He likely didn't

> > >count on his
> > >condescent,
> > >pontification and
> > >lack of interpersonal skills
> > >alienating a large number of the particpants in this forum. His
> > >reception has likely been somewhat cooler than the one he >envisioned.
> >
> > Or perhaps he is getting precisely the response he wants.
> >
> > >The jeers and tomatoes must make Len feel like
> > >Susan Sarandon at VFW
> > >convention.
> >
> > Some people like any attention they can get.
> > Even negative attention.
>
> Mr. Smug is the master of not making mistakes. It's what makes him so smug.

I've never heard Len referred to as Mr. Smug. Not making mistakes makes
him smug?

Dave K8MN

165. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 04:20:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB1F1FD.A8EE8E93@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66215

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >Here Vshah goes off into his personally created, artificial distinction
> >between hams and amateurs. He fails to realize that those who do belong to
> >ARRL are probably split in the same percentages in their interests as those
> >who are not members.
>
> Yes, they are split in the same percentages, whether or no they belong to the
> ARRL. That still does not change the difference between Hams and amateurs. I
> did not say Hams did not belong to the ARRL.

As you've been told repeatedly, there is no difference between ham radio operators and radio amateurs. How can you stand doing the same thing over and over (like in your farcial rants)?

Dave K8MN

166. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:01:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3m$dl0li$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66239

I guess it beats wearing a belt. I have seen some of these "old farts" that wear those as far up as 12" from their chins!
As long as I live (while not in uniform that is) I will resort to either the good old blue jeans or the Docker style pants. (dependant on the occasion obviously)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8rh34$5hi$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> Not yet Ryan...but I keep eyeballing those specials at Wally world...hi.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b8r2lp$cg4h3$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > Not necessarily Dan, unless you have resorted to wearing those pants
with
> > the elastic in the waistband, and wear them pulled up half way between
> your
> > bellybutton and your chest..... HI HI! :)
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> > >
> > > See....told you I resembled that 'old fart' stuff.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

167. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:15:16 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3n$dl0li$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66238

Let me pose this one to ya then Dan, what if you were issued W4ASS or W4FUK or many other "offensive" combinations? Would you want to "buy" one then?? The paying for the call is a fee for the processing of the paperwork as far as I understand...

I am contemplating getting the call of an old friend of mine who was like a 2nd father to me, who has since passed on. He let his license slip and had not pursued it after it after 1992. We had talked and I asked him if I ever pursued his call would he have a problem with that, and his response was that he would be honored. Now in this case, he was not "blood related" but closer as a father than my father was at times growing up. According to your statements, this is still a bad thing if I pursue it.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
> Mine is also a recycled call. Similar story. Issued to me when I changed
> districts, as was REQUIRED back in the 70s.
>
> My point is BUYING a call. I think that is not so good. But everyone has
> an opinion.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

168. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:19:40 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3p$dl0li$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66240

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86llxqa1z6.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Ryan" == Ryan <Ryan> writes:

[...]

Dan> You have been brainwashed by Incentive Licensing. The class is
Dan> the thing. Bull crap.

Ryan> No I haven't. It's no different that the licenses or
Ryan> certifications I do currently hold. I respect and am proud of
Ryan> the priviliges and opportunities and the things I am allowed to
Ryan> do with those certifications and licenses I hold (outside of
Ryan> amatuer radio) The registration numbers on those are no
Ryan> different than the callsign. Its the
Ryan> privileges/rights/responsibilities I have earned that I respect
Ryan> and am proud of.

Out of curiosity, do you recite your registration numbers every ten
minutes while taking advantages of the privileges and opportunities
they afford you?

My ham radio registration yes.... as in accordance to the rules. My license
plate, or drivers license, no.

The purpose of callsigns are to identify radio operators and/or
stations. This is the same purpose of a person's name, so it is
natural that some people would consider callsigns to be nicknames and
precious to them. It's also natural for some people to feel that
callsigns, like family names, should be handed down to family
relatives when appropriate.

Some could consider a license plate the same thing too.... (in my case my
call is on my plate though)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

169. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:23:10 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3q$dl0li$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66241

Damn.... I wish my newsgroup provider allowed me to post images! I think I found that portrait that displays that talent so well.. Didn't know he posted it in the alt.humor newsgroups!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Tell me Len....do you get nosebleed because of having your nose up your own
> ass so long?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

170. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:25:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502012512.19604.00000402@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66216

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/1/03 5:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Xns936EBCAE836A2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>Aircraft - prefix + '-' + 1 to 3 letters (see what I mean?)
>Everything else - Prefix + 1 to 3 letters

>The FCC aleady issues the wrong format calls to aircraft...(SNIP)

Funny you mention this, Alun. I was watching a show on Discover Wings not too long ago (A Plane Is Born) and was listening to the ATC traffic. I was wondering how different it would sound in the US if we had all letter registrations.

I think it would be very confusing to people who do not use a radio more often than an hour or two a month around the pattern. While this system works fine in many othr countries where there is no where near the number of registered aircraft as the United States, I wonder how well it wouuld go here?

Of course after just one generation of pilots taught under the "new" system, they'd be wondering how we ever kept ffrom getting confused!

73

Steve, K4YZ

171. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:29:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502012901.19604.00000403@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66217

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5/1/03 9:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0305011813.2875f43e@posting.google.com>

>Alun, I hope Steve isn't reading this. "The FCC must follow all treaties."

I am, and they should. "The Government" expects me to obey all laws, and asserts that ignorance of the law is no excuse for not complying with it. I expect no less of them.

No law (save for the Ten Commandments) is written in stone and is certainly subject to review and change. However once implemented, whether a speed limit in a school zone, don't spit on the side walk, or how radio calsigns should be formatted, should be obeyed, even by the government that "wrote" it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

172. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:34:00 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3r$dl0li$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66242

Agreed.... we had someone who had let thier 5-7 year old kid talk on the HT or base radio, that was also on our county fire frequency a couple months ago, and it definitely tied up that repeater. They never found out who was doing it, but the potential for possible safety risks for the county firefighters could have been real, if there was something of importance for the responding firefighters to know but could not hear due to the interference. Could have been a freebander's kid or possible one of the 300+ county firefighter's kid, one will never know.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Jammed PS communications means a delay in getting what is needed to
where
> it's needed. RFI'd navaids means people get can hurt.
>
> Potential for interference with Navaids, public safety communications
and
> general broadcast media is more than enough reason to maintain certain
rules
> and regulations on ANY "radio hobby" that involves transmitting.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

173. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:35:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502013513.19604.00000404@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66218

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/1/03 8:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501210522.24076.00000517@mb-m27.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>>Then why haven't YOU passed the test?
>
>Theres that irrelevant Morse code test I would have to take first. I don't
>want
>to learn Morse code.

Morse Code is not irrelevent. It is required by law, ergo it is VERY
relevent.

Since you have made a concious decision that the effort required is not
worth the privileges you stand to gain, PLEASE stop your whining.

Steve, K4YZ

174. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:38:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3s$dl0li$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66243

Okay... understand where you were going with that now.... I thought it was supposed to be some type of cb lingo like as in a variation to the 10 codes or something. My apologies, as I thought that was what you were referencing.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB1A6CD.D273DD9A@crosslink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > Some type of CB term?? Not up on "cb lingo." Is there a ham radio
> > equivalent??
> >
> > "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EB03645.AC756BF4@crosslink.net...
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > What's a 100-1??
> > >
> > > Prefer 100:1?
> > > 73, K3DWW
>
> Sorry Ryan, it's a math notation for a ratio (100 to 1) - in this case
> 100 CBrs per ham were we to try to use "their" channels.

175. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:42:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3t$dl0li$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66244

Yes, but the post said memorization, and nothing about techniques, until after the post, which would lead the average person to basically believe it to be word-for-word memorization. My statement still stands, that if someone can memorize (corrected) 665 questions and all four possible answers, they have my respect.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > If someone can memorize both the questions and answers for the complete
> test
> > pool for the extra class, I think that is definitely an achievement in
my
> > book. That means word-for-word memorization.. Isn't that like
something
> > over 300+ questions???
> >
>
> The Extra pool is 665 questions. You don't need to memorize word for word
> just enough key words that you have the answers paired correctly with the
> questions so you don't get confused between similar questions. However
even
> on that basis, 665 is too many to learn in a single day. One might be
able
> to do it with a photographic memory but few are so blessed.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

176. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:45:38 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3u$dl0li$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66245

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305012316270.361@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Thu, 1 May 2003, Vshah101 wrote:
> > I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
> > memorized the questions and answers, not the material.
> >
> > The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician
license.
>
> It's not. The extra test has 50 questions while the others have only 35.
>

Wow.... they should up the number to at least 100 questions per testing level..... Every test I have taken in the fire service has had at least a minimum of 100 questions. The final exam for the firefighter 1 and 2 certification in Michigan has 200 questions and that is based on a pool of 1,500 questions..... (try memorizing that many!!!!!)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

177. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:48:14 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl3v$dl0li$10@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66246

> >
>
> The Tech pool is 384 questions. I simply can't believe that it can be
done
> in a single day without some prior preparation. Those that I have known
who
> succeeded had done some advance preparation as recommended by the sponsors
> of the one day class.

Is this under the assumption that one would have "some" basic knowledge
prior to "cramming" and then testing or is under the assumption that someone
without any radio knowledge (other than the am/fm broadcast bands)
whatsoever did this???

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

178. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:50:13 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8tl40$dl0li$11@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66247

Well.... same here too as far as the last sentence goes (below), but I still
did it. And probably will do it again, and again..... Now, getting the
speed up is clearly a different issue!!! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501211259.24076.00000518@mb-m27.aol.com...
> From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" kc8pmx@diamondcs.net
>
> >5 wpm is not a hard thing to achieve.
> Yes, but it does take months of effort. Learning this realtime encoding
skill
> doesn't get me much. For me, the benefit is small compare to the effort.
>
>
>

179. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:50:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502015015.19604.00000405@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66219

>Subject: Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/1/03 10:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501230704.24076.00000523@mb-m27.aol.com>

>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>>Here Vshah goes off into his personally created, artificial distinction
>>between hams and amateurs. He fails to realize that those who do belong to
>>ARRL are probably split in the same percentages in their interests as those
>>who are not members.
>
>Yes, they are split in the same percentages, whether or no they belong to the
>ARRL. That still does not change the difference between Hams and amateurs. I
>did not say Hams did not belong to the ARRL.

There is no difference between "Amateurs" and "Hams".

>It is not artificial distinction. The poll results show which areas Hams are
>most interested in. More Hams are interested in Antennas and CW than
>troubleshooting, electronics theory.

There is no "poll". You have tried this before and have failed to produce
the URL or other relevent reference of this vaporous document. It does not
exist, therefore any reference to it is untruthful. A lie.

>This is shown in the various surveys. The interests are further shown in the
>local clubs, their newsletters, and Hams at Hamfests in several states.

I'd ask you to produce those "surveys" and subsequently show me where the
division is drawn between being an "Amateur" and a "Ham" based upon them, but
since it's all a figment of your (weak) imagination, I'll suffice to accept
that you're just off your rocker.

>And there is an element of tradition in Ham radio....(SNIP)

As there is in NASCAR racing, aviation, stamp collecting, quilting, art,
dancing, music, etc etc etc.

Why is it that the ONLY avocation you seem to paint darkly over a
perception of "tradition" is Amatuer Radio, Vippy?

>For example, in code class,
>they not only teach the code, but the various "additional vocabulary" in the
>example paragraph.

As there is in NASCAR racing, aviation, stamp collecting, quilting, art,
dancing, music, etc etc etc.

Why is it that the ONLY avocation you seem to paint darkly over a perception of "additional vocabulary" is Amateur Radio, Vippy?

>These conventions are not required, yet some people have the
>desire to use them. These are <some of the> conventions of Ham radio, which
>mainly experimenters may not use.

How would you know? So far you've not presented us with one iota of "experimentation" carried out at KB1HMW.

>Some of the new EEs or hobbyists may be discouraged by the focus of most of
>the
>current clubs.

I'll not lose sleep over them being discouraged by what any one club may or may not like to do. I'll lose even LESS sleep knowing they have it in their power to create such clubs for their own interests. However based upon examples set by present company, I know that all that will be done is a bunch of moping and whining about "Morse Code".

Your mileage will vary, but I doubt it.

Steve, K4YZ

180. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 05:56:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502015620.19604.00000406@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66220

>Subject: Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/1/03 9:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501225142.24076.00000522@mb-m27.aol.com>

>Hams focus on contesting, CW, antennas. ARRL can expand the areas of
>experimentation.

QST (and certainly QEX) often present articles of interest on numerous "experimental" modes, techniques and technology.

ARRL is under no obligation to drag anyone into a dark basement corner and force-feed them "experimentation".

YOUR focus seems to be forcing others to participate in activities that YOU deem "appropriate" regardless of their preferences and to seeking out "preety fems". You are no doubt wonderstruck that they (preety fems) could be so crazy as to pass up a hot deal such as yourself.

As for what you perceive Hams to be focusing on, your vision of reality is very narrow. Have your eyes checked ASAP.

Steve, K4YZ

181. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 06:10:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502021051.19604.00000407@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66221

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/1/03 7:44 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501204410.24076.00000514@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>>We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
>>doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments. He
>>prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.
>
>Lenover21 seems to have alot of valid arguments. Just because you disagree
>does
>not mean the arguments are not valid.

Most of his arguments outside of his opinion that Morse Code testing is "archaic" ARE invalid.

Lennie's frequent rants on Amateur Radio itself, The ARRL in particular, and many individual Amateurs is based solely upon his LACK of practical experience in Amateur Radio, and are a direct result of his failure to "make a mark" in the discipline of radiocommunications that his ego feels he deserved.

For the most part, they have no basis in fact and are, for the most part, proven erroneous by reference to any number of alternate sources of information.

Lennie's "arguments" are centered around being the loudest kid in the classroom, the meanest bully, or the "rich kid" who thinks that his "superior upbringing" make him better than anyone else.

He routinely lies. He blatantly does NOT tell the truth. This is because the truth does not support his contentions about Amateur Radio in general or those of us licensed in it in particular.

If that were not enough to discredit this creep, his shameful and cowardly efforts to embellish his own lackluster military service record at the expense of men killed in action three years before he was even in boot camp should warrant him a place in The Loser's Hall of Shame.

You consider him "valid", Vipul? I guess that just tells the rest of us what your least common denominator is in the "morals and scruples" deaprtment.

Steve, K4YZ

182. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 06:19:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502021929.19604.00000408@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66222

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/1/03 7:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501204801.24076.00000515@mb-m27.aol.com>

>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>>What should anyone expect from a uninvolved troll whose only interest
>>in life is in attempting to relieve his terminal boredom by trying (most
>>unsuccessfully)
>>to trash a hobby he has long held in envy but could never join?

>What reason could someone never join?
>The Technician class license is so easy even children can pass it in one day.
>
>What could be any possible reason for envy of a hobby?

In a day, huh? And then get access to such things as APRS, PSK31, RTTY,
ATV, SSTV, several "voice" modes including digital, MARS, ARISS, ARES, public
service programs, SKYWARN...Moonbounce, satellites, repeaters....

Just to name a few...

Yeppers, Vippy, I can see what you mean...Not much there to be envious
about, huh?

Sheesh.

73

Steve, K4YZ

183. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 06:23:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502022308.19604.00000409@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66223

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/1/03 11:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EB1EE4E.47B7E430@earthlink.net>

>Vshah101 wrote:

>> Yes, but it does take months of effort. Learning this realtime encoding
>skill
>> doesn't get me much. For me, the benefit is small compare to the effort.

>Months of effort? For five words per minute? Aren't you the guy who
>claims that the written exams are so easy that anyone can memorize
>everything in a day? For a sharp kid like you, learning morse shouldn't
>take over a week or two

Dave..is that what people call "giving one the benefit of the
doubt"...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

184. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 06:38:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502023841.19604.00000410@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66224

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/1/03 8:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501212127.24076.00000519@mb-m27.aol.com>

>From Brian Kelly:
>>> Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member.
>>That guy has some "issues" well beyond ham radio.
>
>For what, observing that Ham radio is not for a certain group of EEs?

Oh really? There's an exclusionary clause in Part 97 for "a certain groups of EEs"...?!?! I'll have to check that out...

Or is that some membership rule of IEEE that refuses membership to EEs who possess an Amateur license? Do they have monitors who double check the FCC database against their own membership rolls?

>>One big advantage of the CQ is the number of expeditions which
>>get into it, lotta straight dxers go ape in the CQs and don't bother
>>turning in the logs, all they want is the cards.
>
>And this is not an example of a cult?

No...it's not. It's an example of guys collecting cards from far-off places. Absolutely no different than people who collect stamps or foreign coins...except they used a radio to do it.

>>Today there's a
>>lot of grousing about restricting single ops to 30 hours max per
>>contest.
>
>How can anyone do the same thing over and over again (like a contest)?

Every attempt is different. Different bands, different propagation, different distribution of effort.

Absolutely no different than marathon runners or NASCAR, except our "race track" is the electromagnetic spectrum, and you don't have to break a sweat or risk eating a retaining wall at 185 MPH to do it.

In the 2000 ARRL Sweepstakes I set goals for myself...a "contest within a contest", if you will. I tried to work all 50 states within 12 hours, and to get all 80 ARRL Sections within 24 hours, and do it with the absolute MINIMUM number of QSO's possible.

I had "clean sweeps" in both SSB and CW. I worked WAS in under 12 hours in the SSB weekend but not in CW (where in the heck were all the HI stations...?!?!) And I didn't make more than 151 Q's in either weekend. That was partially because of out-of-district calls (ie: answering a W1 hoping for NH, but finding out he was in LAX or OR) and working additional stations in sections I wanted to be SURE of.

Bottom line...?!?! I HAD FUN!

73

Steve, K4YZ

185. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 07:00:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502030036.21428.00000411@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66225

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5/1/03 9:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0305011845.38536100@posting.google.com>

>What is Paul Harvey's call sign?

What does it matter? It's the message, not the messenger.

>My most frequently heard reaction to "ham radio" is, "Isn't that like CB?"

And you correct this misconception how? I've heard it too, but when I do
I take the time to explain the differences and the benefits.

>didit

More Lennie-like every day, aren't you? GPD is infectious.

Steve, K4YZ

186. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 07:43:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502034353.27028.00000397@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66226

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/30/03 4:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430170658.18769.00000310@mb-m21.aol.com>

>>Different strokes for different folks, Len. The reason I left SoCal
>>decades ago is that the residents live in a "Hotel California" wherein
>>all crimes are done by transients, all storms and diseases come up from
>>Mexico and government not only takes care of everybody, but does it
>>perfectly.
>
> That is an extremely biased "opinion" which is untrue as to the
> charges you've made.

No it's not.

I was there too. California is one of the most "government-protected"
places I have ever lived in. Think you can't handle some aspect of life? No
problem...The State of California will assume responsibility fo it and take
over managing your life for you.

They are so intent on "protecting" everyone's "right to [fill in the
blank]", that they've now made it almost impossible to do anything without
violating somebody's "rights".

As for taking care of people, I refer to IMS, or "Indigant Medical
System", a California program to pay for the healthcare of persons who claim
indigant status or refuse to get a job and earn their benefits.

I loved the beaches and I loved the high desert (especially the Owens
Valley, Bishop, etc), but I found precious little in between to warrant
surrendering my liberties or tax dollars to...

>Such "charges" are disproven by reading the area newspapers,
> listening/watching local broadcasting, attending City Hall and
> County Council meetings and hearing the debates. Such
> "charges" are untrue according to public police logs, several
> local health and medical service agency statements, the
> Immigration and Naturalization Service, local county sheriffs
> and California Highway Patrol.

Such charges are VALIDATED by spending a day on Trauma Call in any
hospital south of Santa Barbara, or by spending a day on a citizen ridership
program with the PD's that allow it, if any still do anymore.

I did. It's scary.

I also had an ambulance shot up while sitting in traffic in LA.

Guess this was just an "over exuberent" cultural expression?

>>By the same reasoning I'm sure California ACS works better
>>than ARES.
>
> I'm sure you think so...but we can all see evidence of how
> biased you are. California ACS, the Greater Los Angeles
> emergency communications organizations have been
> PROVED BY EXAMPLE in many and varied examples.

As previously pointed out, the areas you cite have the tax base to support such preparedness.

>>But please understand that back in America we still rely on
>>ourselves instead of Government.
>
> I'm sure you do in that separate mythical nation that lives
> in your head.

We pretty much do that elsewhere, too. Most "emergency preparedness" in this part of the country is still conducted by local programs and volunteers. We don't have 12 million people packed into a relatively small geographical area to draw dolalrs from to create these programs for.

> California is still a State within the Union and citizens of this
> state are also very much citizens of the United States of
> America.

Yeah...the SAME state in which "Welcome To California...Leave Your Money, Leave Your Foot Prints, But Please, LEAVE" bumperstickers are popular.

> Yes, everyone in the United States of America has seen your
> mythical country's "reliance on self" from the seasonal
> hurricane disasters where all the commercial facilities "fail"
> only to be miraculously "saved" by hobbyists.

"Hobbyists"...?!?! Volunteer firemen, EMT's and Red Cross staffers are "hobbyists"..?!?! Because that's who does the bulk of the disaster work in THIS part of the country.

Oh yeah...A few thousand LICENSED Radio Amateurs who pitch in from time to time.

But AS USUAL, Lennie, your vision is myopic and your "facts" are anything BUT.

Nothing new from Lanark Street. Same disgusting lies and rhetoric.

Same PUTZ.

Steve, K4YZ

187. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 07:46:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502034630.27028.00000398@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66227

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 5/1/03 9:55 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305010655.251b2e95@posting.google.com>

>> Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member.
>
>That guy has some "issues" well beyond ham radio

Yeah..."preety fems", "cults" and an overbearing family that won't let him
be an EE or go to hamfests.

Sheeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

188. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 07:57:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502035700.27028.00000399@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66228

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5/1/03 4:55 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0305011355.427c9cde@posting.google.com>

> I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
>> father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.
>
>Algore was a grunt in Vietnam.

Algore as not a "grunt". "Grunts" are infantrymen. Try again on his
duties, Brain.

>> The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.
>
>Sure. People were trying to get into the Air Force to avoid
>conscription.

None of the services drafted anyone. The Selective Service did.

They subsequently assigned conscripts based upon the stated needs of the
services. I know at least two people who served in the USAF in Viet Nam who
were conscripted.

>> Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
>> tantrum, the floor or the staring?
>
>Your spoiled, child-like behavior, David.

Whew...Coming from YOU that has to hurt...NOT.

Steve, K4YZ

189. Weather Guessing for Dummies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 08:10:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502041016.21229.00000454@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66229

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/1/03 6:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EB1AEA1.F725E675@earthlink.net>

>During the times they were on duty, they could sometimes predict the
>weather. During the monsoon season their predictions were much more
>accurate.

Did they use the same "weather rock" that some Navy weatherguessers used???

Bright Rock = Sunny

Dull Rock = Cloudy

Hot Rock = Summer

Cold Rock = Winter

White Rock = Snowing

Wet Rock = Raining

Moving Rock = Earthquake

Missing Rock = Hurricaine

73

Steve, K4YZ

190. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 08:23:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502042325.21229.00000455@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66230

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/1/03 3:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501162020.18769.00000391@mb-m14.aol.com>

>>All of that stuff happened in the middle of the King Spark days eh? Imagine
>>that. Guess 200 meters and down is wrong then.
>
> That historical work ("200 Meters and Down") sins by omission in
> order to highlight amateur radio. Not my fault...but that is typical
> of the incomplete picture of the whole of radio history since 1896.

Too bad Clinton DeSoto didn't have you around to keep him straight in
1936, eh, Lennie?

>The first ever radio membership organization is the Radio Club of
> America, founded in 1909

It wasn't the first...just the first to be as successful as it was (and is)

>The RCA (not to be
> confused with the old RCA Corporation) has a number of
> history items on its website that may be of interest to more
> broad-minded amateurs.

So do several other "non-Amateur" websites. Your point?

>Prior to World War One, the overwhelming type of radio trans-
> mitter of any kind...(SNIP)

Very interesting. Sounds like the same stuff from "200 Meters and Down".
But THAT can't BE...it's an ARRL publication.

>Let's face it, early radio technology was PRIMITIVE. Any
> improvement in construction represented a virtual plateau-
> jump in advancing the state of the art of that day.

As is any technical innovation in it's infancy. Ya gotta start somewhere.

>I wasn't there in 1896 or 1914 and didn't exist until 1932. My
> references are many and varied sources of information from
> the radio industry, academics, professional organizations and
> membership societies not concentrating solely on or about
> amateurism.

But...but...but...LENNIE! You have frequently trid to discredit many of MY
posts as a result of my age (ie: having not experienced something in the
first-person).

So that being one of YOUR rules, where do YOU get of by posting lengthy historical ramblings about things that happened WELL before "your day"...?!?!

Or is this yet another "Do As I Say, Don't Do As Do" moment?

>>Hey Len...stick to what you know....not a damn thing about Amateur Radio.
>
> There are only a few "damning" things about amateur radio.
> Most of amateur radio is quite good. It is a few of the much-later
> participants who get off on wild tears of their imagination and
> self-righteous pontificating about their hobby involvement.

At least we ARE "involved"...Not just shouting from the bleachers.

>There are an unfortunate few US radio amateurs who wish an
> almost ultimate elitism and recognition for undeserved glory-of-
> accomplishment in a hobby endeavor and undeserved honors
> for achievement such to allow them to look down on others.
> That's the damning part.

Who are these folks, Lennie? What did they say that was untrue? Are these alleged achievements not verifyable by 3-party reporters or observers?

Steve, K4YZ

191. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 08:25:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502042519.21229.00000456@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66231

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 5/1/03 4:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b8s280$f54$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>

>You are a world-class asshole ain't ya Lennie me boy? Ever been in a
>redneck bar with that attitude?

I'd like to be close by when he goes in, Dan...I love a good
"multi-trauma" call...!!!

73

Steve, K4YZ

192. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 08:39:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502043910.21229.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66232

>Subject: Re: Dayton Hamfest?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/1/03 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030501202658.18769.00000429@mb-m13.aol.com>

>>Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of
>>repeaters.
>
> BZZZT! Wrong answer, Dan. Sorry.

>Cellular telephones can be traced back to the first "handie-talkies"
> designed by Motorola back in WW2

The first "handie talkies" were pioneered by Amateurs BEFORE the war,
Lennie.

>ATT may have had the very first pocket-size paging receiver...(SNIP)

Pagers are related to cellphones?

>Today's "cell phone" owes its existance to several areas of
> technology: Development of efficient solid-state RF amplifiers
> centered on 1 GHZ; Very Large Scale Integrated Circuits of low
> power demand to handle all the digital functions and control
> needed in a single small IC package; efficient batteries and
> charging system to enable long use.

Todays "cellphone" has been the catalyst for the advancement of those
technologies.

And cellphones owe their existence to AT&T and other industries looking to
expand the coverage and reliabiltiy of the mobile telephone. More telephone
users meant more profits, and no one was going to pay the kind of money that
the old services could command for very limited coverage areas and intermittent
service.

>The very first ever television was already "slow-scan." Those were
> mechanical and their ultimate mechanical form was done by
> Scotsman John Logie Baird in the UK...(SNIP)

Isn't it a shame that you can "recall" all this trivia, yet you can't get
the "respect" you expect because you have a sewer for a mouth and acid for
personality, Lennie?

>Automatic Link Establishment such as on SHARES network...
> oops, sorry, that is government communications on HF, very
> little done in amateur radio

Since WHEN did you let something like "not Amatuer Radio" deter you from incorporating it into a rant, Lennie?

As usual...SOLDAISNDAID.

Steve, K4YZ

193. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 10:36:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020236.52b609d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66233

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030502030036.21428.00000411@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 5/1/03 9:45 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0305011845.38536100@posting.google.com>
>
> >What is Paul Harvey's call sign?
>
> What does it matter? It's the message, not the messenger.

It seems to matter here. Please recall that if you don't have a
callsign, you have no voice concerning amateur radio.

> >My most frequently heard reaction to "ham radio" is, "Isn't that like CB?"
>
> And you correct this misconception how? I've heard it too, but when I do
> I take the time to explain the differences and the benefits.

That new impression should last until just about the time to recall
it, but not quite long enough.

> >didit
>
> More Lennie-like every day, aren't you? GPD is infectious.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Your rules, not mine. Get used to them.

194. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 10:42:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020242.f90bf0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66234

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b8spvm$din$1@208.207.71.129>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns936EBCAE836A2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> > > news:b8r2lq$cg4h3$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
> > >
> > > > Or.... 1 or 2 letter characters before a number representing the order
> > > > of which state became a state and then 2 or 3 letter characters after
> > > > that number?
> > > >
> > > > For example, my call KC8PMX might be KC36PMX if Michigan was the 36th
> > > > state to join the "union."
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Don't worry... not serious about that, but it is some food for
> > > > thought.....
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > > FF/MFR
> > > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
> > > > ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:6pEra.217$2I.57@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> > > >> Perhaps we should follow the telephone and increase the number of call
> > > >> sign districts. With 100 districts, more folks can have a 1X2 or 2X1
> > > >> call. Gee, with a 6 digit number, we can have a 1 letter call sign!
> > > >> CQ dx cq dx cq dx de W401236 W401236 W401236. Think of the
> > > >> possibilities! Of course, with A, N, K, or W at the start, we could
> > > >> almost do with only 4 numbers in the call. Maybe force the codeless
> > > >> techs to make do with a 1X1 call sign while the 'important' folks get
> > > >> just a single letter. Fact is that most folks can get just about any
> > > >> single digit in their call now so it would appear that this thread is
> > > >> moot. Nice try, however, to come up with something different :)
> > > >>
> > > >> 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > >> Jim AA2QA
> > > >>
> > > >>
```

> > > >>
> > > >> ---
> > > >> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > > >> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > > >> Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > It's against ITU rules - although that never stopped the FCC before. The
> > > ITU lays down the following, very roughly speaking -
> > >
> > > Ham and experimental calls - prefix + 1 digit + 1 to 3 letters
> > > Aircraft - prefix + '-' + 1 to 3 letters (see what I mean?)
> > > Everything else - Prefix + 1 to 3 letters
> > >
> > > Ships can optionally use their name as a callsign, and stations that are
> > > fixed or land mobile are not supposed to be issued a call unless their
> > > signals can cross international borders.
> > >
> > > The ITU definition of a prefix is not the same as in the WPX contest, e.g.
> > > in my call (N3KIP) the prefix is really 'N', not 'N3'.
> > >
> > > The FCC aleady issues the wrong format calls to aircraft, issues calls to
> > > stations that shouldn't have any, and issues all kinds of calls that don't
> > > fit any of these formats. So, I guess issuing wierd non-ITU ham calls
> > > wouldn't be too big a departure for them anyway, ROTFL!
> > >
> > > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Alun, I hope Steve isn't reading this. "The FCC must follow all treaties."
>
> Won't matter, it's incorrect.

One liner DICK, Steve just posted that it is correct. Get a clue.

195. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 10:45:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020245.c3bd078@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66235

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB1F07E.D9794B85@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >

> > Mr. Smug is the master of not making mistakes. It's what makes him so smug.
>
> I've never heard Len referred to as Mr. Smug. Not making mistakes makes
> him smug?
>
> Dave K8MN

What are you talking about? I don't recall ever referring to Len as "Mr. Smug."

196. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 11:08:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020308.3d82bf2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66236

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB1AEA1.F725E675@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB13376.5F2DA7A8@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > >
> > > > > And there you have it. This whole thing over Dave's obtuseness.
> > > >
> > > No, this whole thing is over Len's several errors about a non-existent
> > > place, a supply depot and moving boxes. He managed to get quite a bit
> > > wrong in only a couple of sentences.
> > >
> > Another example of Dave's obtuseness.
> >
> Mistakes on Len's part and silliness on your part do not translate to my
> being obtuse.

Correct. Mistakes and silliness on anyone's part do not translate to
your being obtuse.

You are a self-made obtuse man.

> > > > > > You must have been very special when you were in Vietnam. Did you
> > > > > > serve with Algore?
> > > > >
> > > > > Al Gore wasn't in the Air Force.
> > > >
> > > > And I wasn't in the Army or Navy, yet I was assigned to them. Being
> > > > in the Air Force, you've probably never even seen a grunt.
> > >
> > I've seen plenty of 'em.
> >
> > But in all your time in the Air Force you never moved a box.
> >
> I don't recall ever moving a box as part of my duties.

Wow.

> > I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
> > > father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.

> >
> > Algore was a grunt in Vietnam.
>
> So? My sister lives in L.A. Do you know her?

Maybe. What is her name?

> > But you didn't see him because you
> > were in the Air Force.
>
> Really? I thought I didn't see him because I had no idea who he was.
> To this day, I have no idea where he spent his time. I have some
> friends in Columbus. Do you know them? Have you ever seen them?

Maybe. What are their names?

> > But you say that you saw plenty of grunts.
>
> I DID say that, didn't I?

Are you sure?

> > And you say that you saw Algore's father. If Algore's father wasn't
> > in the Air Force, was he one of the grunts you saw?
>
> No, he was busy being a senator from Tennessee. I saw him in West Palm
> Beach.

I thought the context was your time in Vietnam. Please try to stay on
topic.

> > > I didn't operate RTTY equipment. Keep guessing.
> >
> > OK. You didn't operate RTTY equipment, and you (say you) didn't
> > operate amateur radio equipment either. Why were you there again?
>
> I was on a year's holiday, all expenses paid. They even provided my
> clothing and meals.

Kind of like John Candy joining the Army because it was cheaper than a
trip to the fat farm. Except he couldn't operate ham radio.

> > I found that the
> > > weather men could sometimes predict the weather.
> >
> > When they were on duty. They're only on duty sometimes. They do get
> > time off to go hang out in snack bar like the other personnel.
>
> During the times they were on duty, they could sometimes predict the
> weather. During the monsoon season their predictions were much more
> accurate.

They kept verification statistics, you know. Just like they do at
every other Air Force weather station. How did they compare with the

local TV and radio stations forecasts?

> > > > It would appear that you had very limited experiences while serving.
> > > >
> > > Keep guessing.
> > >
> > You had no experiences?
> >
> I haven't related my experiences to you.

So you do have experiences.

> > > > You were ordered not to operate amateur radio; you never touched a box
> > > > or did anything outside your AFSC. Must be the difference between the
> > > > conscription era and the all volunteer force.
> > > >
> > > The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.
> > >
> > Sure. People were trying to get into the Air Force to avoid
> > conscription.
> >
> I don't have a problem with anyone who did so. Those who entered under
> those circumstances traded two years of their lives for four years of
> their lives. Are you trying to make an issue of it?

The conscription era was a different era than the all volunteer force.
Are you trying to say it wasn't?

> > > > > > Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> > > > > > throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
> > > > > > word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
> > > > > > behavior.
> > > > > >
> > > > > That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
> > > > > you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
> > > > > enough for him.
> > > > >
> > > > We were discussing you, not Len. Fact stands. Now go put some salve
> > > > on that scrape.
> > > >
> > > It'd have to first be a fact in order to stand. It isn't and it
> > > doesn't.
> > >
> > Fact stands.
> >
> Oh fact stands all right. You just didn't have one.

Fact stands.

> > > > > > > > And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > Do you also deny bringing it up?
> > > > > >
> > > > > That wasn't the issue, though you tried to make it into one.
> > > > >
> > > > If you weren't stationed at a snack bar, and if Len didn't bring it
> > > > up, why did you throw it in the ring when discussing where you were
> > > > stationed?
> > > >
> > > I wasn't discussing where I was stationed.
> >
> > That was the context. What did you think we were discussing when you
> > brought up the snack bar?
>
> I wasn't discussing where I was stationed. I wasn't discussing what I
> did in Viet Nam. What I did was address one of Len's typical (as
> outlined in N2EY's accurate profile) attempts at a slam.

Wow. Couldn't you just have ignored it?

> > > > Maybe you just spent a lot of time at the snack bar.
> > >
> > > You're reduced to guessing.
> >
> > Just another sign of your obtuseness.
>
> Your guessing is my "obtuseness"?

You go on endlessly, but you really have nothing to say. Nothing of
substance anyway. You throw in talk of moving boxes, and places such
as snackbars, and we are left guessing to what you might possibly be
talking about.

> > > > > > > > > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > > > > > > > > did.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It was still his choice.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > ...and you were still the factor governing the decision.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Your words. His action.
> > > > > >
> > > > > And so it is written.
> > > >
> > > > Actually, so you wrote and wrote and wrote silly comments much like
> > > > you're doing in the game you're attempting to play with me.
> > >

> > David, you're the one who cannot bring himself to say what he means.
>
> I've said quite precisely what I mean. What I haven't done is write
> what you'd like me to write. That scenario isn't likely to take place.

You precisely choose to be obtuse.

> > Everything has become so cryptic, couched, and circular that its a
> > real chore just to try to understand you. Maybe if we resorted to
> > Q-signals we might do better.
> >
> > QTH Snackbar?
>
> There's a pretty good example of what I mean above. ZBM-2.

Roger.

> > > > > > > > > Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> > > > > > > > > said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> > > > > > > > > with operating on the ham bands.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Grow up, Brian.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Pffft! Quit throwing yourself to the floor and having tantrums,
> > > > > > > > > David. Everyone's staring at you.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > What tantrum, Brian? What floor? What staring?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Your spoiled, child-like behavior. Grow up, Dave.
> > > > >
> > > > > Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
> > > > tantrum, the floor or the staring?
> > >
> > > Your spoiled, child-like behavior, David.
>
> I ask a valid question and I get another unrelated partial sentence as a
> response.

It's just a meager attempt at obtuseness. How am I doing?

197. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 11:11:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020311.6931b9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66237

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030501231042.01745.00000424@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >Don't forget that local LE can put CBers in jail.
> >
>
> Did that already happen to you?

Its not likely to happen, but you need to keep it in mind.

198. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 12:37:58 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305020437.7dfed397@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66248

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030501212127.24076.00000519@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> From Brian Kelly:
> >> Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member.
> >That guy has some "issues" well beyond ham radio.
>
> For what, observing that Ham radio is not for a certain group of EEs?

Of course . . spare me. No, I'm not an EE.

> >One big advantage of the CQ is the number of expeditions which
> >get into it, lotta straight dxers go ape in the CQs and don't bother
> >turning in the logs, all they want is the cards.
>
> And this is not an example of a cult?

No it's not a cult, some hams enjoy collecting QSL cards, some people
enjoy collecting stamps, are philatelists and coin collectors cultists
on your planet too? Beyond that nobody give a rat's ass if you think
these sorts of pursuits are cults or not.

> >Today there's a
> >lot of grousing about restricting single ops to 30 hours max per
> >contest.
>
> How can anyone do the same thing over and over again (like a contest)?

Easy. Get a good night's sleep, get up, scratch everything that
itches, turn on the radios, grease the paddles . . like baseball, get
up, scratch everything that itches, put on the uniform, step up the
plate . . Contesting is a *sport*, it's no more complicated than that.
And we do it over & over just like ballplayers do in their sport. If
you have a problem with that it's *your* problem, it is not the
contesters problem. See above wrt to your "issues".

w3rv

199. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 12:41:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305020441.69ddbcc1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66249

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0305011841.12d5439e@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305011155.639fb7fc@posting.google.com>...
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> > > What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since you
> > > have had your license?
> > > Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....
> >
> > I have more "bests" than I can count, great hobby. But I have one
> > "worst" which still haunts me today. Early May 1956, the Hungarians
> > had revolted against their Soviet occupiers a few days earlier, the
> > Hungarian hams were all over the bands pleading for help from the
> > west.
>
> We encouraged them to revolt. We would help. Then we didn't.
>
> Which never came as the Soviets crushed the Hungarians with
> > tanks and the HAs disappeared from the bands overnight. Some made it
> > over the fence, many did not and were never heard again.
> >
> > All I could do was sit in the shack and stare at my HQ-129. It was a
> > long, long time before any hams in the west worked any Soviet hams
> > again.
>
> Steve doesn't want the liberators of Iraq to get on the air.

Work harder at being relevant willya?

200. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 12:53:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305020453.2cb47a25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66250

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030502034630.27028.00000398@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 5/1/03 9:55 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305010655.251b2e95@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member.
> >
> >That guy has some "issues" well beyond ham radio
>
> Yeah..."preety fems", "cults" and an overbearing family that won't let him
> be an EE or go to hamfests.

Maybe Mommy has good reasons for not letting him get loose in the
profession or at the hamfests.

> Sheeesh.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

w3rv

201. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 12:55:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502085506.18135.00000533@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66401

>but you need to keep it in mind.
>

I dont need your advice on anything

202. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 14:59:46 UTC
From: "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eb287fa_4@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 66404

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0305011833.4d93d506@posting.google.com...
> "Kevin Muenzler" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3eb19067$1_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> > "Gordon A Langstaff" <veryniceguy@clomp.com> wrote in message
> > news:LlYpa.605532$3D1.330423@sccrnsc01...
> > > Tell us something we don't already know. This ng is nothing but a
> > > cesspool.
> > >
> > > GAL N6RUE
> >
> > Another "RUE" Welcome to the road-club.
> >
> > Kevin, WB5RUE
>
> Kevin, this isn't the road-club. Its either rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> or its
> rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments. I don't think the other "rue"
> got it changed over yet.
>
> Brian

Rue means "road" in French. OOOOPS! I said the "F" word!
```

203. Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 15:15:17 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <IcCcnWjSqqviFi-jXTWcpA@crocker.com>
Source record: 66405

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2AD0F.E82D023D@crosslink.net...
> "FCC Seeks Assistance in Curbing Unlicensed 10-Meter Incursions"
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/01/100/?nc=1

more info sent from k1ki (arrl ne div director) to our club reflector:

<quote>
Here's your chance to help identify and remove some of the 10m "junk"...
Riley Hollingsworth has requested the assistance of the ARRL Amateur
Auxiliary/Official Observers in stepped-up monitoring and reporting of
interference from unlicensed domestic operation on 10 meters. He
specifically asks for reports of interference from "business entities
including trucking companies, truckers or other individuals."

Riley requests special attention to this problem for the next 6 months
(May - October). He indicates that the FCC will use the information to
identify the areas where such operation is most prevalent and work with FCC
regional offices on enforcement.

Even if you're not an OO, you can help out in this effort. Reports can be
sent to Chuck Skolaut/K0BOG (k0bog@arrl.org) and should include as much
detail as possible. Chuck will organize the data collected and send it to
the FCC.

Chuck suggests the following: date, time, frequency, and mode type (SSB, AM,
etc)and then listen for distinguishing operating characteristics such as
language used (English, Spanish and some use echo boxes), possible
identifying references to location and if mobile, such as truckers, possible
schedule and highway routes and truckline names and handles(names).
<unquote>

At his request I sent the following info to k0bog on my past monitoring of
these intruders in the hope that it would be passed on to the oo's to give
them some background and tips:

<quote>
K1ki said you might be able to use a summary of what I have learned about
10m truckers to pass on to OO's so they have a starting point. Below are
some listening hints and hot spots that I have heard:

Many of the radios they use are modified cb's. Because of how the
modifications are done there are some preferred frequencies. Apparently what
one common mod does is use a multi position switch that shifts the normal 40
channel dial up into the 10m band in a couple steps. In the 'down' position
it is the normal 40 channels. 'Up 1' click it puts channel 19 on 28085, and

'Up 2' it puts channel 19 on 28535. Both of those frequencies are the most common spots I have heard stateside truckers. They also frequent the range between 28105 and 28295 in 10kc steps. They almost always use AM though I have heard a couple of them trying FM and SSB (obviously using Ham equipment), though they don't seem to like those modes.

Most of the operations I have heard have been fleet truckers. They usually run in pairs on interstates or other major highways, almost always in sight of each other as they commonly point out landmarks and interesting sights to each other and stop for meals together. They also seem to be mostly on regular routes, often heard on the same routes week after week. It is often necessary to listen to a pair for quite a while to figure out where they are from road and landmark references, or some occasions they will mention warehouses and destination stores and types of cargo they are carrying, but not very often.

Because I am in the north east I mostly hear them from the south east or west of the Mississippi. Some common areas I have heard in the past were:
1. Stone/gravel/sand delivery dump trucks in the Pensacola Fl area. Relatively short hauls over local roads and I-10 in the Fla panhandle and into southern Alabama.
2. Target Stores fleet drivers in the AZ/NM/CO/UT/NV/s.CA area. Long hauls with several stops at stores in various cities. This was one of the few where the drivers actually discussed specific warehouses and store deliveries.
3. Cattle trucks from the Dakotas down to Oklahoma City or Kansas City area. These guys were on for long periods on what sounded like a very regular schedule.
4. Stone/gravel/sand deliver dump trucks around Rockwall Tx, north east of Dallas Tx.
5. Furniture manufacturer out of Alabama with trucks heading west through TX.
6. Random trucks going to/from New Orleans LA, Little Rock Ar, San Antonio Tx, Denver Co., Houston Tx, and many other cities.

Some other odd occurances and notes:
1. A drunk sounding operator usually using a callsign like 'unit 23' from Houston Tx on 28475 AM, usually in late after noon or early evening.
2. Extremely wide and distorted audio not quite copyable on AM up to about 28800 or so... You can sometimes make out the roger beeps and other birdie effects and the repetitious cb lingo. On many occasions I have found this to be caused by one or more stations saying they are from New Orleans La. or 'in the Bayou country'. Their actual frequency is normally 27085 or 27025 or in that range.
3. Wife to driver chats around 28675.
4. Many Spanish speaking stations, most probably South American but some possibly in the south west states. Some of the obvious stateside drivers I have heard seem to switch back and forth between Spanish and English.
5. Very rarely have I heard them above 28800.
6. They are almost always on 10kc steps on the 5's on AM, probably because of the common cb channel assignments and the rig modifications.

7. I have heard fishing boats in the Atlantic off the south east coast between 28310 and about 28330 on ssb, usually in the evenings.
8. There is lots of South American AM operation on 28305 and 28315, though they can be heard every 10kc from 28005 up to about 28325 when the band is open. I also understand there is a lot on those frequencies from Asia that is heard out west.
9. A quick way to find truckers is to set up a series of memory channels on the common frequencies and let it scan. Scanning 28085, 28535, 28525, 28095, and other 10kc steps from 28105 up to 28295 on AM would probably be the easiest way to find activity. Those close to major interstates and cities will probably hear lots more than those farther out these days.

(Un)fortunately with the reduction in solar activity over the last year or so I haven't heard nearly as much as I have in the past. And being relatively far from interstates up here I probably can't hear the low power ones in New England.
<unquote>

good hunting!

204. Hunting truckers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 15:58:29 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <pcqdnU753a84CC-jXTWcog@crocker.com>
Source record: 66406

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2AD0F.E82D023D@crosslink.net...
> "FCC Seeks Assistance in Curbing Unlicensed 10-Meter Incursions"
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/01/100/?nc=1

more info sent from k1ki (arrl ne div director) to our club reflector:

<quote>
Here's your chance to help identify and remove some of the 10m "junk"...
Riley Hollingsworth has requested the assistance of the ARRL Amateur
Auxiliary/Official Observers in stepped-up monitoring and reporting of
interference from unlicensed domestic operation on 10 meters. He
specifically asks for reports of interference from "business entities
including trucking companies, truckers or other individuals."

Riley requests special attention to this problem for the next 6 months
(May - October). He indicates that the FCC will use the information to
identify the areas where such operation is most prevalent and work with FCC
regional offices on enforcement.

Even if you're not an OO, you can help out in this effort. Reports can be
sent to Chuck Skolaut/K0BOG (k0bog@arrl.org) and should include as much
detail as possible. Chuck will organize the data collected and send it to
the FCC.

Chuck suggests the following: date, time, frequency, and mode type (SSB, AM,
etc)and then listen for distinguishing operating characteristics such as
language used (English, Spanish and some use echo boxes), possible
identifying references to location and if mobile, such as truckers, possible
schedule and highway routes and truckline names and handles(names).
<unquote>

At his request I sent the following info to k0bog on my past monitoring of
these intruders in the hope that it would be passed on to the oo's to give
them some background and tips:

<quote>
K1ki said you might be able to use a summary of what I have learned about
10m truckers to pass on to OO's so they have a starting point. Below are
some listening hints and hot spots that I have heard:

Many of the radios they use are modified cb's. Because of how the
modifications are done there are some preferred frequencies. Apparently what
one common mod does is use a multi position switch that shifts the normal 40
channel dial up into the 10m band in a couple steps. In the 'down' position
it is the normal 40 channels. 'Up 1' click it puts channel 19 on 28085, and

'Up 2' it puts channel 19 on 28535. Both of those frequencies are the most common spots I have heard stateside truckers. They also frequent the range between 28105 and 28295 in 10kc steps. They almost always use AM though I have heard a couple of them trying FM and SSB (obviously using Ham equipment), though they don't seem to like those modes.

Most of the operations I have heard have been fleet truckers. They usually run in pairs on interstates or other major highways, almost always in sight of each other as they commonly point out landmarks and interesting sights to each other and stop for meals together. They also seem to be mostly on regular routes, often heard on the same routes week after week. It is often necessary to listen to a pair for quite a while to figure out where they are from road and landmark references, or some occasions they will mention warehouses and destination stores and types of cargo they are carrying, but not very often.

Because I am in the north east I mostly hear them from the south east or west of the Mississippi. Some common areas I have heard in the past were:
1. Stone/gravel/sand delivery dump trucks in the Pensacola Fl area. Relatively short hauls over local roads and I-10 in the Fla panhandle and into southern Alabama.
2. Target Stores fleet drivers in the AZ/NM/CO/UT/NV/s.CA area. Long hauls with several stops at stores in various cities. This was one of the few where the drivers actually discussed specific warehouses and store deliveries.
3. Cattle trucks from the Dakotas down to Oklahoma City or Kansas City area. These guys were on for long periods on what sounded like a very regular schedule.
4. Stone/gravel/sand deliver dump trucks around Rockwall Tx, north east of Dallas Tx.
5. Furniture manufacturer out of Alabama with trucks heading west through TX.
6. Random trucks going to/from New Orleans LA, Little Rock Ar, San Antonio Tx, Denver Co., Houston Tx, and many other cities.

Some other odd occurances and notes:
1. A drunk sounding operator usually using a callsign like 'unit 23' from Houston Tx on 28475 AM, usually in late after noon or early evening.
2. Extremely wide and distorted audio not quite copyable on AM up to about 28800 or so... You can sometimes make out the roger beeps and other birdie effects and the repetitious cb lingo. On many occasions I have found this to be caused by one or more stations saying they are from New Orleans La. or 'in the Bayou country'. Their actual frequency is normally 27085 or 27025 or in that range.
3. Wife to driver chats around 28675.
4. Many Spanish speaking stations, most probably South American but some possibly in the south west states. Some of the obvious stateside drivers I have heard seem to switch back and forth between Spanish and English.
5. Very rarely have I heard them above 28800.
6. They are almost always on 10kc steps on the 5's on AM, probably because of the common cb channel assignments and the rig modifications.

7. I have heard fishing boats in the Atlantic off the south east coast between 28310 and about 28330 on ssb, usually in the evenings.
8. There is lots of South American AM operation on 28305 and 28315, though they can be heard every 10kc from 28005 up to about 28325 when the band is open. I also understand there is a lot on those frequencies from Asia that is heard out west.
9. A quick way to find truckers is to set up a series of memory channels on the common frequencies and let it scan. Scanning 28085, 28535, 28525, 28095, and other 10kc steps from 28105 up to 28295 on AM would probably be the easiest way to find activity. Those close to major interstates and cities will probably hear lots more than those farther out these days.

(Un)fortunately with the reduction in solar activity over the last year or so I haven't heard nearly as much as I have in the past. And being relatively far from interstates up here I probably can't hear the low power ones in New England.
<unquote>

good hunting!

205. Re: Another "policy" question ...FCC representative.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 16:07:37 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB297C9.E1476E36@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66402

Getting rep's on the FCC is easy. All one need do is donate enough money or media time to the President's campaign, just like the commercial interests do. We do, after all, have the finest Government money can buy.

206. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 16:15:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8u5jm$6jh$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 66407

Brian wrote:

>
> > > > The ITU definition of a prefix is not the same as in the WPX contest, e.g.
> > > > in my call (N3KIP) the prefix is really 'N', not 'N3'.
> > > >
> > > > The FCC aleady issues the wrong format calls to aircraft, issues calls to
> > > > stations that shouldn't have any, and issues all kinds of calls that don't
> > > > fit any of these formats. So, I guess issuing wierd non-ITU ham calls
> > > > wouldn't be too big a departure for them anyway, ROTFL!
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> > >
> > > Alun, I hope Steve isn't reading this. "The FCC must follow all treaties."
> >
> > Won't matter, it's incorrect.
>
> One liner DICK, Steve just posted that it is correct. Get a clue.

Some of you guys are clueless beyond belief. ITU regs spell out callsign
allocations to the various countries with prefixes beginning AAA through ZZZ
When the country needs, the prefix is followed by a numeric, then, also if needed,
suffix of AAA through ZZZ. Been that way for decades.
The FCC could legally assign AAA1ZZZ as an amateur callsign if they
wanted/needed to.

207. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 16:43:19 UTC
From: treddy <hoho@njtreddyorg.com>
Message-ID: <b8u77q$9gb$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

Oh my oh my, I can see it now, a fleet of bald tire wrecks
rolling all over the nation's highways and byways with large
cardboard signs duck taped on the side reading "Junior
FCC auxiliary trucker Radio Patrol." All intent on hunting
outlaw truckers. Said vehicles will have a minimum of eight
antennas mounted and a minimum of four obese pencil pocket
coke bottle lens white male geeks riding in each vehicle. Said
geeks will display hats with their call signs emblazoned on them,
call sign badges, a minimum of fifteen "ARRL member" stickers
glued all over the windows of the vehicles. Uniform for said geeks
will consist of food stained shirts and filthy trousers.
Additionally, said geeks will not be required to practice
bodily hygiene for a minimum of one week before leaving
on auxiliary patrol duties, including having not shaved for two
weeks. Word circulating among truckers is the greatest
countermeasure to the "geek patrols" is to have an
attractive young girl clad in a string bikini riding in one's
truck cab. Upon spotting the geek radio patrol, said
young woman will display her wears at the geeks. The
geeks, not ever having experienced the full attention of a
beautiful young woman before , will consequently lose control
of their vehicle and begin salivating profusely.

hyt

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:IcCcnWjSqqviFi-jXTWcpA@crocker.com...
> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB2AD0F.E82D023D@crosslink.net...
> > "FCC Seeks Assistance in Curbing Unlicensed 10-Meter Incursions"
> >
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/01/100/?nc=1
>
> more info sent from k1ki (arrl ne div director) to our club reflector:
>
> <quote>
> Here's your chance to help identify and remove some of the 10m "junk"...
> Riley Hollingsworth has requested the assistance of the ARRL Amateur
> Auxiliary/Official Observers in stepped-up monitoring and reporting of
> interference from unlicensed domestic operation on 10 meters. He
> specifically asks for reports of interference from "business entities
> including trucking companies, truckers or other individuals."
>
> Riley requests special attention to this problem for the next 6 months

> (May - October). He indicates that the FCC will use the information to
> identify the areas where such operation is most prevalent and work with
FCC
> regional offices on enforcement.
>
> Even if you're not an OO, you can help out in this effort. Reports can be
> sent to Chuck Skolaut/K0BOG (k0bog@arrl.org) and should include as much
> detail as possible. Chuck will organize the data collected and send it to
> the FCC.
>
> Chuck suggests the following: date, time, frequency, and mode type (SSB,
AM,
> etc)and then listen for distinguishing operating characteristics such as
> language used (English, Spanish and some use echo boxes), possible
> identifying references to location and if mobile, such as truckers,
possible
> schedule and highway routes and truckline names and handles(names).
> <unquote>
>
> At his request I sent the following info to k0bog on my past monitoring of
> these intruders in the hope that it would be passed on to the oo's to give
> them some background and tips:
>
> <quote>
> K1ki said you might be able to use a summary of what I have learned about
> 10m truckers to pass on to OO's so they have a starting point. Below are
> some listening hints and hot spots that I have heard:
>
> Many of the radios they use are modified cb's. Because of how the
> modifications are done there are some preferred frequencies. Apparently
what
> one common mod does is use a multi position switch that shifts the normal
40
> channel dial up into the 10m band in a couple steps. In the 'down'
position
> it is the normal 40 channels. 'Up 1' click it puts channel 19 on 28085,
and
> 'Up 2' it puts channel 19 on 28535. Both of those frequencies are the most
> common spots I have heard stateside truckers. They also frequent the range
> between 28105 and 28295 in 10kc steps. They almost always use AM though I
> have heard a couple of them trying FM and SSB (obviously using Ham
> equipment), though they don't seem to like those modes.
>
> Most of the operations I have heard have been fleet truckers. They usually
> run in pairs on interstates or other major highways, almost always in
sight
> of each other as they commonly point out landmarks and interesting sights
to
> each other and stop for meals together. They also seem to be mostly on
> regular routes, often heard on the same routes week after week. It is

often
> necessary to listen to a pair for quite a while to figure out where they
are
> from road and landmark references, or some occasions they will mention
> warehouses and destination stores and types of cargo they are carrying,
but
> not very often.
>
> Because I am in the north east I mostly hear them from the south east or
> west of the Mississippi. Some common areas I have heard in the past were:
> 1. Stone/gravel/sand delivery dump trucks in the Pensacola Fl area.
> Relatively short hauls over local roads and I-10 in the Fla panhandle and
> into southern Alabama.
> 2. Target Stores fleet drivers in the AZ/NM/CO/UT/NV/s.CA area. Long hauls
> with several stops at stores in various cities. This was one of the few
> where the drivers actually discussed specific warehouses and store
> deliveries.
> 3. Cattle trucks from the Dakotas down to Oklahoma City or Kansas City
area.
> These guys were on for long periods on what sounded like a very regular
> schedule.
> 4. Stone/gravel/sand deliver dump trucks around Rockwall Tx, north east of
> Dallas Tx.
> 5. Furniture manufacturer out of Alabama with trucks heading west through
> TX.
> 6. Random trucks going to/from New Orleans LA, Little Rock Ar, San Antonio
> Tx, Denver Co., Houston Tx, and many other cities.
>
> Some other odd occurances and notes:
> 1. A drunk sounding operator usually using a callsign like 'unit 23' from
> Houston Tx on 28475 AM, usually in late after noon or early evening.
> 2. Extremely wide and distorted audio not quite copyable on AM up to about
> 28800 or so... You can sometimes make out the roger beeps and other birdie
> effects and the repetitious cb lingo. On many occasions I have found this
to
> be caused by one or more stations saying they are from New Orleans La. or
> 'in the Bayou country'. Their actual frequency is normally 27085 or 27025
or
> in that range.
> 3. Wife to driver chats around 28675.
> 4. Many Spanish speaking stations, most probably South American but some
> possibly in the south west states. Some of the obvious stateside drivers I
> have heard seem to switch back and forth between Spanish and English.
> 5. Very rarely have I heard them above 28800.
> 6. They are almost always on 10kc steps on the 5's on AM, probably because
> of the common cb channel assignments and the rig modifications.
> 7. I have heard fishing boats in the Atlantic off the south east coast
> between 28310 and about 28330 on ssb, usually in the evenings.
> 8. There is lots of South American AM operation on 28305 and 28315, though
> they can be heard every 10kc from 28005 up to about 28325 when the band is

> open. I also understand there is a lot on those frequencies from Asia that
> is heard out west.
> 9. A quick way to find truckers is to set up a series of memory channels
on
> the common frequencies and let it scan. Scanning 28085, 28535, 28525,
28095,
> and other 10kc steps from 28105 up to 28295 on AM would probably be the
> easiest way to find activity. Those close to major interstates and cities
> will probably hear lots more than those farther out these days.
>
> (Un)fortunately with the reduction in solar activity over the last year or
> so I haven't heard nearly as much as I have in the past. And being
> relatively far from interstates up here I probably can't hear the low
power
> ones in New England.
> <unquote>
>
> good hunting!
>
>
>

208. Aircraft Navaid QRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 16:48:25 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <s785bvg8id8sabn551fk3beasfvrvie197@4ax.com>
Source record: 66409

I'd be interested in how you can get a 6 meter harmonic to interfere with a navaid.

Jim

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

-> Harmonics on 6 meters can also interfere with TV, broadcast and
->aeronautical navaids.

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

209. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 16:56:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020856.2064ce86@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66410

"Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3eb287fa_4@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0305011833.4d93d506@posting.google.com...
> > "Kevin Muenzler" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<3eb19067$1_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> > > "Gordon A Langstaff" <veryniceguy@clomp.com> wrote in message
> > > news:LlYpa.605532$3D1.330423@sccrnsc01...
> > > > Tell us something we don't already know. This ng is nothing but a
> > > > cesspool.
> > > >
> > > > GAL N6RUE
> > >
> > > Another "RUE" Welcome to the road-club.
> > >
> > > Kevin, WB5RUE
> >
> > Kevin, this isn't the road-club. Its either rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> > or its
> > rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments. I don't think the other "rue"
> > got it changed over yet.
> >
> > Brian
>
> Rue means "road" in French. OOOOPS! I said the "F" word!

I thought rue was a butter based sauce in French.

Ooops. Gotta go wash my mouth.

210. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:10:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020910.1aafb8e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66411

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030502035700.27028.00000399@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 5/1/03 4:55 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0305011355.427c9cde@posting.google.com>
>
> > I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
> >> father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.
> >
> >Algore was a grunt in Vietnam.
>
> Algore as not a "grunt". "Grunts" are infantrymen. Try again on his
> duties, Brain.
>
> >> The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.
> >
> >Sure. People were trying to get into the Air Force to avoid
> >conscription.
>
> None of the services drafted anyone. The Selective Service did.

And?

> They subsequently assigned conscripts based upon the stated needs of the
> services. I know at least two people who served in the USAF in Viet Nam who
> were conscripted.

Take it up with Dave.

> >> Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
> >> tantrum, the floor or the staring?
> >
> >Your spoiled, child-like behavior, David.
>
> Whew...Coming from YOU that has to hurt...NOT.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

bwhaha

211. Re: Weather Guessing for Dummies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:16:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305020916.63c8b4dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66412

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030502041016.21229.00000454@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 5/1/03 6:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EB1AEA1.F725E675@earthlink.net>
>
> >During the times they were on duty, they could sometimes predict the
> >weather. During the monsoon season their predictions were much more
> >accurate.
>
> Did they use the same "weather rock" that some Navy weatherguessers used???

Those would be "aerographer's mates." They are highly trained - they
went through the Air Force weather school.

> Bright Rock = Sunny
>
> Dull Rock = Cloudy
>
> Hot Rock = Summer
>
> Cold Rock = Winter
>
> White Rock = Snowing
>
> Wet Rock = Raining
>
> Moving Rock = Earthquake
>
> Missing Rock = Hurricaine

Weather rocks are great. But they are only good for "now-casting."
Find an AF trained weatherman if you want prediction.

212. ID I OT A LERT !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:21:42 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3EB2A926.F5836774@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 66413
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

treddy wrote:

Treddy wrote a crossposted diatribe that should have stayed on
misc.transport.trucking

A H

213. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:34:00 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns936F89FF4DDA3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66414

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:b8u5jm$6jh$0@208.206.142.101:

>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
>>
>> > > > The ITU definition of a prefix is not the same as in the WPX
>> > > > contest, e.g. in my call (N3KIP) the prefix is really 'N', not
>> > > > 'N3'.
>> > > >
>> > > > The FCC aleady issues the wrong format calls to aircraft, issues
>> > > > calls to stations that shouldn't have any, and issues all kinds
>> > > > of calls that don't fit any of these formats. So, I guess
>> > > > issuing wierd non-ITU ham calls wouldn't be too big a departure
>> > > > for them anyway, ROTFL!
>> > > >
>> > > > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>> > >
>> > > Alun, I hope Steve isn't reading this. "The FCC must follow all
>> > > treaties."
>> >
>> > Won't matter, it's incorrect.
>>
>> One liner DICK, Steve just posted that it is correct. Get a clue.
>
> Some of you guys are clueless beyond belief. ITU regs spell out
> callsign
> allocations to the various countries with prefixes beginning AAA
> through ZZZ When the country needs, the prefix is followed by a
> numeric, then, also if needed, suffix of AAA through ZZZ. Been that way
> for decades.
> The FCC could legally assign AAA1ZZZ as an amateur callsign if they
> wanted/needed to.
>
>

Good point. Three letter prefixes are the only way they could issue more
calls without going astray of the ITU.

214. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:34:37 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <uZxsa.543$fM2.228@fe07.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 66417
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

treddy <hoho@njtreddyorg.com> wrote in message
news:b8u77q$9gb$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Oh my oh my, I can see it now, a fleet of bald tire wrecks
> rolling all over the nation's highways and byways with large
> cardboard signs duck taped on the side reading "Junior
> FCC auxiliary trucker Radio Patrol." All intent on hunting
> outlaw truckers. Said vehicles will have a minimum of eight
> antennas mounted and a minimum of four obese pencil pocket
> coke bottle lens white male geeks riding in each vehicle. Said
> geeks will display hats with their call signs emblazoned on them,
> call sign badges, a minimum of fifteen "ARRL member" stickers
> glued all over the windows of the vehicles. Uniform for said geeks
> will consist of food stained shirts and filthy trousers.
> Additionally, said geeks will not be required to practice
> bodily hygiene for a minimum of one week before leaving
> on auxiliary patrol duties, including having not shaved for two
> weeks. Word circulating among truckers is the greatest
> countermeasure to the "geek patrols" is to have an
> attractive young girl clad in a string bikini riding in one's
> truck cab. Upon spotting the geek radio patrol, said
> young woman will display her wears at the geeks. The
> geeks, not ever having experienced the full attention of a
> beautiful young woman before , will consequently lose control
> of their vehicle and begin salivating profusely.
>
> hyt

I can see it now. Ratty old trailer with a dented old car sitting on a
jack at a crazy angle. Another
old 70's Pontiac rusted out under the doors and the requisite dents. And
when the feller drives
"hit", missing hubcaps and all, the motor misses on 3 of 8 cylinders
(FOOOMP, FOOOMP, FOOMP, FOOOMP!). Don't fergit the rebel flag in the rear
window behind all the batting that
has erupted behind upholstery long since faded and split like "mini"
mountains all across the
warped package tray. Don't fergit about them thar twin 'antenners' put
about 4' across the trunk,
or better, two whup-whups on the bumper because the pore feller has not even
a clue about the
term "co-phase". BUT he thinks 'hit' looks cool. "Bout as cool at the
'backer" juice staining the corners of his mouth and the snaggled, rotten

teeth. He cain't hardly feed them young'uns, but he
spent $400 fer that mobile "leenyar" in that rusty 'Pony-aack", and another
$300 for a modulator fer the one at home. He got a super "deal" down at
Bubba's CB Shop and Pool Parlor; time pay-
ments work wonders. He'll argue, whilst his listeners dodge "backy' juice,
spewing (pun intended)
forth his "knowledge" about the "raht" length fer his coax; truth is, he
knows as much about a
chicken band 'reddio' as them chickens his wife has to keep shooing out of
the trailer. Heck, she
should let 'em come on in; them chickens might gid "atter" some roaches in
'ere. ....

Anyone can stereotype another. I have found that, for the most part,
Amateurs are pretty average
and most intelligent. If you can label one group, out of that group, you
can find an equal number
of the types you describe; nerds, truckers with ponytails, Harley belts,
leather jackets with rebel
flags, pocket holders, unkempt, thick glasses, disheveled, etc. OTH, I meet
many truckers AND
hams who dress neatly, are polite, can engage in intelligent, erudite
conversation, and are----well--
--just folks. It is just as to easy to label one group as another, like I
said.

WRT the issue of truckers operating on frequencies that are assigned to
others, it's almost funny.
That ham that *may* have an odd--looking antenna likely is just as
non-descript as any other
vehicle, and the "poor" driver would never know he's been fingered until his
employer received
a letter of warning. It may be funny to you, but it is NOT funny to the
driver who has to explain
why he is operating illegal equipment. Drivers have fired over this, and
you think it is a joke?

The bottom line is, those drivers who operate on frequencies not theirs are
wrong to do so and it is patently illegal. The rightful users of the
frequencies you take so lightly as if you had a "right" to anything you
please DON'T think it is funny. And those "nerdy" hams that do monitor (but
then Cbers have no concept of self-policing) THEIR bands will continue to
attempt to protect that which
belongs to THEM. Like it or lump it, that vehicle you see following you
may or may not be recording your conversation, and Mr.Hollingsworth will
follow up on it. Stay tuned.. there's more
about to get a surprise.

J

the ARRL Amateur
> > Auxiliary/Official Observers in stepped-up monitoring and reporting of

> > interference from unlicensed domestic operation on 10 meters. He
> > specifically asks for reports of interference from "business entities
> > including trucking companies, truckers or other individuals."
> >
> > Riley requests special attention to this problem for the next 6 months
> > (May - October). He indicates that the FCC will use the information to
> > identify the areas where such operation is most prevalent and work with
> FCC
> > regional offices on enforcement.
> >
> > Even if you're not an OO, you can help out in this effort. Reports can
be
> > sent to Chuck Skolaut/K0BOG (k0bog@arrl.org) and should include as much
> > detail as possible. Chuck will organize the data collected and send it
to
> > the FCC.
> >
> > Chuck suggests the following: date, time, frequency, and mode type (SSB,
> AM,
> > etc)and then listen for distinguishing operating characteristics such as
> > language used (English, Spanish and some use echo boxes), possible
> > identifying references to location and if mobile, such as truckers,
> possible
> > schedule and highway routes and truckline names and handles(names).
> > <unquote>
> >
> > At his request I sent the following info to k0bog on my past monitoring
of
> > these intruders in the hope that it would be passed on to the oo's to
give
> > them some background and tips:
> >
> > <quote>
> > K1ki said you might be able to use a summary of what I have learned
about
> > 10m truckers to pass on to OO's so they have a starting point. Below are
> > some listening hints and hot spots that I have heard:
> >
> > Many of the radios they use are modified cb's. Because of how the
> > modifications are done there are some preferred frequencies. Apparently
> what
> > one common mod does is use a multi position switch that shifts the
normal
> 40
> > channel dial up into the 10m band in a couple steps. In the 'down'
> position
> > it is the normal 40 channels. 'Up 1' click it puts channel 19 on 28085,
> and
> > 'Up 2' it puts channel 19 on 28535. Both of those frequencies are the
most

> > common spots I have heard stateside truckers. They also frequent the
range
> > between 28105 and 28295 in 10kc steps. They almost always use AM though
I
> > have heard a couple of them trying FM and SSB (obviously using Ham
> > equipment), though they don't seem to like those modes.
> >
> > Most of the operations I have heard have been fleet truckers. They
usually
> > run in pairs on interstates or other major highways, almost always in
> sight
> > of each other as they commonly point out landmarks and interesting
sights
> to
> > each other and stop for meals together. They also seem to be mostly on
> > regular routes, often heard on the same routes week after week. It is
> often
> > necessary to listen to a pair for quite a while to figure out where they
> are
> > from road and landmark references, or some occasions they will mention
> > warehouses and destination stores and types of cargo they are carrying,
> but
> > not very often.
> >
> > Because I am in the north east I mostly hear them from the south east or
> > west of the Mississippi. Some common areas I have heard in the past
were:
> > 1. Stone/gravel/sand delivery dump trucks in the Pensacola Fl area.
> > Relatively short hauls over local roads and I-10 in the Fla panhandle
and
> > into southern Alabama.
> > 2. Target Stores fleet drivers in the AZ/NM/CO/UT/NV/s.CA area. Long
hauls
> > with several stops at stores in various cities. This was one of the few
> > where the drivers actually discussed specific warehouses and store
> > deliveries.
> > 3. Cattle trucks from the Dakotas down to Oklahoma City or Kansas City
> area.
> > These guys were on for long periods on what sounded like a very regular
> > schedule.
> > 4. Stone/gravel/sand deliver dump trucks around Rockwall Tx, north east
of
> > Dallas Tx.
> > 5. Furniture manufacturer out of Alabama with trucks heading west
through
> > TX.
> > 6. Random trucks going to/from New Orleans LA, Little Rock Ar, San
Antonio
> > Tx, Denver Co., Houston Tx, and many other cities.
> >

> > Some other odd occurances and notes:
> > 1. A drunk sounding operator usually using a callsign like 'unit 23'
from
> > Houston Tx on 28475 AM, usually in late after noon or early evening.
> > 2. Extremely wide and distorted audio not quite copyable on AM up to
about
> > 28800 or so... You can sometimes make out the roger beeps and other
birdie
> > effects and the repetitious cb lingo. On many occasions I have found
this
> to
> > be caused by one or more stations saying they are from New Orleans La.
or
> > 'in the Bayou country'. Their actual frequency is normally 27085 or
27025
> or
> > in that range.
> > 3. Wife to driver chats around 28675.
> > 4. Many Spanish speaking stations, most probably South American but some
> > possibly in the south west states. Some of the obvious stateside drivers
I
> > have heard seem to switch back and forth between Spanish and English.
> > 5. Very rarely have I heard them above 28800.
> > 6. They are almost always on 10kc steps on the 5's on AM, probably
because
> > of the common cb channel assignments and the rig modifications.
> > 7. I have heard fishing boats in the Atlantic off the south east coast
> > between 28310 and about 28330 on ssb, usually in the evenings.
> > 8. There is lots of South American AM operation on 28305 and 28315,
though
> > they can be heard every 10kc from 28005 up to about 28325 when the band
is
> > open. I also understand there is a lot on those frequencies from Asia
that
> > is heard out west.
> > 9. A quick way to find truckers is to set up a series of memory channels
> on
> > the common frequencies and let it scan. Scanning 28085, 28535, 28525,
> 28095,
> > and other 10kc steps from 28105 up to 28295 on AM would probably be the
> > easiest way to find activity. Those close to major interstates and
cities
> > will probably hear lots more than those farther out these days.
> >
> > (Un)fortunately with the reduction in solar activity over the last year
or
> > so I haven't heard nearly as much as I have in the past. And being
> > relatively far from interstates up here I probably can't hear the low
> power
> > ones in New England.

> > <unquote>
> >
> > good hunting!
> >
> >
> >
>
>

215. Funny you should mention that ....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:38:23 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2AD0F.E82D023D@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66403

"FCC Seeks Assistance in Curbing Unlicensed 10-Meter Incursions"

<http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/01/100/?nc=1>

216. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:38:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8uaebgpt1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66415

SSTV is not the antique technology of pre vidiocon flying spot scanners.

Amateur REPEATERS, not handi talkies, is what I was refering to. It showed
that linking could indeed work.

As for QST....There hasn't been anything technical there in 20 plus years.
That I agree with you on.

Tell you what Len....give me a chance to get a copy of that 'fact' program
you have and we can copy and past into the gigibit range.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501202658.18769.00000429@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <b8ribg$m34$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> >news:b8r2lv$cg4h3$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> >> > With the exception of antennas and propagation conditions, Hams are
> >> usually not
> >> > technical. However, in this technical area, Hams are often very
skilled.
> >>
> >> Hams are very technical in a variety of areas actually.... its the
> >> mechanical side that a percentage probably lacks. Sure ya can build a
> >> transciever but can't change the oil in the car or replace something
simple
> >> like an alternator.....
> >>
> >> --
> >> Ryan, KC8PMX
> >> FF/MFR
> >> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> >> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
..-.
> >> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >Actually from the non-ham Len over 21his lack of knowledge of Amateur
Radios
> >history is not surprising. Hams have contributed quite a lot into the
> >technology we see today.
> >
> >Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of
> >repeaters.
>

> BZZZT! Wrong answer, Dan. Sorry.
>
> Cellular telephones can be traced back to the first "handie-talkies"
> designed by Motorola back in WW2. First two-way radio that
> could be held in one hand. Motorola followed that with the SCR-300
> "walkie-talkie" during WW2, low VHF range two-way backpack.
> The follow-on designs available just after WW2 and used in the
> Korean War (AN/PRC-9 as one example of three) had an adapter
> cable and box to couple two sets for unattended repeater use.
> A whole family of radio relay equipment was operational with the
> US military at the end of WW2 that was specifically designed for
> unattended repeater use, including multiple-site linking.
>
> ATT may have had the very first pocket-size paging receiver, the
> Bell System's "Pageboy" about 1960, a simple VHF receiver with
> vibrating audio-range reeds for tone decoding. [was written up in
> technical detail in the Bell System Technical Journal in one issue
> about 1961] About a decade later the first of the portable, mobile
> telephone radios appeared, rather bulky, and with conventional
> handsets, suitable only for use within vehicles. These were VHF
> range, not the cordless phone variety used indoors.
>
> Meanwhile, Motorola and others designed and made VHF and
> UHF handheld two-way radios that featured sub-audible audio
> signalling for business, utility, and public safety radio use.
> Many pagers were also designed and made, smaller than the
> Pageboy. Some of those radio user networks had unattended
> repeater stations. Several system concepts were built and
> studied beginning in the 1970s that utilized much digital
> signalling and control from any site...which eventually morphed
> into the UHF cellular concept employed in the USA and elsewhere
> today.
>
> Today's "cell phone" owes its existance to several areas of
> technology: Development of efficient solid-state RF amplifiers
> centered on 1 GHZ; Very Large Scale Integrated Circuits of low
> power demand to handle all the digital functions and control
> needed in a single small IC package; efficient batteries and
> charging system to enable long use.
>
> >Slow Scan TV....utilized on several of the early moon shots and on the
deep
> >space probes, such as voyager. Invented and perfected by ham radio.
>
> BZZZT! Wrong again, Dan.
>
> The very first ever television was already "slow-scan." Those were
> mechanical and their ultimate mechanical form was done by
> Scotsman John Logie Baird in the UK. The invention of the
> iconoscope enabled all-electronic television cameras and after

> WW2 the image orthicon (big studio equipment) and vidicon
> (small portable cameras) allowed better imaging. All invented and
> perfected by commercial interests well before we had a space
> program such as Mercury.
>
> The first "moon shot" (literally) unmanned vehicles that impacted
> the moon used small vidicon cameras of conventional higher
> scan rates; receiving equipment was improved at terrestrial stations
> to enable capturing and storing individual scan frames. The early
> deep space probes used highly-modified camera vacuum tubes to
> study a very wide spectrum above and below human visual range.
> Later models used semiconductor camera ICs for lighter weight and
> less power consumption. All designed and built by NASA's
> contractors.
>
> >And amongst many others the Internet you are reading this over comes from
> >ham radio and PACKET radio linking.
>
> AOL doesn't use "ham radio links," works over POTS (Plain Old
> Telephone System). Inter-exchange cable and fiber linking of the
> telephone system is done by high-speed digital systems, notably
> the "T-1 Carrier" running at 1.544 MBPS with many many voice
> channels carried in "packets." T-1 and other similar carrier
> systems can be carried on microwave radio and many such links
> exist in both telco and other business use.
>
> The "packet" concept probably has more of an origin in microwave
> radio relay systems using various forms of pulse modulation. Two
> examples are the AN/TRC-5 and AN/TRC-6 military relay systems
> operational in the late 1940s. The TRC-6 was in low X-band and
> came with its own tower. By 1950 General Electric had a 24
> voice channel radio relay system on 1.8 GHz for commercial users
> followed shortly by Philco with a similar C-band system, also 24
> channels. The Bell System laboratories did extensive research
> into many forms of packetized high-speed time multiplexing in the
> early 1950s and the T-1 Carrier is just one example.
>
> While not "packet" in form the USN contract time-division MUX
> of 1952 for putting 4 TTY channels into one voice-bandwidth
> circuit utilized synchronization and framing pulses. The military
> and commercial "torn-tape" TTY relay system that began before
> WW2 is the ancestor of "packet" message relay systems. By
> the time of AUTODIN the TTY relay system had eliminated the
> human link in relaying, going directly to electronic relaying.
> Today's DSN (Digital Switched Network) for government and the
> military can handle everything the Internet can handle.
>
> I don't believe that direct Internet interface of amateur repeaters
> to commercial ISPs is in line with the definition of AMATEUR
> radio, that of "an activity without pecuniary compensation."

> Perhaps you know of an ISP operating as a purely non-profit
> organization? :-)
>
> >Now-a-days we have much experimenting going on in the digital field
within
> >Amateur Radio.
>
> Yes, automatic position reporting on amateur VHF-UHF radio
> using GPSS data input. Without GPS there's no data. GPSS
> began as the USN's NAVSTAR in 1970.
>
> Embedded microcontrollers in just about every ready-built amateur
> transceiver, receiver, transmitter, automatic antenna tuner, all
> designed and manufactured by non-amateurs...adapted by some
> amateurs for their own use.
>
> Adaptation of microcontrollers in amateur radio of limited relative
> experimentation enabled by the Microchip PIC line and the
> Basic STAMP family, picking up what was done by ordinary,
> non-amateur hobbyists involved in robotics.
>
> Automatic Link Establishment such as on SHARES network...
> oops, sorry, that is government communications on HF, very
> little done in amateur radio. Strike ALE. Or drink it.
>
> There is Digital Signal Processing or DSP for true brick-wall
> audio filtering...following already-done DSP in the commercial
> area of electronics. DSP above audio in amateur radio
> equipment was designed and produced by profit-making
> companies first. The same for SDR or Software Defined Radio.
>
> >Check out AMSAT for some cutting edge stuff.
>
> Check out TAPR (Tucson Amateur Packet Radio) for more
> practical digital experimentation...such as the "world's most
> accurate clock" using the GPSS as the source.
>
> >Sorry Len.... your full of crap as usual.
>
> Sorry, Dan. You are the one with mental constipation.
>
> If all you read about radio is from QST, your mental constipation
> will become terminal.
>

217. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:40:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8uaj0gqq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66416

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030502043910.21229.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Dayton Hamfest?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 5/1/03 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030501202658.18769.00000429@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
> >>Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of
> >>repeaters.
> >
> > BZZZT! Wrong answer, Dan. Sorry.
>
> >Cellular telephones can be traced back to the first "handie-talkies"
> > designed by Motorola back in WW2
>
> The first "handie talkies" were pioneered by Amateurs BEFORE the war,
> Lennie.
>
> >ATT may have had the very first pocket-size paging receiver...(SNIP)
>
> Pagers are related to cellphones?
>
> >Today's "cell phone" owes its existance to several areas of
> > technology: Development of efficient solid-state RF amplifiers
> > centered on 1 GHZ; Very Large Scale Integrated Circuits of low
> > power demand to handle all the digital functions and control
> > needed in a single small IC package; efficient batteries and
> > charging system to enable long use.
>
> Todays "cellphone" has been the catalyst for the advancement of those
> technologies.
>
> And cellphones owe their existence to AT&T and other industries
looking to
> expand the coverage and reliabiltiy of the mobile telephone. More
telephone
> users meant more profits, and no one was going to pay the kind of money
that
> the old services could command for very limited coverage areas and
intermittent
> service.
>
> >The very first ever television was already "slow-scan." Those were
> > mechanical and their ultimate mechanical form was done by

> > Scotsman John Logie Baird in the UK...(SNIP)
>
> Isn't it a shame that you can "recall" all this trivia, yet you can't
get
> the "respect" you expect because you have a sewer for a mouth and acid for
> personality, Lennie?
>
> >Automatic Link Establishment such as on SHARES network...
> > oops, sorry, that is government communications on HF, very
> > little done in amateur radio
>
> Since WHEN did you let something like "not Amatuer Radio" deter you
from
> incorporating it into a rant, Lennie?
>
> As usual...SOLDAISNDAID.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You know somtin Steve? This guy is acting more like Herby Schoembohm every day? Notice that? Never quite answers a question, or responds to a comment with answer directly related. Just sort of dances around things....hmmmm. Yep sure do sound like Herby.

Dan/W4NTI

218. Re: Hunting truckers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:42:52 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <ebysa.2367$H17.659@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 66419

David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:pcqdnU753a84CC-jXTWcog@crocker.com...
> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB2AD0F.E82D023D@crosslink.net...
> > "FCC Seeks Assistance in Curbing Unlicensed 10-Meter Incursions"
> >
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/01/100/?nc=1
>
> more info sent from k1ki (arrl ne div director) to our club reflector:
>
> <quote>
> Here's your chance to help identify and remove some of the 10m "junk"...
> Riley Hollingsworth has requested the assistance of the ARRL Amateur
> Auxiliary/Official Observers in stepped-up monitoring and reporting of
> interference from unlicensed domestic operation on 10 meters. He
> specifically asks for reports of interference from "business entities
> including trucking companies, truckers or other individuals."
>
> Riley requests special attention to this problem for the next 6 months
> (May - October). He indicates that the FCC will use the information to
> identify the areas where such operation is most prevalent and work with
FCC
> regional offices on enforcement.
>
> Even if you're not an OO, you can help out in this effort. Reports can be
> sent to Chuck Skolaut/K0BOG (k0bog@arrl.org) and should include as much
> detail as possible. Chuck will organize the data collected and send it to
> the FCC.
>
> Chuck suggests the following: date, time, frequency, and mode type (SSB,
AM,
> etc)and then listen for distinguishing operating characteristics such as
> language used (English, Spanish and some use echo boxes), possible
> identifying references to location and if mobile, such as truckers,
possible
> schedule and highway routes and truckline names and handles(names).
> <unquote>
>
> At his request I sent the following info to k0bog on my past monitoring of
> these intruders in the hope that it would be passed on to the oo's to give
> them some background and tips:
>
> <quote>
> K1ki said you might be able to use a summary of what I have learned about

> 10m truckers to pass on to OO's so they have a starting point. Below are
> some listening hints and hot spots that I have heard:
>
> Many of the radios they use are modified cb's. Because of how the
> modifications are done there are some preferred frequencies. Apparently
what
> one common mod does is use a multi position switch that shifts the normal
40
> channel dial up into the 10m band in a couple steps. In the 'down'
position
> it is the normal 40 channels. 'Up 1' click it puts channel 19 on 28085,
and
> 'Up 2' it puts channel 19 on 28535. Both of those frequencies are the most
> common spots I have heard stateside truckers. They also frequent the range
> between 28105 and 28295 in 10kc steps. They almost always use AM though I
> have heard a couple of them trying FM and SSB (obviously using Ham
> equipment), though they don't seem to like those modes.
>
> Most of the operations I have heard have been fleet truckers. They usually
> run in pairs on interstates or other major highways, almost always in
sight
> of each other as they commonly point out landmarks and interesting sights
to
> each other and stop for meals together. They also seem to be mostly on
> regular routes, often heard on the same routes week after week. It is
often
> necessary to listen to a pair for quite a while to figure out where they
are
> from road and landmark references, or some occasions they will mention
> warehouses and destination stores and types of cargo they are carrying,
but
> not very often.
>
> Because I am in the north east I mostly hear them from the south east or
> west of the Mississippi. Some common areas I have heard in the past were:
> 1. Stone/gravel/sand delivery dump trucks in the Pensacola Fl area.
> Relatively short hauls over local roads and I-10 in the Fla panhandle and
> into southern Alabama.
> 2. Target Stores fleet drivers in the AZ/NM/CO/UT/NV/s.CA area. Long hauls
> with several stops at stores in various cities. This was one of the few
> where the drivers actually discussed specific warehouses and store
> deliveries.
> 3. Cattle trucks from the Dakotas down to Oklahoma City or Kansas City
area.
> These guys were on for long periods on what sounded like a very regular
> schedule.
> 4. Stone/gravel/sand deliver dump trucks around Rockwall Tx, north east of
> Dallas Tx.
> 5. Furniture manufacturer out of Alabama with trucks heading west through
> TX.

> 6. Random trucks going to/from New Orleans LA, Little Rock Ar, San Antonio
> Tx, Denver Co., Houston Tx, and many other cities.
>
> Some other odd occurances and notes:
> 1. A drunk sounding operator usually using a callsign like 'unit 23' from
> Houston Tx on 28475 AM, usually in late after noon or early evening.
> 2. Extremely wide and distorted audio not quite copyable on AM up to about
> 28800 or so... You can sometimes make out the roger beeps and other birdie
> effects and the repetitious cb lingo. On many occasions I have found this
to
> be caused by one or more stations saying they are from New Orleans La. or
> 'in the Bayou country'. Their actual frequency is normally 27085 or 27025
or
> in that range.
> 3. Wife to driver chats around 28675.
> 4. Many Spanish speaking stations, most probably South American but some
> possibly in the south west states. Some of the obvious stateside drivers I
> have heard seem to switch back and forth between Spanish and English.
> 5. Very rarely have I heard them above 28800.
> 6. They are almost always on 10kc steps on the 5's on AM, probably because
> of the common cb channel assignments and the rig modifications.
> 7. I have heard fishing boats in the Atlantic off the south east coast
> between 28310 and about 28330 on ssb, usually in the evenings.
> 8. There is lots of South American AM operation on 28305 and 28315, though
> they can be heard every 10kc from 28005 up to about 28325 when the band is
> open. I also understand there is a lot on those frequencies from Asia that
> is heard out west.
> 9. A quick way to find truckers is to set up a series of memory channels
on
> the common frequencies and let it scan. Scanning 28085, 28535, 28525,
28095,
> and other 10kc steps from 28105 up to 28295 on AM would probably be the
> easiest way to find activity. Those close to major interstates and cities
> will probably hear lots more than those farther out these days.
>
> (Un)fortunately with the reduction in solar activity over the last year or
> so I haven't heard nearly as much as I have in the past. And being
> relatively far from interstates up here I probably can't hear the low
power
> ones in New England.
> <unquote>
>
> good hunting!

Sounds like Riley is about to kick some a**. Whoo hoo! Burn, baby, burn!
(I-77 thru Columbia
and I-20 seems to be a good place to "fish" as well.)
>
>
>

>

219. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:49:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8ub2d$8ll$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66418

I just don't agree with the madness about scarfing up short or 'good contest' calls. As for you intentions, no problem. Its the rules now and Im just expressing my opinion.

As for the call of ASS and FUK....until recently those calls would NEVER HAVE BEEN ISSUED. It was policy to NOT issue those sort of calls. So until now it wasn't a problem.

I know folks that asked for KKK in the suffix. Kinda assinine in my book. But it wern't mine... hi.

I have had several chances to change to a shorter call. I don't like the 'I' on the end. Its a problem in contesting. The 'I' gets dropped by qsb/qrm too easly on CW. But I don't think Ill change.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message news:b8tl3n$dl0li$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Let me pose this one to ya then Dan, what if you were issued W4ASS or W4FUK
> or many other "offensive" combinations? Would you want to "buy" one then??
> The paying for the call is a fee for the processing of the paperwork as far
> as I understand...
>
> I am contemplating getting the call of an old friend of mine who was like a
> 2nd father to me, who has since passed on. He let his license slip and had
> not pursued it after it after 1992. We had talked and I asked him if I ever
> pursued his call would he have a problem with that, and his response was
> that he would be honored. Now in this case, he was not "blood related" but
> closer as a father than my father was at times growing up. According to
> your statements, this is still a bad thing if I pursue it.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >

> >
> > Mine is also a recycled call. Similar story. Issued to me when I
changed
> > districts, as was REQUIRED back in the 70s.
> >
> > My point is BUYING a call. I think that is not so good. But everyone
has
> > an opinion.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

220. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:50:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8ub5s$1p4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66420

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501202658.18769.00000430@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <b8s280$f54$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >You are a world-class asshole ain't ya Lennie me boy? Ever been in a
> >redneck bar with that attitude?
>
> I've never been in a bar that had redneck radio amateurs.
>
> Is that your favorite hang-out? :-)

Sure is....come on down and I'll introduce ya to the boys and girls.

Dan/W4NTI

221. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:51:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8ub79$6nl$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66421

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030502042519.21229.00000456@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
> >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
> >Date: 5/1/03 4:06 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <b8s280$f54$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >You are a world-class asshole ain't ya Lennie me boy? Ever been in a
> >redneck bar with that attitude?
>
> I'd like to be close by when he goes in, Dan...I love a good
> "multi-trauma" call...!!!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Do you get 'piece work' Steve? grin.

Dan/W4NTI

222. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:56:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2B1E4.2E9BECBB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66422

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB1F07E.D9794B85@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
>
> > > Mr. Smug is the master of not making mistakes. It's what makes him so smug.
> >
> > I've never heard Len referred to as Mr. Smug. Not making mistakes makes
> > him smug?

>
> What are you talking about? I don't recall ever referring to Len as "Mr. Smug."

Why, I'm talking about your response to a post about Len Anderson. What
else could you have meant? Do you ever bother to read and digest the
material to which you respond?

Dave K8MN

223. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 17:59:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8ubl3$i8n$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66423

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0305011837.4d192c2f@posting.google.com...
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030501171409.26399.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> > >Since the lines are not shielded. It seems to me that a large amount
of RF
> > >properly applied could, shall we say, 'disrupt' the link.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > Thats what Im gearing up for right now DAn, I have a couple neighbors I
cant
> > stand
>
> Whoop-de-doo. Don't forget that local LE can put CBers in jail.

Good on them. Whats that got to do with a legal ham station? Nuttin.

Dan/W4NTI

224. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 18:06:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502140621.18767.00000324@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66424

In article <20030501204801.24076.00000515@mb-m27.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>>What should anyone expect from a uninvolved troll whose only interest
>>in life is in attempting to relieve his terminal boredom by trying (most
>>unsuccessfully)
>>to trash a hobby he has long held in envy but could never join?
>
>What reason could someone never join?
>The Technician class license is so easy even children can pass it in one day.
>
>What could be any possible reason for envy of a hobby?

Vipul, to see where Carroll is coming from you need to experience his "arguments" in this forum going back at least four years.

Carroll is a another pridefull PCTA who doggedly sticks to the Established Order and feels qualified to flatly state his opinions as being the Only Truth. [that seems to be endemic with PCTAs]

Carroll has had a number of arguments on various subjects with various participants in here and could not sustain his viewpoints on technical subjects. [those who live in the past can go back to Google and see the play-by-play with Cecil Moore on antenna technicalities or two others on Shannon's Law...or myself on the LAPD supposedly tied into a "nationwide manual telegraphy network" claim]

Carroll generally lost every argument on technical and historical subjects so he resorted to the personal insult attack. He seems to now be in a perpetual personal attack mode. This time he goes into the My Opinions Are The Only Truth mode...namely anyone who does not agree with him therefore "hates ham radio" and is probably stupid and ignorant as well. :-)

PCTAs are passionate about the Established Order being maintained at all costs. Requiring morse code skill of each and every ham is part of the Established Order. Amateur radio licensees who did not test for morse code are put down as inferior beings unworthy of civility who cannot reason.

The most militant of the PCTAs demanding absolute adherence to the Established Order is the Gang of Four (Heil, Miccolis, Robeson, Roll) in this forum. Roll has been absent lately and Kelly has taken his place. It may be that Carroll is striking for

a place on that Gang now.

The prevailing opinion of those demanding absolute adherence
to Established Order is that anyone showing any disagreement
with Established Order is an automatic "hater of ham radio"
and possibly "envious" of their nobility in a hobby activity. :-)

There is NO debate possible with such passionate EO nobility.

225. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 18:06:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502140621.18767.00000325@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66425

In article <20030501204410.24076.00000514@mb-m27.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>>We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
>>doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments. He
>>prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.
>
>Lenover21 seems to have alot of valid arguments. Just because you disagree
>does not mean the arguments are not valid.

There shall be NO arguments against the Established Order.

Dee represents the Established Order.

All arguments against the Established Order are therefore invalid.

Anything against the Established Order are "totally unrelated tangents."

That pretty well sums up the attitude of the PCTA. :-)

226. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 18:14:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2B574.8CDF2A07@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66426

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB1AEA1.F725E675@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB13376.5F2DA7A8@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And there you have it. This whole thing over Dave's obtuseness.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, this whole thing is over Len's several errors about a non-existent
> > > > > place, a supply depot and moving boxes. He managed to get quite a bit
> > > > > wrong in only a couple of sentences.
> > > >
> > > > Another example of Dave's obtuseness.
> > >
> > > Mistakes on Len's part and silliness on your part do not translate to my
> > > being obtuse.
> >
> > Correct. Mistakes and silliness on anyone's part do not translate to
> > your being obtuse.

There you have it.

> > > But in all your time in the Air Force you never moved a box.
> > >
> > > I don't recall ever moving a box as part of my duties.
> >
> > Wow.
> >
> > > > I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
> > > > > father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.
> > > >
> > > > Algore was a grunt in Vietnam.
> > >
> > > So? My sister lives in L.A. Do you know her?
> >
> > Maybe. What is her name?

Mrs. Carney.

> > > But you didn't see him because you
> > > were in the Air Force.
> >
> > Really? I thought I didn't see him because I had no idea who he was.
> > To this day, I have no idea where he spent his time. I have some
> > friends in Columbus. Do you know them? Have you ever seen them?
>
> Maybe. What are their names?

Mr. and Mrs. Bonnie.

> > > But you say that you saw plenty of grunts.
> >
> > I DID say that, didn't I?
>
> Are you sure?

Yes, I'm sure I said that.

> > > And you say that you saw Algore's father. If Algore's father wasn't
> > > in the Air Force, was he one of the grunts you saw?
> >
> > No, he was busy being a senator from Tennessee. I saw him in West Palm
> > Beach.
>
> I thought the context was your time in Vietnam.

Obviously you were incorrect.

> Please try to stay on
> topic.

Al Gore wasn't on topic. Please attempt to play by the rules you'd like
to establish.

> > > > I didn't operate RTTY equipment. Keep guessing.
> > >
> > > OK. You didn't operate RTTY equipment, and you (say you) didn't
> > > operate amateur radio equipment either. Why were you there again?
> >
> > I was on a year's holiday, all expenses paid. They even provided my
> > clothing and meals.
>
> Kind of like John Candy joining the Army because it was cheaper than a
> trip to the fat farm. Except he couldn't operate ham radio.

Not really like that at all. I weighed about 170 lbs. I didn't run
into John Candy in Viet Nam either.

> > > I found that the
> > > > weather men could sometimes predict the weather.
> > >
> > > When they were on duty. They're only on duty sometimes. They do get

> > > time off to go hang out in snack bar like the other personnel.
> >
> > During the times they were on duty, they could sometimes predict the
> > weather. During the monsoon season their predictions were much more
> > accurate.
>
> They kept verification statistics, you know. Just like they do at
> every other Air Force weather station. How did they compare with the
> local TV and radio stations forecasts?

I very seldom watched Vietnamese TV and certainly didn't watch it for
the weather.

> > > > > It would appear that you had very limited experiences while serving.
> > > > >
> > > > Keep guessing.
> > >
> > > You had no experiences?
> >
> > I haven't related my experiences to you.
>
> So you do have experiences.

Everybody has experiences, Brian.

> > > > > You were ordered not to operate amateur radio; you never touched a box
> > > > > or did anything outside your AFSC. Must be the difference between the
> > > > > conscription era and the all volunteer force.
> > > > >
> > > > The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.
> > >
> > > Sure. People were trying to get into the Air Force to avoid
> > > conscription.
> >
> > I don't have a problem with anyone who did so. Those who entered under
> > those circumstances traded two years of their lives for four years of
> > their lives. Are you trying to make an issue of it?
>
> The conscription era was a different era than the all volunteer force.
> Are you trying to say it wasn't?

I already wrote what I was trying to say.

> > > > > > > Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> > > > > > > throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
> > > > > > > word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
> > > > > > > behavior.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
> > > > > > you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
> > > > > > enough for him.
> > > > > >

> > > > > We were discussing you, not Len. Fact stands. Now go put some salve
> > > > > on that scrape.
> > > > >
> > > > It'd have to first be a fact in order to stand. It isn't and it
> > > > doesn't.
> > > >
> > > Fact stands.
> > >
> > Oh fact stands all right. You just didn't have one.
>
> Fact stands.

Yes, fact stands. Let me know when you come up with one.

> > > That was the context. What did you think we were discussing when you
> > > brought up the snack bar?
> > >
> > I wasn't discussing where I was stationed. I wasn't discussing what I
> > did in Viet Nam. What I did was address one of Len's typical (as
> > outlined in N2EY's accurate profile) attempts at a slam.
>
> Wow. Couldn't you just have ignored it?

I could have but I chose not to.

> > > > > Maybe you just spent a lot of time at the snack bar.
> > > > >
> > > > You're reduced to guessing.
> > > >
> > > Just another sign of your obtuseness.
> > >
> > Your guessing is my "obtuseness"?
>
> You go on endlessly, but you really have nothing to say. Nothing of
> substance anyway. You throw in talk of moving boxes, and places such
> as snackbars, and we are left guessing to what you might possibly be
> talking about.

Try to keep up. Len wrote of moving boxes and supply depots. It
wouldn't matter much what was written by whom. You'd still be left
guessing.

> > > > > > > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Your words. His action.
> > > > > >
> > > > > And so it is written.
> > > > >
> > > > Actually, so you wrote and wrote and wrote silly comments much like
> > > > you're doing in the game you're attempting to play with me.
> > > >
> > > David, you're the one who cannot bring himself to say what he means.

> >
> > I've said quite precisely what I mean. What I haven't done is write
> > what you'd like me to write. That scenario isn't likely to take place.
>
> You precisely choose to be obtuse.

I choose to say what I want to convey. I'd imagine any number of things
seem obtuse to a guy with a reading comprehension problem.

> > > > Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
> > > > tantrum, the floor or the staring?
> > >
> > > Your spoiled, child-like behavior, David.
> >
> > I ask a valid question and I get another unrelated partial sentence as a
> > response.
>
> It's just a meager attempt at obtuseness. How am I doing?

It is a role you were born to play.

Dave K8MN

227. Re: How to change adress with FCC?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 18:27:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.he81dzg.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66427

On 01 May 2003 20:53:05 GMT, MarkWGPSU wrote:

>
>How do I change the address of my ameteur station?

If you still receive mail at your current address you do not
have to do anything.
>
> I know there is a form but I don't know how to get it.

It's easiest to do on line. Go to <www.fcc.gov/wtb/uls> and
follow the instructions. You want to make an Administrative
Update.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

228. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 20:57:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2DBD4.5080001@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66428

Dave Heil wrote:
> a PROFESSIONAL. :-) :-)

A professional what?

- Mike KB3EIA -

229. I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 21:06:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66429

Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We only got a few comments on Ryans thread.

How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:

I don't do public service because:

230. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 21:28:32 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86k7d96nsv.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 66430

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

Mike> I don't do public service because:

* I don't have a good location.
I have yet to get my HF rig to work at home due to interference and
being stuck in a narrow valley between two high ridges. My wife
chose the apartment before we got married and she's not a ham.

* I don't have good equipment.
My VHF stuff is limited to running xastir on a 5W HT. A bit more
money and time, and I'll have a good APRS station that can run off
battery for 48hrs, but that's not now.

* I don't have any training.
I haven't yet spent the time or the money to take the ARRL courses
or to work with local volunteers on ARES and RACES operations.

Luckily for me, all three of those problems can be solved over the
course of a year or two, given enough stability in the rest of my
life. Maybe I'll have a different answer next year.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+suMyGPFSfAB/ezgRAonHAJwNOyYQXv8fJieDj2tpwRxPQxP//QCgt7JM
dCJ21AYPi8ad2HhwaolVWb0=
=wFdZ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

231. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 21:51:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305022151260.607@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66431

If you want a real answer, don't post the question on "rec.radio.amateur.SPAM"!
:-)

On Fri, 2 May 2003, Mike Coslo wrote:
> Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>
> How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
> I don't do public service because:

232. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:27:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502182727.18771.00000301@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66438

In article <b8uaebgpt1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>SSTV is not the antique technology of pre vidiocon flying spot scanners.

"Vidicon."

I wasn't talking about "flying spot scanners." "Flying spot"
imaging was used by WREX-TV in 1956 in their film and
slide chain. Kinescope to generate the "spot," photomultiplier
to pick up the "spot" after it passed through film. Made by
DuMont.

You can check out a number of sources on all NASA space
missions...at NASA's own website or in many different
publications available in libraries or at low cost from the US
Government Printing Office. Lots of electronic industry links
on the history, techniques, details of all NASA cameras and
photoimaging. Not a single one of them was designed by
amateur radio activity as you claim.

Over a year ago a prominent off-shore designer and maker
of amateur radio equipment debuted a portable camera and
color display that was designed to work with their existing
line of VHF-UHF handheld FM transceivers. It could
transmit images in a slow-scan rate using digital protocol
very similar to what is done on computers today handling
JPG format images. Bandwidth was only 3 KHz, same as
normal voice requirements. Did not seem to enthuse US
radio amateurs at all since sales were considered dismal.

For several years (at least 5) there have been small cameras
available as peripheral items for personal computers and that
market has expanded into security monitors, some available
for wireless linking. I've seen nothing in amateur publications
on using such now low-cost cameras with adapters to
couple to amateur radios. You are free to expand on that to
show they ARE being used.

>Amateur REPEATERS, not handi talkies, is what I was refering to. It showed
>that linking could indeed work.

The US Army Signal Corps did that in Europe in WW2 using
AN/TRC-1, -3, -4 radio relay equipment. From the Italian
Campaign on past the Battle of the Bulge. Unattended
repeatering of 12 KHz bandwidth FM on VHF.

In the late 1940s through 1950s, US military VHF portables
(AN/PRC-6, AN/PRC-8, -9, -10) were specifically designed
to operate (using a supplied adapter) in the field as unattended
repeaters. That is described, illustrated in their TMs.

>As for QST....There hasn't been anything technical there in 20 plus years.
>That I agree with you on.

I beg to differ with you. The recycling of used tuna cans into
high-tech two-transistor transmitters represents an
advancement in the ham state of the art...as most hams
know it.

>Tell you what Len....give me a chance to get a copy of that 'fact' program
>you have and we can copy and past into the gigibit range.

Do your OWN homework, grasshopper. There are many, many,
many sources of information. You are free to call ALL those
non-amateur-radio-oriented sources by any names you want.
That doesn't change history at all.

Stick with APRS in recent times and radio communication with
Antarctic polar expeditions before WW2, running phone patches
for "our boys overseas" before the first Gulf War. Beyond that
few will believe you.

233. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:27:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502182729.18771.00000302@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66440

In article <20030502043910.21229.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com writes:

>>Subject: Re: Dayton Hamfest?
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/1/03 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030501202658.18769.00000429@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>>>Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of
>>>repeaters.
>>
>> BZZZT! Wrong answer, Dan. Sorry.
>
>> Cellular telephones can be traced back to the first "handie-talkies"
>> designed by Motorola back in WW2
>
> The first "handie talkies" were pioneered by Amateurs BEFORE the war,
>Lennie.

No. The radio-electronic industry history credits Motorola with that,
including the name "handie-talkie." "Walkie-talkie" was applied by
Motorola to their SCR-300 backpack portable VHF radio but Motorola
failed to secure a trademark due to all the exposure in the news
media using "handie-talkie" and "walkie-talkie" in print for those
radios.

The military handie-talkie of WW2 was designed specifically to
augment and replace the pre-WW2 multiple-halversack-sized
US Army man-portable radio. The hand-held walkie-talkie could
survive the harsh environment of the battlefield with solid
communications over short ranges (under 5 miles).

Motorola's SCR-300 walkie-talkie, designed by Dan Noble, was
a technology plateau-jump in state of the art, operating at VHF
using FM and having manual tuning for both receiver and trans-
mitter (integrated for the same air frequency) and with capability
of checking/marking/adjusting tuning from a built-in quartz
crystal calibrator. Noble had previously been instrumental in
designing the first of the mobile FM radios for public safety
services and is recognized as a pioneer in that by the IEEE
Historical Society. Following the successful operation in the
field during WW2, the basic SCR-300 design was copied
almost outright by several international militaries, including
the United Kingdom, West Germany, and Norway.

>>ATT may have had the very first pocket-size paging receiver...(SNIP)
>

> Pagers are related to cellphones?

Yes. The first paging systems were operated by the Bell System
in the United States. Bell Labs may have been the first to design
a pocket-size paging receiver; it was certainly the first to widely
publicize its technical description in detail [Bell System
Technical Journal in the early 1960s, BSTJ is a monthly
periodical].

The first paging receiver use was to alert users to access a wired
telephone. Later, after radio service creation and expansion by the
FCC, private paging services grew and prospered in urban areas
of the USA. The main use of pagers today is to alert users to
access a telephone number; the only difference is that now the
number to call may be sent over the pager as well as short
messages.

>> Today's "cell phone" owes its existance to several areas of
>> technology: Development of efficient solid-state RF amplifiers
>> centered on 1 GHZ; Very Large Scale Integrated Circuits of low
>> power demand to handle all the digital functions and control
>> needed in a single small IC package; efficient batteries and
>> charging system to enable long use.
>
> Todays "cellphone" has been the catalyst for the advancement of those
>technologies.

Incorrect. The only "catalyst" was overall industry MARKET
DEMAND for higher transistor transition frequency, VLSI, and
battery technology. That applied to ALL areas of electronics.

The small, lightweight cellular telephone handset of today would
not exist without market satisfaction of earlier portable telephones
which were much larger and bulkier.

> And cellphones owe their existence to AT&T and other industries looking
to
>expand the coverage and reliabiltiy of the mobile telephone. More telephone
>users meant more profits, and no one was going to pay the kind of money that
>the old services could command for very limited coverage areas and
>intermittent service.

Despite industry and Census figures indicating one in three citizens
having cellular telephone subscription in the USA, a higher
percentage of citizens have wired telephone subscriptions. The USA
has ranked high internationally on per capita use of telephones since
before WW2 days.

The "cell" structure of many low-power cell sites is a concept that is
actually international. Foreign countries have taken to that concept
as readily as the USA. We differ from "them" only in the electronic
format of voice-data communication. Nokia of Finland is a leading
designer and maker of cellular telephones, cell site equipment.

The USA has permitted private corporations to operate the civilian
telephone system. Private corporations exist to make a profit on
services rendered. Profit making by businesses is not some
implied evil...except to socialists who want everything free to
them because they cannot make much profit on their own.

>> The very first ever television was already "slow-scan." Those were
>> mechanical and their ultimate mechanical form was done by
>> Scotsman John Logie Baird in the UK...(SNIP)
>
> Isn't it a shame that you can "recall" all this trivia, yet you can't get
>the "respect" you expect because you have a sewer for a mouth and acid for
>personality, Lennie?

The written history of the radio-electronics industry is available to
any who wish to access it. There are lots of sources. None of the
sources are located in any "sewer."

As to the charge of "acid," that is subjective, used by those with
limited knowledge of the overall history of radio and electronics.
Or, it may be charged by Believers in the Existing Order where
their entire radio history input is from a single source that spoon-
feeds them knowledge on what the source thinks they should
know.

>> Automatic Link Establishment such as on SHARES network...
>> oops, sorry, that is government communications on HF, very
>> little done in amateur radio
>
> Since WHEN did you let something like "not Amatuer Radio" deter you from
>incorporating it into a rant, Lennie?

Irrelevant. The history and organization and experience of the
US government SHARES is public knowledge. So is the Federal
Standard on Automatic Link Establishment. ALE permits real-
time adjustment of link frequencies and data transmission rates
plus error detection and correction of data. ALE was originated
for HF radio use.

The only amateur (not "amatuer") radio activity concerning ALE
use seems to be located on the website "Tactical Systems"
originated and maintained by a female radio amateur in mid-
California. There may be other such websites.

234. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:27:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502182730.18771.00000303@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66439

In article <b8tl3u$dl0li$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305012316270.361@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>> On Thu, 1 May 2003, Vshah101 wrote:
>> > I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you to
>> > memorized the questions and answers, not the material.
>> >
>> > The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician
>license.
>>
>> It's not. The extra test has 50 questions while the others have only 35.
>
>Wow.... they should up the number to at least 100 questions per testing
>level..... Every test I have taken in the fire service has had at least a
>minimum of 100 questions. The final exam for the firefighter 1 and 2
>certification in Michigan has 200 questions and that is based on a pool of
>1,500 questions..... (try memorizing that many!!!!!)

Present-day FCC regulations on written testing requirements
specify a MINIMUM of 10 questions in any question pool for
all written test elements. [ref: 97.523 since at least 1995]

The FCC does not originate the question pool, representatives
of Volunteer Examiner organizations do that. The VEC Question
Pool Committee originate all questions and answers. The FCC
merely approves or disproves VEC QPC pools. All question
pools are public knowledge when approved for use by the FCC.

There is NO maximum number of pool questions. 97.523
clearly states all written test elements shall have "at least 10
times the number of required [by the FCC regulations]."

The VEC QPC could originate 11, 12, 15, 20 or any number
greater number of required questions within the law now or
8 years ago.

With today's easy electronic transfer of data and personal
computers capable of storing vast quantities of data and then
randomly selecting the required number of test questions,
there is no problem to having a very large question pool.

There would be some extra work required by the VEC QPC
on pools larger than the 10-times number now done. That will
not impact either examinees nor the VEs administering the

written tests; the number of required written test questions remains the same, examinees would answer the same number of questions and VEs would score the same number of questions.

Doubling or tripling the question pool quantity does two things: A larger pool quantity makes it more difficult to memorize and allegedly "cheat"; a larger quantity for random selection of the same required question quantity increases probability of uniqueness in each written test, again lessening alleged charges of "cheating by copying another's test."

No changes in US amateur radio regulations are required to increase the quantity of question pool questions. There is little impact on any additional work by the FCC; new question pools are generated approximately once every two years. There is additional work imposed on the VEC QPC.

235. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:46:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305021446.1c3c37af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66441

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB2B574.8CDF2A07@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB1AEA1.F725E675@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB13376.5F2DA7A8@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB069D8.A07C1E09@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > And there you have it. This whole thing over Dave's obtuseness.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No, this whole thing is over Len's several errors about a non-existent
> > > > > > place, a supply depot and moving boxes. He managed to get quite a bit
> > > > > > wrong in only a couple of sentences.
> > > > >
> > > > > Another example of Dave's obtuseness.
> > > >
> > > > Mistakes on Len's part and silliness on your part do not translate to my
> > > > being obtuse.
> > >
> > > Correct. Mistakes and silliness on anyone's part do not translate to
> > > your being obtuse.

You are a self-made obtuse man.

> There you have it.

You are a self-made obtuse man.

> > > > But in all your time in the Air Force you never moved a box.
> > > >
> > > I don't recall ever moving a box as part of my duties.
> > >
> > Wow.
> >
> > > > > I did not, however, see Al Gore. I met his
> > > > > > father once though. He wasn't in the Air Force either.
> > > > >
```

> > > > Algore was a grunt in Vietnam.
> > >
> > > So? My sister lives in L.A. Do you know her?
> >
> > Maybe. What is her name?
>
> Mrs. Carney.

Doesn't ring a bell. Does she work in a snack bar?

> > > > But you didn't see him because you
> > > > were in the Air Force.
> > >
> > > Really? I thought I didn't see him because I had no idea who he was.
> > > To this day, I have no idea where he spent his time. I have some
> > > friends in Columbus. Do you know them? Have you ever seen them?
> >
> > Maybe. What are their names?
>
> Mr. and Mrs. Bonnie.

I'm certain I don't know them.

> > > > But you say that you saw plenty of grunts.
> > >
> > > I DID say that, didn't I?
> >
> > Are you sure?
>
> Yes, I'm sure I said that.
>
> > > > And you say that you saw Algore's father. If Algore's father wasn't
> > > > in the Air Force, was he one of the grunts you saw?
> > >
> > > No, he was busy being a senator from Tennessee. I saw him in West Palm
> > > Beach.
> >
> > I thought the context was your time in Vietnam.
>
> Obviously you were incorrect.

You worked in a cafeteria in West Palm Beach?

> > Please try to stay on
> > topic.
>
> Al Gore wasn't on topic. Please attempt to play by the rules you'd like
> to establish.

Oops. Sorry.

> > > > > I didn't operate RTTY equipment. Keep guessing.
> > > >

> > > > OK. You didn't operate RTTY equipment, and you (say you) didn't
> > > > operate amateur radio equipment either. Why were you there again?
> > > >
> > > I was on a year's holiday, all expenses paid. They even provided my
> > > clothing and meals.
> > >
> > Kind of like John Candy joining the Army because it was cheaper than a
> > trip to the fat farm. Except he couldn't operate ham radio.
> >
> Not really like that at all. I weighed about 170 lbs. I didn't run
> into John Candy in Viet Nam either.

But it was like a holiday?

> > > > I found that the
> > > > > weather men could sometimes predict the weather.
> > > > >
> > > > When they were on duty. They're only on duty sometimes. They do get
> > > > time off to go hang out in snack bar like the other personnel.
> > > >
> > > During the times they were on duty, they could sometimes predict the
> > > weather. During the monsoon season their predictions were much more
> > > accurate.
> > >
> > They kept verification statistics, you know. Just like they do at
> > every other Air Force weather station. How did they compare with the
> > local TV and radio stations forecasts?
> >
> I very seldom watched Vietnamese TV and certainly didn't watch it for
> the weather.

That's too bad. They might have provided a better forecast then the
Air Force weathermen you complain about.

> > > > > > It would appear that you had very limited experiences while serving.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Keep guessing.
> > > > >
> > > > You had no experiences?
> > > >
> > > I haven't related my experiences to you.
> > >
> > So you do have experiences.
> >
> Everybody has experiences, Brian.
> >
> > > > > > You were ordered not to operate amateur radio; you never touched a box
> > > > > > or did anything outside your AFSC. Must be the difference between the
> > > > > > conscription era and the all volunteer force.
> > > > > >
> > > > > The Air Force didn't draft anyone. Keep guessing.

> > > >
> > > > Sure. People were trying to get into the Air Force to avoid
> > > > conscription.
> > > >
> > > I don't have a problem with anyone who did so. Those who entered under
> > > those circumstances traded two years of their lives for four years of
> > > their lives. Are you trying to make an issue of it?
> > >
> > The conscription era was a different era than the all volunteer force.
> > Are you trying to say it wasn't?
> >
> I already wrote what I was trying to say.

Just be sure you don't make an issue of it.

> > > > > > > > Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
> > > > > > > > throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
> > > > > > > > word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
> > > > > > > > behavior.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That one seems to be a non-fact. Did you assume that I was going to let
> > > > > > > > you slide on it? If Len uses his standards on me, they should be good
> > > > > > > > enough for him.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > We were discussing you, not Len. Fact stands. Now go put some salve
> > > > > > > > on that scrape.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It'd have to first be a fact in order to stand. It isn't and it
> > > > > > > doesn't.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Fact stands.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Oh fact stands all right. You just didn't have one.
> > > > >
> > > > Fact stands.
> > > >
> > > Yes, fact stands. Let me know when you come up with one.
> > >
> > > > > That was the context. What did you think we were discussing when you
> > > > > brought up the snack bar?
> > > > >
> > > > I wasn't discussing where I was stationed. I wasn't discussing what I
> > > > did in Viet Nam. What I did was address one of Len's typical (as
> > > > outlined in N2EY's accurate profile) attempts at a slam.
> > > >
> > > Wow. Couldn't you just have ignored it?
> > >
> > I could have but I chose not to.

You Go, Boy.

> > > > > > Maybe you just spent a lot of time at the snack bar.
> > > > >
> > > > > You're reduced to guessing.
> > > > >
> > > > Just another sign of your obtuseness.
> > >
> > > Your guessing is my "obtuseness"?
> >
> > You go on endlessly, but you really have nothing to say. Nothing of
> > substance anyway. You throw in talk of moving boxes, and places such
> > as snackbars, and we are left guessing to what you might possibly be
> > talking about.
>
> Try to keep up. Len wrote of moving boxes and supply depots. It
> wouldn't matter much what was written by whom. You'd still be left
> guessing.

Its a lot like playing charades through text, where what is meant and
what is typed are not the same thing. It requires a certain amount of
guessing.

> > > > > > > > > I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Your words. His action.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > And so it is written.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Actually, so you wrote and wrote and wrote silly comments much like
> > > > > you're doing in the game you're attempting to play with me.
> > > > >
> > > > David, you're the one who cannot bring himself to say what he means.
> > >
> > > I've said quite precisely what I mean. What I haven't done is write
> > > what you'd like me to write. That scenario isn't likely to take place.
> >
> > You precisely choose to be obtuse.
>
> I choose to say what I want to convey. I'd imagine any number of things
> seem obtuse to a guy with a reading comprehension problem.

David, the "things" aren't obtuse. Their meaning is merely obscured
by your obtuseness.

> > > > > Which portion does your partial sentence comment address, Brian--the
> > > > > tantrum, the floor or the staring?
> > > >
> > > > Your spoiled, child-like behavior, David.
> > >
> > > I ask a valid question and I get another unrelated partial sentence as a
> > > response.
> >
> > It's just a meager attempt at obtuseness. How am I doing?

>
> It is a role you were born to play.

Nope. But I like to work outside my "role" once in a while.

236. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:48:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305021448.d155320@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66442

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b8soq1cdg0@208.207.71.129>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030501121006.27207.00000575@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 5/1/03 5:54 AM Central Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0305010254.2d9fdc1a@posting.google.com>
> > > >
> > > >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:<b8q1e8obl0@208.207.71.136>...
> > > >> Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >>
> > > >> >
> > > >> > Grow up, Brian.
> > > >>
> > > >> Never gonna happen.
> > > >
> > > >Hit and Run DICK still can't bring a full thought together.
>
> So far Slim hasn't done anything here that *requires* more than a small piece of a
> thought to handle easily.

Then my comments are made to order for your thinking capacity.

237. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:49:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8uslk$sf4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66443

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:TGCsa.2709$3f7.2192137@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030501204410.24076.00000514@mb-m27.aol.com...
> > From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >
> > >We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
> > >doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments.
> He
> > >prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.
> >
> > Lenover21 seems to have alot of valid arguments. Just because you
disagree
> does
> > not mean the arguments are not valid.
>
> He discards all analogies and other illustrations from related fields. He
> only allows himself to use analogies. He quotes non-existent documents
> and/or misquotes them (one can easily check many of his so-called
sources).
>
> He then proceeds to develop his argument into a chain that ends up on a
> totally different aspect than the initial discussion and claims that
> unrelated topic that he finally gets to proves or disproves the initial
> premise when it is not even related.
>
> I was a member of our high school's debate team and had formal training in
> debate techniques. Len Over 21 has yet to develop a logical, coherent
> dissertation that supports whatever point he is attempting to make. In
> general it is impossible to even figure out what he is trying to prove.
>
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

Don't worry about the facts...just baffle them with the bull....right?

Dan/W4NTI

238. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:51:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305021451.1e7440ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66444

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB2B1E4.2E9BECBB@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB1F07E.D9794B85@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
>
> > > > Mr. Smug is the master of not making mistakes. It's what makes him so smug.
> > >
> > > I've never heard Len referred to as Mr. Smug. Not making mistakes makes
> > > him smug?
>
> >
> > What are you talking about? I don't recall ever referring to Len as "Mr. Smug."
>
> Why, I'm talking about your response to a post about Len Anderson. What
> else could you have meant? Do you ever bother to read and digest the
> material to which you respond?

David, I meant precisely what I typed. Why do you force yourself into
confusion over it?

239. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:52:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8usqu$f0v$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66445

The reason I haven't chimmed in...is that I get tired of the smart assed replies from 'certain folks over 21'.

But....I have been involved with most phases of Emergency Comm since Ive been a ham. Over 40 years. Even while overseas in the Military I was involved in MARS when possible.

Stateside I check into the local traffic nets nightly. I operate the Vhf nets in wx watches as needed and just normal checking in. I am net control on the Alabama Section Net one night a week, and I am in Air Force MARS and am active in their emergency comm drills.

Dan/W4NTI

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net...
> Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>
>
> How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
>
> I don't do public service because:
>

240. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:53:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305021453.69775359@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66446

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030502085506.18135.00000533@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >but you need to keep it in mind.
> >
>
> I dont need your advice on anything

Just trying to keep you out of jail.

241. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:54:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <TGCsa.2709$3f7.2192137@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66432

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501204410.24076.00000514@mb-m27.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
> >doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments.
He
> >prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.
>
> Lenover21 seems to have alot of valid arguments. Just because you disagree
does
> not mean the arguments are not valid.

He discards all analogies and other illustrations from related fields. He only allows himself to use analogies. He quotes non-existent documents and/or misquotes them (one can easily check many of his so-called sources).

He then proceeds to develop his argument into a chain that ends up on a totally different aspect than the initial discussion and claims that unrelated topic that he finally gets to proves or disproves the initial premise when it is not even related.

I was a member of our high school's debate team and had formal training in debate techniques. Len Over 21 has yet to develop a logical, coherent dissertation that supports whatever point he is attempting to make. In general it is impossible to even figure out what he is trying to prove.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

242. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:55:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305021455.779bb65a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66447

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b8ubl3$i8n$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0305011837.4d192c2f@posting.google.com...
> > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
> news:<20030501171409.26399.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> > > >Since the lines are not shielded. It seems to me that a large amount
> of RF
> > > >properly applied could, shall we say, 'disrupt' the link.
> > > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > >
> > > Thats what Im gearing up for right now DAn, I have a couple neighbors I
> cant
> > > stand
> >
> > Whoop-de-doo. Don't forget that local LE can put CBers in jail.
>
> Good on them. Whats that got to do with a legal ham station? Nuttin.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Bruce talks like a CBer. It was only natural for me tho think he's a CBer.

243. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:57:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <HJCsa.2715$3f7.2193418@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66433

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501205255.24076.00000516@mb-m27.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint"
>
> >You don't need to memorize word for word
> >just enough key words that you have the answers paired correctly with the
> >questions
>
> Exactly. Thats the way to pass the test. Also, alot of the questions are
> similar, just rephrased, which makes it even easier.

Some questions are similar but a lot are not. Every band limit question and every antenna question (as examples) must have each one individually memorized as the "wrong" answers look too much like the right answers. Even allowing for the fact that some questions are indeed quite similar, 384 is still too many to do in one day without prior preparation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

244. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 22:58:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <TKCsa.2718$3f7.2192696@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66434

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501211259.24076.00000518@mb-m27.aol.com...
> From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" kc8pmx@diamondcs.net
>
> >5 wpm is not a hard thing to achieve.
> Yes, but it does take months of effort. Learning this realtime encoding
skill
> doesn't get me much. For me, the benefit is small compare to the effort.

It takes the average person 30 hours of practice and study if the practice
and study is done correctly. You could do this in 30 days.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

245. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:02:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305021502.3c008fde@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66448

Hello? Hello? Dan, are you still there?

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0305011412.53df3c56@posting.google.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b8ribg$m34$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b8r2lv$cg4h3$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > > > With the exception of antennas and propagation conditions, Hams are
> usually not
> > > > technical. However, in this technical area, Hams are often very skilled.
> > >
> > > Hams are very technical in a variety of areas actually.... its the
> > > mechanical side that a percentage probably lacks. Sure ya can build a
> > > transciever but can't change the oil in the car or replace something
> simple
> > > like an alternator.....
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF/MFR
> > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Actually from the non-ham Len over 21his lack of knowledge of Amateur Radios
> > history is not surprising. Hams have contributed quite a lot into the
> > technology we see today.
>
> OK, Dan, go for it. Name the Ham behind each of the technologies
> below. Also state their occupation at the time of their
> contributions.
>
> > Cellphones is a good example. It began with Amateur radio linking of
> > repeaters.
>
>
>
>
> (This space intentionally left blank so that Dan can answer)
>

> > Slow Scan TV....utilized on several of the early moon shots and on the deep
> > space probes, such as voyager. Invented and perfected by ham radio.
>
>
>
>
> (This space intentionally left blank so that Dan can answer)
>
> > And amongst many others the Internet you are reading this over comes from
> > ham radio and PACKET radio linking.
>
>
>
>
> (This space intentionally left blank so that Dan can answer)
>
> > Now-a-days we have much experimenting going on in the digital field within
> > Amateur Radio.
> >
> > Check out AMSAT for some cutting edge stuff.
> >
> > Sorry Len.... your full of crap as usual.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI

246. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:03:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nPCsa.2727$3f7.2194912@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66435

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030501230704.24076.00000523@mb-m27.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >Here Vshah goes off into his personally created, artificial distinction
> >between hams and amateurs. He fails to realize that those who do belong
to
> >ARRL are probably split in the same percentages in their interests as
those
> >who are not members.
>
> Yes, they are split in the same percentages, whether or no they belong to
the
> ARRL. That still does not change the difference between Hams and amateurs.
I
> did not say Hams did not belong to the ARRL.
>
> It is not artificial distinction. The poll results show which areas Hams
are
> most interested in. More Hams are interested in Antennas and CW than
> troubleshooting, electronics theory.

Who determines the status of the people answering the polls. Hams and
amateurs ARE THE SAME THING. You and only you make any distinction.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

247. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:05:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305021505.1b074fbf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66449

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305020441.69ddbcc1@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0305011841.12d5439e@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305011155.639fb7fc@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> > > > What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since you
> > > > have had your license?
> > > > Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....
> > >
> > > I have more "bests" than I can count, great hobby. But I have one
> > > "worst" which still haunts me today. Early May 1956, the Hungarians
> > > had revolted against their Soviet occupiers a few days earlier, the
> > > Hungarian hams were all over the bands pleading for help from the
> > > west.
> >
> > We encouraged them to revolt. We would help. Then we didn't.
> >
> > Which never came as the Soviets crushed the Hungarians with
> > > tanks and the HAs disappeared from the bands overnight. Some made it
> > > over the fence, many did not and were never heard again.
> > >
> > > All I could do was sit in the shack and stare at my HQ-129. It was a
> > > long, long time before any hams in the west worked any Soviet hams
> > > again.
> >
> > Steve doesn't want the liberators of Iraq to get on the air.
>
> Work harder at being relevant willya?

Go burst your "stones."

248. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:07:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66436

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB1EE4E.47B7E430@earthlink.net...
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" kc8pmx@diamondcs.net
> >
> > >5 wpm is not a hard thing to achieve.
> > Yes, but it does take months of effort. Learning this realtime encoding
skill
> > doesn't get me much. For me, the benefit is small compare to the effort.
>
>
> Months of effort? For five words per minute? Aren't you the guy who
> claims that the written exams are so easy that anyone can memorize
> everything in a day? For a sharp kid like you, learning morse shouldn't
> take over a week or two.
>
> Dave K8MN

According to the book, "Morse Code, The Essential Language" one can achieve 5wpm in 30 hours of study if an effective study method is chosen. Of course some people learn much quicker. My older daughter learned it in a week spending not more than an hour or so per day. It took me longer but so what.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

249. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:14:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2FBEE.5000205@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66450

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> The reason I haven't chimmed in...is that I get tired of the smart assed
> replies from 'certain folks over 21'.

That is a bit of a nuisance for sure. I like to put some relevant stuff in here from time to time - call it spring cleaning. When all the posts become p*****g contests between ol' he who I won't name, and others, it is pretty dreary.

> But....I have been involved with most phases of Emergency Comm since Ive
> been a ham. Over 40 years. Even while overseas in the Military I was
> involved in MARS when possible.
>
> Stateside I check into the local traffic nets nightly. I operate the Vhf
> nets in wx watches as needed and just normal checking in. I am net control
> on the Alabama Section Net one night a week, and I am in Air Force MARS and
> am active in their emergency comm drills.

Great! Good to see more people in here who take civic responsibility.

- Mike KB3EIA -

250. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:15:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2FC1E.5000808@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66351

D. Stussy wrote:
> If you want a real answer, don't post the question on "rec.radio.amateur.SPAM"!
> :-)
>
> On Fri, 2 May 2003, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
>>only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>>
>>How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>>
>>I don't do public service because:
>

Does seem that way these days! 8^(

- Mike KB3EIA -

251. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:17:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB2FCB6.4020109@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66352

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> I was a member of our high school's debate team and had formal training in
> debate techniques. L** **** *1 has yet to develop a logical, coherent
> dissertation that supports whatever point he is attempting to make. In
> general it is impossible to even figure out what he is trying to prove.

He isn't trying to prove anything. He is trolling, and this is a very
well stocked pond.

- Mike KB3EIA -

252. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-02 23:20:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <G2Dsa.2735$3f7.2199822@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66437

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns936F89FF4DDA3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:b8u5jm$6jh$0@208.206.142.101:
>
> > Some of you guys are clueless beyond belief. ITU regs spell out
> > callsign
> > allocations to the various countries with prefixes beginning AAA
> > through ZZZ When the country needs, the prefix is followed by a
> > numeric, then, also if needed, suffix of AAA through ZZZ. Been that way
> > for decades.
> > The FCC could legally assign AAA1ZZZ as an amateur callsign if they
> > wanted/needed to.
> >
> >
>
> Good point. Three letter prefixes are the only way they could issue more
> calls without going astray of the ITU.

Actually there are three letter prefixes in use. They just don't happen to
be assigned to the amateur radio service. I was a MARS operator for a short
while. That's one of the services that gets assigned a three letter prefix.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

253. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 00:26:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502202644.18759.00000554@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66353

In article <BAD66D2D.18047%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>> No way. The ARRL helps and represent all licensed
>> radio amateurs, whether or not they become a member.

That's true if and only if an ARRL action helps amateur radio in general.

> Even as an ARRL member, I'm not totally convinced of that. I'm not even
>convinced ARRL always fully represents their own members.

All depends on the issue. Take the issue of keeping your callsign when moving
between districts. For hams who move a lot, it can be beneficial. For hams who
like the idea of being able to tell where another ham is just by the callsign,
it's not.
>
>> ARRL acts for Hams when the Hams themselves are
>> unable to. The other 75% are an unorganized group.
>> Acting on their own, the other 75% will not be as
>> effective and will weaken the ARRL's position.

I disagree.

The main reason for an organized group is to do things that individuals would
have a hard time doing. Consider the issue of using power lines for highspeed
data, as discussed in another thread. How many hams have the technical
expertise, skills, facilities and time to prepare a well-researched report on
the possible impact of that technology on amateur radio communications? How
many will actually do the work and present it to the FCC in a timely fashion?
Not many - but ARRL will do it.

> I would really like to see an alternative to the ARRL. Clearly, one
>organization cannot fully represent the diverse views of an entire
>population group.

That's true of any diverse group dealing with complex issues.

Note that the ARRL leadership states its position and the reasons for them, but
also encourages all interested parties to make their positions known to the
FCC.

>Furthermore, a second organization might strengthen our
>representation. For example, when the two agree, having a second
>organization back your position always strengthens that position.

Agreed.

>But, where
>hams disagree, they should have an alternative organization to represent
>their views.
>
There have been several alternative amateur radio organizations over the years. All have focused on a few issues, gotten some recognition and a few thousand members, and then faded away. ARRL's 25% membership is a much larger percentage than any other American amateur radio organization can claim.

73 de Jim, N2EY

254. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 00:31:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66354

In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>According to the book, "Morse Code, The Essential Language" one can achieve >5wpm in 30 hours of study if an effective study method is chosen. Of course >some people learn much quicker. My older daughter learned it in a week >spending not more than an hour or so per day. It took me longer but so >what.

According to the Armed Forces of the United States, morse code cognition is of such a limited aptitude in the "average" person that they kept a morse code aptitude test in the bank of recruit tests for two decades...1940s on through to at least 1960.

A better question, more related to "saving the Novice Class license" title of this thread is WHY have a morse code test at all?

In US amateur radio, Novice Class examinations have always required morse code testing. At the same time, the Novice Class license numbers have steadily decreased for years. The decrease in license numbers was so much and for so long that it was obvious to all who bothered to examine that Class. The FCC dropped the Novice Class from any new license grants following the recent restructuring.

Another question, again more suited to the subject thread, is WHY "save" the Novice Class?

The only US amateur radio license class that kept growth in US amateur radio license totals was the no-code-test Technician Class. Since its inception as a class in 1991 the no-code-test Technician Class kept the total of all US amateur radio licensees on a slight increase. Without that class, US amateur license numbers would have dropped between 1991 and now.

255. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 00:31:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502203101.18775.00000344@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66355

In article <nPCsa.2727$3f7.2194912@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Who determines the status of the people answering the polls. Hams and >amateurs ARE THE SAME THING. You and only you make any distinction.

Incorrect. Many of us do make the distinction.

According to the official ARRL website fount of amateur radio knowledge, "ham" was a derogatory name used by professional morsemen to identify amateurs in early radio days.

Any butcher can define "ham" as the butchered meat of swine, which it is. Such ham is often the main course in holiday meals across the USA. The meat of swine is forbidden in some religious beliefs, therefore calling an Israeli radio amateur a "ham" might be considered an insult if not incongrous.

ARRL publications often state occupations of amateur licensees with a preceding "ham-" as in "ham-astronaut." Should there be a respected actor with an amateur radio license, ARRL would identify them as "ham-actor," a definite personal insult!

ARRL style of identification with hyphenation implies that an identified individual placed overdue emphasis on amateur radio. For example, astronauts have spent years of personal dedication in more than one technical endeavor to enter the astronaut ranks. It is quite unlikely that any of them would personally place more importance on amateur radio than their years of striving, work, and dedication in and for the space program. Most of the current US astronauts possessing amateur radio licenses did so as part of NASA's overall public relations effort and have been granted no-code Technician Class licenses. That license was just one of a great number of astronaut work tasks during space training. NASA neither uses, relies, or plans on amateur radio use of any kind for actual space missions; amateur radio activities in space travel is really one of public-awareness tasks to publicize NASA's overall image.

256. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 00:31:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502203102.18775.00000345@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66356

In article <TGCsa.2709$3f7.2192137@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030501204410.24076.00000514@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>
>> >We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
>> >doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments. He
>> >prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.
>>
>> Lenover21 seems to have alot of valid arguments. Just because you disagree
does
>> not mean the arguments are not valid.
>
>He discards all analogies and other illustrations from related fields.

Only when others using such are untrue or misrepresentative.

>He only allows himself to use analogies.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I can do calculations on practically any radio-
related physics phenomenon. Problem is, most of the denizens
of this din of inequity have difficulty using (and reading) an
ordinary 4-function calculator. :-)

>He quotes non-existent documents
>and/or misquotes them (one can easily check many of his so-called sources).

What "non-existant documents" are those, Dee?

Name them and show where I "misquoted" them. :-)

>He then proceeds to develop his argument into a chain that ends up on a
>totally different aspect than the initial discussion and claims that
>unrelated topic that he finally gets to proves or disproves the initial
>premise when it is not even related.

Heh heh heh...which means I do not stick solely to ARRL
publications as references.

>I was a member of our high school's debate team and had formal training in
>debate techniques.

Much of the "debate" in here is at middle or grade-school level.
:-)

"Formal debate" requires a moderator, always has. There is
no such moderator here.

This forum is certainly NOT any "formal debate" venue. It is more
like an old professional wrestling tag-team match. :-)

>Len Over 21 has yet to develop a logical, coherent
>dissertation that supports whatever point he is attempting to make.

You aren't exactly a bundle of formalcy yourself, Dee. :-)

In fact, based on previous Sysop experience on Bulletin Board
Systems, this posting of yours is a rather fine example of
emotionally-driven arrogant posturing of superiority that is all
denigration without reference.

You've made a lot of "charges" of some kind of improper conduct
in here, yet you haven't referenced a single one of them, haven't
named those "non-existant references" I'm supposed to have
listed. You've stated a number of gross generalities that can
only reference your own personal pique.

>In general it is impossible to even figure out what he is trying to prove.

I would suggest you forgo all the "formal debate training in high
school" topic and go back to your high school for some formal
training in English Comprehension.

English Comprehension is not an overly difficult subject. All
students are required to overcome their own emotionalism and
personal biases as a prerequisite to such a course. Average
people should be able to complete it in only 30 days.

257. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 00:41:00 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86y91o6ew3.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 66357

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "N2EY" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:

[...]

N2EY> All depends on the issue. Take the issue of keeping your
N2EY> callsign when moving between districts. For hams who move a lot,
N2EY> it can be beneficial. For hams who like the idea of being able
N2EY> to tell where another ham is just by the callsign, it's not.

Both sides can be happy here. Come to California and operate with
"N2EY/6". You can keep your callsign and let hams know where you are.

Jack.
(I won't mention this again.)
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+sxAhGPFSfAB/ezgRApAIAKDJQ6MWFD64tUYydXVolKajm3DYIQCg9yN7
/534M9/ICvrVI0Uva1R3W2E=
=YcTI
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

258. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 01:08:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502210808.18773.00000285@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66358

In article <3EB2FCB6.4020109@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> He isn't trying to prove anything. He is trolling, and this is a very
>well stocked pond.

Mike, it's not my fault so many of you are "fishy." :-)

259. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 01:46:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502214644.26363.00000659@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66359

>Just trying to keep you out of jail.
>
>

I can easily manage that with out your help.

260. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 01:47:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030502214750.26363.00000660@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66360

>Bruce talks like a CBer. It was only natural for me tho think he's a CBer.
>

Well then I guess what I have been saying is TRUE, Ham Radio is nothing but CB

261. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:05:46 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8v85q$4mm$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 66361

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > a PROFESSIONAL. :-) :-)
>
> A professional what?
>
>

The world's oldest. In his case what else?

262. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:19:48 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8v904$8a2$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 66362

Brian wrote:

>
> > So far Slim hasn't done anything here that *requires* more than a small piece of a
> > thought to handle easily.
>
> Then my comments are made to order for your thinking capacity.

As usual, you'e gott it all bassackwards again, Slim. You've peaked out and I'm
still just coasting.

263. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:29:23 UTC
From: Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you>
Message-ID: <7QFsa.849$I%2.127170785@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66363
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message ..

> < Snipped the usual Oxy-bullshit >

Hey ASSWIPE... if you ever get that trolling, stereotyping, big head of
yours, from out of your big fat ass......

.... learn Netiquette about cross posting !!!

Tom
gofast24@prodigy.net

264. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:30:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB32A02.6060407@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66364

Jack Twilley wrote:
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
>>>>>>"N2EY" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:
>>>>>
>
> [...]
>
> N2EY> All depends on the issue. Take the issue of keeping your
> N2EY> callsign when moving between districts. For hams who move a lot,
> N2EY> it can be beneficial. For hams who like the idea of being able
> N2EY> to tell where another ham is just by the callsign, it's not.
>
> Both sides can be happy here. Come to California and operate with
> "N2EY/6". You can keep your callsign and let hams know where you are.

Yeah, but then he'd have to like...go to California! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

265. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:33:18 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <fSFsa.9316$1S3.8317@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 66365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

```
GTH!
Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you> wrote in message
news:7QFsa.849$I%2.127170785@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message ..
>
> > < Snipped the usual Oxy-bullshit >
>
> Hey ASSWIPE... if you ever get that trolling, stereotyping, big head of
> yours, from out of your big fat ass......
>
>
> .... learn Netiquette about cross posting !!!
>
>
> Tom
> gofast24@prodigy.net
>
>
>
```

266. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:42:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030502224238.18771.00000273@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 66366

In article <vatog5b1all060@corp.supernews.com>, "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL"
<vlfiscus@mcn.net> writes:

>
>Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
>general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
>nickle extra's retest at 20.
>
>KB7ADL

Vince:

I'll take it one step further. I say retroactively cancel all new or upgraded licenses granted since 4/15/00, and apply the previous, Post-Restructuring licensing standards to whomever cares to re-apply for their ham license.

73 de Larry, K3LT

267. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:42:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030502224239.18771.00000274@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 66367

In article <b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I am
>trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
>others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>
>
>So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
>reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
>congressional districts etc.?
>
>
>Discuss.

Ryan:

Call sign districts are simply geographically-based assignments of the
call sign "number." The original intent was to identify the operator by
geographical region within the U.S. and it's territories/possessions while
operating. The Vanity Call Sign system scrapped this useful feature, and
now the "district" numbers are essentially meaningless, since any ham
in any district can request a call sign including a number from an entirely
different district. Personally, I would not have permitted this.

Therefore, to answer your question, there is no need to do this. It would
serve no practical purpose. Moreover, in an era when the FCC has had to
resort to the extreme measures taken in Restructuring in order to streamline
the administrative burden of the ARS, this would only serve to add cost and
complexity it cannot afford and doesn't need. "Redistricting" the call areas
to reflect demographic shifts is of no value to the ARS, since all licensees
are already treated equally as radio amateurs. The ARRL already has a
system in place to address demographic changes among the ham population;
it creates new Sections to reflect increases in regonal ham populations.

Nice try; next topic, please. Keep going, though, you're on the right track.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Dover, Delaware

268. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 02:48:03 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <34Gsa.9402$1S3.9269@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 66368
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

AWW! I must've hit a nerve. If the shoe fits, WEAR it! IF you can read and absorb intelligence,
it seems that it is OK to stereotype one group and trash another--as long as it isn't YOUR group.

BTW, the crossposting was intentional. I erased several newsgroup from the header. I was NOT
the one that started the thread.

J
Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you> wrote in message news:7QFsa.849$I%2.127170785@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message ..
>
> > < Snipped the usual Oxy-bullshit >
>
> Hey ASSWIPE... if you ever get that trolling, stereotyping, big head of
> yours, from out of your big fat ass......
>
>
> .... learn Netiquette about cross posting !!!
>
>
> Tom
> gofast24@prodigy.net
>
>
>

269. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 03:46:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB33C1F.F8733B53@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66369

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > a PROFESSIONAL. :-) :-)
>
> A professional what?

We cant' be sure. He performs services for money.

Dave K8MN

270. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 03:58:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB33EE2.EF7994AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66370

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB2B1E4.2E9BECBB@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB1F07E.D9794B85@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> >
> > > > > Mr. Smug is the master of not making mistakes. It's what makes him so smug.
> > > >
> > > > I've never heard Len referred to as Mr. Smug. Not making mistakes makes
> > > > him smug?
> >
> > >
> > > What are you talking about? I don't recall ever referring to Len as "Mr. Smug."
> >
> > Why, I'm talking about your response to a post about Len Anderson. What
> > else could you have meant? Do you ever bother to read and digest the
> > material to which you respond?
>
> David, I meant precisely what I typed. Why do you force yourself into
> confusion over it?

If you meant what you typed, I got my comments right the first time.
Meaning what you typed isn't the same as understanding that to which you
respond.

Dave K8MN

271. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 04:18:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB34370.CE302560@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66371

Brian wrote:
>
> "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3eb287fa_4@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0305011833.4d93d506@posting.google.com...
> > > "Kevin Muenzler" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<3eb19067$1_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> > > > "Gordon A Langstaff" <veryniceguy@clomp.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:LlYpa.605532$3D1.330423@sccrnsc01...
> > > > > Tell us something we don't already know. This ng is nothing but a
> > > > > cesspool.
> > > > >
> > > > > GAL N6RUE
> > > >
> > > > Another "RUE" Welcome to the road-club.
> > > >
> > > > Kevin, WB5RUE
> > >
> > > Kevin, this isn't the road-club. Its either rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> > > or its
> > > rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments. I don't think the other "rue"
> > > got it changed over yet.
> > >
> > > Brian
> >
> > Rue means "road" in French. OOOOPS! I said the "F" word!
>
> I thought rue was a butter based sauce in French.

"Roux" - fat and flour used to thicken sauces.

> Ooops. Gotta go wash my mouth.

For writing "sauce"?

Dave K8MN

272. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 04:25:39 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9370457E2319elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66372

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:G2Dsa.2735$3f7.2199822@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns936F89FF4DDA3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
>> news:b8u5jm$6jh$0@208.206.142.101:
>>
>> > Some of you guys are clueless beyond belief. ITU regs spell out
>> > callsign
>> > allocations to the various countries with prefixes beginning AAA
>> > through ZZZ When the country needs, the prefix is followed by a
>> > numeric, then, also if needed, suffix of AAA through ZZZ. Been that
>> > way for decades.
>> > The FCC could legally assign AAA1ZZZ as an amateur callsign if they
>> > wanted/needed to.
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Good point. Three letter prefixes are the only way they could issue
>> more calls without going astray of the ITU.
>
> Actually there are three letter prefixes in use. They just don't
> happen to be assigned to the amateur radio service. I was a MARS
> operator for a short while. That's one of the services that gets
> assigned a three letter prefix.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>

Well, yes , I did know that. This goes back to my point about the FCC
issuing the wrong format of calls for quite a number of different
services. The trouble is, on the ITU level, those calls **do** belong only
to either amateur or experimental use, which MARS doesn't quite fit into.
Still, it will be a while before ham radio needs them in the US. My bet is
the first ham call with a three letter prefix will begin with 'JAA'.

273. Re: Hot Amateur Strips! Series 1/10

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 04:31:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB34614.4F571583@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66373

numskull@imtoosexy.com wrote:

Appropriate name.....

> For more awsome amateur pics

YLs holding HTs?.....

274. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 05:54:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503015429.08218.00000537@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66374

>Subject: Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/2/2003 7:31 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030502203101.18775.00000344@mb-m11.aol.com>

>In article <nPCsa.2727$3f7.2194912@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>Who determines the status of the people answering the polls. Hams and
>>amateurs ARE THE SAME THING. You and only you make any distinction.
>
> Incorrect. Many of us do make the distinction.

"Us"...?!?! Who would that be, Lennie? More spoiled brat "engineers" who think thier "life experiences" makes then too good to take the same tests that every other citizen must take, such as yourself? Or those spoiled brat "engineers" like Vippy who can't seem to decide which offends them more...Not enough "preety fems" or the presence of radio hobbyists who want to have some fun with radios, not just eat, sleep and breed inside an O-scope?

>According to the official ARRL website fount of amateur radio
> knowledge, "ham" was a derogatory name used by professional
> morsemen to identify amateurs in early radio days.

"fount..."...?!?!

Yep...them "professionals" ahve been a pain in the side since "day 1"...!

>ARRL style of identification with hyphenation...(SNIP)

You really need a new hobby, Lennie. You've pretty well abused the dickens out of this one. Pretty far-fetched stuff here.

Steve, K4YZ

275. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 06:06:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503020601.08218.00000542@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66375

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/2/2003 1:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030502140621.18767.00000325@mb-m15.aol.com>

>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>>We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
>>>doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments. He
>>>prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.

>There shall be NO arguments against the Established Order.

Seems to me the Lady's got you pegged, Putzy One.

>Dee represents the Established Order

Hmmmmmmm...I don't remember seeing Dee's name on any ballot. I'd vote for her though if it did.

>All arguments against the Established Order are therefore invalid.

No, just the irrational, emotional, falsehood-based rants of former radio technicians who think they were engineers.

That would be you, Lennie.

>Anything against the Established Order are "totally unrelated
> tangents."

"Pedantic Parson"..."Herr Oberst"...."Jackbooted thug"..."elitist Morsemen"..."Dill Sergeant"...All various "nicknames" bestowed on licensed Radio Amateurs who happen to disagree with Lennie.

Yeah, I can see how you'd disagree with the term "unrelated tangents", Lennie...

>That pretty well sums up the attitude of the PCTA.

Self righteous, selfish, irresponsible, untruthful...I say that pretty well sums up the attitude of the GITMN/IDIMTYD

Steve, K4YZ

* Give It To Me NOW / I Deserve It More Than You Do.

276. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 06:22:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503022224.08218.00000547@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66376

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/2/2003 1:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030502140621.18767.00000324@mb-m15.aol.com>

>Vipul, to see where Carroll is coming from you need to experience
> his "arguments" in this forum going back at least four years

Whew...Lennie just opened a BIG box of worms!

>Carroll is a another pridefull PCTA who doggedly sticks to the
> Established Order and feels qualified to flatly state his opinions
> as being the Only Truth. [that seems to be endemic with PCTAs]

Anderson is a prideful ex-radio technician with dubious qualifications
other than his ability to cut-and-paste and plagiarize the works of others. He
feels his years of "professional" electronics places him on a pedestle that no
mere "morseman" dare approach.

>Carroll has had a number of arguments on various subjects with
> various participants in here and could not sustain his viewpoints
> on technical subjects. [those who live in the past can go back
> to Google and see the play-by-play with Cecil Moore on
> antenna technicalities or two others on Shannon's Law...or
> myself on the LAPD supposedly tied into a "nationwide manual
> telegraphy network" claim]

Lennie has had a number of arguments on various subjects with various
participants on POLICY matters and could not sustain his viewpoints. This is
immediately evident by his resorting to such adjectives as "jackbooted thug",
"elitist", "morsemen", etc, when he can no longer "civilly debate" the topic he
thinks he is master of.

>Carroll generally lost every argument on technical and historical
> subjects so he resorted to the personal insult attack.

This must be based on Lennie's "newsgroup message points" system that he
frequently refers to but never publishes. I dare say that he would find
himself falling prey to his own devices as he so often does.

>He seems
> to now be in a perpetual personal attack mode.

Pot. Kettle. Black.

>This time he
> goes into the My Opinions Are The Only Truth mode...namely
> anyone who does not agree with him therefore "hates ham

> radio" and is probably stupid and ignorant as well.

Pot. Kettle. Black.

>PCTAs are passionate about the Established Order being
> maintained at all costs.

Lennie's as equally passionate about destroying anything that he can't
bring to it's knees in honor of himself.

>Requiring morse code skill of each
> and every ham is part of the Established Order.

One more item to heap onto the "Waiting For Lennie To Provide A Quote"
pile. And it's a BIIIIIIIIIG pile!

>Amateur
> radio licensees who did not test for morse code are put down
> as inferior beings unworthy of civility who cannot reason.

Other than Bruce Beynon (and everyone KNOWS that creep is a loser of
monumental proportion), WHO makes such assertions, Lennie?

Until you provide a quote otherwise, I will heap THIS one on the pile for
you to get started on too...

>The most militant of the PCTAs demanding absolute adherence
> to the Established Order is the Gang of Four (Heil, Miccolis,
> Robeson, Roll) in this forum. Roll has been absent lately and
> Kelly has taken his place. It may be that Carroll is striking for
> a place on that Gang now.

Hmmmm....can't get his way, so now we make an analogy to the infamous
"Gang of Four" of the Chinese cultural revolution. This should as quickly seal
the fate of a rant as does one's propensity to make references to Hitler.
Ooooops....Lennie's already done THAT, too! Doesn't give him much room to
maneuver!

>There is NO debate possible with such passionate EO nobility.

Naaaaw...We just don't like "debating" with a known punk and pathological
liar such as yourself.

Don't take offense, Lennie...We just play off of the stuff you
provide...And you make it sooooooooooooo easy.

Steve, K4YZ

277. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 06:40:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503024004.08218.00000551@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66377

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/2/2003 7:31 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030502203102.18775.00000345@mb-m11.aol.com>

>In article <TGCsa.2709$3f7.2192137@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:

>>He discards all analogies and other illustrations from related fields.
>
> Only when others using such are untrue or misrepresentative.

However under YOUR rules-of-engagement, all analogies except yours are
"untrue or misrepresentitive".

You seem to think you can publish this foolishness and people can't see
through you.

>>He only allows himself to use analogies.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I can do calculations on practically any radio-
> related physics phenomenon. Problem is, most of the denizens
> of this din of inequity have difficulty using (and reading) an
> ordinary 4-function calculator

Since this is supposed to be a newsgroup on Amateur Radio POLICY, the use
of calculators is not germane.

>>He quotes non-existent documents
>>and/or misquotes them (one can easily check many of his so-called sources).
>
> What "non-existant documents" are those, Dee?
>
> Name them and show where I "misquoted" them.

Is there enough bandwidth?

>>He then proceeds to develop his argument into a chain that ends up on a
>>totally different aspect than the initial discussion and claims that
>>unrelated topic that he finally gets to proves or disproves the initial
>>premise when it is not even related.
>
> Heh heh heh...which means I do not stick solely to ARRL
> publications as references.

No...it means you proceed to develop your argument into a chian that is completely irrelevent to anything pertinent about any related policy topics.

>>I was a member of our high school's debate team and had formal training in
>>debate techniques.
>
> Much of the "debate" in here is at middle or grade-school level.

Which still puts it over your head, Lennie.

>"Formal debate" requires a moderator, always has. There is
> no such moderator here.

Ahhhhh...but LENNIE ! ! ! You have so modestly placed yourself in that role repeatedly!

>This forum is certainly NOT any "formal debate" venue. It is more
> like an old professional wrestling tag-team match.

And so far it's The World vs Lennie the Loser (pluseVippy, Brain and a handful of "anonymous" nomme-de-guerre's created by Lennie).

They are losing.

>>Len Over 21 has yet to develop a logical, coherent
>>dissertation that supports whatever point he is attempting to make.
>
> You aren't exactly a bundle of formalcy yourself, Dee.

The lady has more on the ball than you think, Lennie. She's got you clocked pretty well.

>In fact, based on previous Sysop experience on Bulletin Board
> Systems, this posting of yours is a rather fine example of
> emotionally-driven arrogant posturing of superiority that is all
> denigration without reference.

YOU are the reference, Lennie. She made THAT clear from the git-go.

>You've made a lot of "charges" of some kind of improper conduct
> in here, yet you haven't referenced a single one of them, haven't
> named those "non-existant references" I'm supposed to have
> listed. You've stated a number of gross generalities that can
> only reference your own personal pique.

What does she need to quote? It's in this very post. It's in almost every post you've made since the net came into existence.

>>In general it is impossible to even figure out what he is trying to prove.
>
> I would suggest you forgo all the "formal debate training in high
> school" topic and go back to your high school for some formal
> training in English Comprehension.

Perhaps you meant NEWSPEAK Comprehension, Lennie. That IS what you try to do here...

>English Comprehension is not an overly difficult subject. All
> students are required to overcome their own emotionalism and
> personal biases as a prerequisite to such a course. Average
> people should be able to complete it in only 30 days.

Was this one of the classes that took you 15 years to complete?

Looks like it to me.

Steve, K4YZ

278. Re: Hot Amateur Strips! Series 1/10

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 06:42:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503024246.08218.00000553@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66378

>Subject: Re: Hot Amateur Strips! Series 1/10
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 5/2/2003 11:31 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EB34614.4F571583@ix.netcom.com>
>
>numskull@imtoosexy.com wrote:
>
>Appropriate name.....
>
>> For more awsome amateur pics
>
>YLs holding HTs?.....

HEY VIPPY! Here's your "preety fems"..! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

279. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 10:25:12 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <d4ednQH9kpd2BS6jXTWcqQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 66379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

The ORIGINAL message which I posted went to only one group, then you guys started using it to call each other names... not a good reflection on either hams or truckers depending on which group you are from.

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:34Gsa.9402$1S3.9269@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com...
> AWW! I must've hit a nerve. If the shoe fits, WEAR it! IF you can read and
> absorb intelligence,
> it seems that it is OK to stereotype one group and trash another--as long as
> it isn't YOUR group.
>
> BTW, the crossposting was intentional. I erased several newsgroup from the
> header. I was NOT
> the one that started the thread.
>
> J
> Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you> wrote in message
> news:7QFsa.849$I%2.127170785@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message ..
> >
> > > < Snipped the usual Oxy-bullshit >
> >
> > Hey ASSWIPE... if you ever get that trolling, stereotyping, big head of
> > yours, from out of your big fat ass......
> >
> >
> > .... learn Netiquette about cross posting !!!
> >
> >
> > Tom
> > gofast24@prodigy.net
> >
> >
> >
>
>
>

280. Re: Funny you should mention that ....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 12:14:21 UTC
From: Bobby Joe <BJ@bjtruckercbtrans.org>
Message-ID: <b90bquidt0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66380

It would appear Oxendine has
stopped wearing his tin-foil hat while around
radios. His thoughts are getting jumbled again.

BJ

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2AD0F.E82D023D@crosslink.net...
> "FCC Seeks Assistance in Curbing Unlicensed 10-Meter Incursions"
>
> <http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/01/100/?nc=1>

281. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 12:26:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66382

In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>According to the book, "Morse Code, The Essential Language" one can achieve
>>5wpm in 30 hours of study if an effective study method is chosen. Of course
>>some people learn much quicker. My older daughter learned it in a week
>>spending not more than an hour or so per day. It took me longer but so
>>what.
>
> According to the Armed Forces of the United States, morse
> code cognition is of such a limited aptitude in the "average"
> person that they kept a morse code aptitude test in the bank
> of recruit tests for two decades...1940s on through to at least
> 1960.

Where is this stated explicitly?

The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find the
recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required. The
required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio code
test.
>
> A better question, more related to "saving the Novice Class
> license" title of this thread is WHY have a morse code test
> at all?

Many reasons have been given on both sides of the debate. They all boil down to
opinions.
>
> In US amateur radio, Novice Class examinations have always
> required morse code testing. At the same time, the Novice
> Class license numbers have steadily decreased for years.

In US amateur radio, Technician Plus Class examinations have always
required morse code testing. At the same time, the Technician Plus
Class license numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that
license class until its being closed to new licenses in April of 2000.

In US amateur radio, Extra Class examinations have always
required morse code testing. At the same time, the Extral Class license
numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that license class.

> The decrease in license numbers was so much and for so
> long that it was obvious to all who bothered to examine that
> Class. The FCC dropped the Novice Class from any new
> license grants following the recent restructuring.

The FCC also dropped the Technician Plus and Advanced Class from any new
license grants in the same restructuring.
>
> Another question, again more suited to the subject thread,
> is WHY "save" the Novice Class?

There's no clear reason to save it, because the Technician and Techncian Plus
classes of license have been the choice of most new US radio amateurs since the
1980s.
>
> The only US amateur radio license class that kept growth in
> US amateur radio license totals was the no-code-test
> Technician Class.

Incorrect.

> Since its inception as a class in 1991
> the no-code-test Technician Class kept the total of all
> US amateur radio licensees on a slight increase. Without
> that class, US amateur license numbers would have
> dropped between 1991 and now.

Incorrect. Here's why:

The above 'alternate history' statement assumes that none of those who obtained
Technician Class licenses after February 1991 would have done so if that
license had not lost its code test. That is clearly incorrect.

For proof, we need only look at the growth in US amateur radio for the past 33
years:

US Hams:

1970: 270,000
1980: 350,000
1990: 514,000
2000: 680,000

Growth Rate:

1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

Oddly enough, percentage growth slowed down after the introduction of code test
waivers and the Tech lost its code test. The total net growth in the '90s was
almost exactly the same as in the '80s, even though the US population was
larger.

As a percentage of the total US population:

Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams
1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
1980: 227 million 350,000 0.154%
1990: 249 million 514,000 0.206%
2000: 281 million 680,000 0.242%

US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052% in the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s. So the growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test.

It stands to reason that if code testing were an 'unnecessary, arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barriers to entry', those who were interested, but dissuaded by those unnecessary barriers would "jump in." when the 'barriers' were eliminated. Except that's not what happened, in either absolute number of hams or percentage growth. Growth in total hams was almost exactly the same during the '90s, compared to the '80s, and the percentage growth actually dropped.

Of course when the "price" of something drops, there is usually an increase of "sales". When the "price" of a US amateur radio license (the tests which must be passed to obtain one) was "dropped" by eliminating the code test for one class, that class attracted many "sales". This in no way proves what would have happened without the "drop in price".

Since the closing of the Technician Plus to new licenses in April 2000, FCC has been renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician, causing the latter class to grow and the former to shrink.

282. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 12:26:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503082659.18783.00000321@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66381

In article <86y91o6ew3.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
<jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:

>N2EY> All depends on the issue. Take the issue of keeping your
>N2EY> callsign when moving between districts. For hams who move a lot,
>N2EY> it can be beneficial. For hams who like the idea of being able
>N2EY> to tell where another ham is just by the callsign, it's not.
>
>Both sides can be happy here. Come to California and operate with
>"N2EY/6". You can keep your callsign and let hams know where you are.
>
Two problems with that:

First, adding the "/6" eliminates most of the advantage of the short call.
Might as well get a 1x3 or 2x3 6-land call.

Second, it only works for those working stations who choose to add the
designator.

73 de Jim, N2EY

283. Oxyendine Alert

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 13:04:11 UTC
From: Bobby Joe <BJ@bjtruckercbtrans.org>
Message-ID: <b90eoc$q2f$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66383

Are you still wearing your tin-foil hat when
around radios?

BJ

284. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 13:19:28 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b90fl0$ru2$0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 66384

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 5/2/2003 1:06 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030502140621.18767.00000324@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
> >Vipul, to see where Carroll is coming from you need to experience
> > his "arguments" in this forum going back at least four years
>
> Whew...Lennie just opened a BIG box of worms!
>
> >Carroll is a another pridefull PCTA who doggedly sticks to the
> > Established Order and feels qualified to flatly state his opinions
> > as being the Only Truth. [that seems to be endemic with PCTAs]
>
> Anderson is a prideful ex-radio technician with dubious qualifications
> other than his ability to cut-and-paste and plagiarize the works of others. He
> feels his years of "professional" electronics places him on a pedestle that no
> mere "morseman" dare approach.
>
> >Carroll has had a number of arguments on various subjects with
> > various participants in here and could not sustain his viewpoints
> > on technical subjects. [those who live in the past can go back
> > to Google and see the play-by-play with Cecil Moore on
> > antenna technicalities or two others on Shannon's Law...or
> > myself on the LAPD supposedly tied into a "nationwide manual
> > telegraphy network" claim]
>
> Lennie has had a number of arguments on various subjects with various
> participants on POLICY matters and could not sustain his viewpoints.

Steve, you sure have nailed that one. In the instant case, Putzie's rant about
the
LAPD never having had a radiotelegraph station on the national police HF net,
I offer the following as evidence that he remains just as full of crap as ever.
Cluelessness such as his is almost criminal. He claims knowledge which he
clearly never had. If he's so wrong in this case, how can he be believable in any
area?

The 1945 issue of the Associated Police Communications Officers Handbook
shows Los Angles PD as operating *TWO* licensed radiotelegraph stations on the
Interstate Police HF net, with the call letters of KGPL and KGHX. At that time they
were the ONLY radiotelegraph stations in the state of California which were on the

net . CHP Sacremento is shown as having wireline teletype service only, and they received relayed traffic off the radiotlegraph net from LAPD!
Notice is made that the second station, KGHX, is a "zone" station.That would be for local (with in the state) use.

By the time of the printing of the 1951 issue of the APCO manual, FCC had changed the system of alloting callsigns, and the 1951 manual shows LAPD with *TWO* radiotelegraph stations, both licensed for the same usage, one with the callsign of KMA89, the other KMC90, both operating on Channels A through I, which were the following frequencies:

Channel Frequency
A- 2804 kc*
B- 2808 kc
C- 2312 kc
D- 5195 kc*
E- 5135 kc
F- 5140 kc
G- 7935 kc*
H- 7805 kc
I- 7480 kc

* denotes a calling frequency. Once contact was established stations moved to one of the other "working" frequencies.

By this time (1951), CHP Sacramento had installed a HF radiotelegraph station on the net with the assigned callsign of KMA25.

This interstate HF radotelegraph usage continued, though activity dwindled through

the 1960's, until the net was deactivated in the early 70's, at which time the primary east-west HF relay station at Flagstaff, Arizona was deactivated.
(I was a part of the technical crew that removed all the HF radio equipment from the Missouri State HF radiotelegraph relay station in 1975. There were 9 district stations throughout the state that had been deactivated previously in late 1965 after Missouri installed a statewide wireline teletype system.)

LAPD was listed as a contact point for the state of California in-state wire teletype
net, as was KMA25, CHP Sacramento.

Both of the APCO manuals noted are in my possession. Quotatations are direct from them.

It might be of interest to mention that the 1951 APCO handbook gives a short historical note on the develepment of police radio communications.

Quoting.....

"..(police) Radio communicatioins methods are divided into two general classifications which,
although normally accomplishing the same objective, decidedly differ in techniques. The first, radiotelephone, was used in the Detroit area for inter-city communications purposes as early as 1929. With the rapid growth of police radio,

radiotelephone came to be the principal medium for the exchange of inter-city and inter-state
police information. This method continued for several years until the volume of police messages made it necessary to develop, or adapt, another system for the dispatching of inter-departmental messages.

Thus, in 1935, the Police Departments of Davenport, Detroit, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Missouri, Minneapolis, and St Louis began a series of tests designed to determine the feasability of communications by radiotelegraph on frequencies designated by the Federal Communications Commission. These tests were so conclusive that operation of the National Police Communications net (NCPN) officially began in 1936, operating under a plan developed by Mr. E. K. Jett, E,ergency Services Engineer for the FCC.

" Now, after 15 years of successful operation, the APCO considers the radiotelegraph as the logical system for Network activity. In this system accuracy, reliability, and speed of communications are maximum, and there is the additional advantage that, with auxiliary power source, it is capable of completely independent operation.

It is not considerad, however, that all departments in the NPCN should utilize the radiotelegraph. In many states for example, radiotelegraph stations form the basic framework for complete state coverage. Radiotelephone stations function as feeders to the radiotelegraph stations and as relay points for other systems. Alabama, Arkansas, California(!!!!!), Illinois, Indiana, Missouri and Ohio are a few of the states so organized..."

End of quoted material----From
"The National Police Communications Network Directory, Sixth Edition, 1951
page 7.
Compiled by the Associated Police Communications Officers. APCO directory committee, 18108 Strasburg, Detroit, Michigan."

THAT comes from the horses *mouth*, not the other end (Len).

So there you have it, hard evidence of just one of his many intransigences.

MUCH of which he speaks he has NO knowledge.

285. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 13:59:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305030559.24aedc54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66385

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB34370.CE302560@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3eb287fa_4@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0305011833.4d93d506@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Kevin Muenzler" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<3eb19067$1_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>...
> > > > > "Gordon A Langstaff" <veryniceguy@clomp.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:LlYpa.605532$3D1.330423@sccrnsc01...
> > > > > > Tell us something we don't already know. This ng is nothing but a
> > > > > > cesspool.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > GAL N6RUE
> > > > >
> > > > > Another "RUE" Welcome to the road-club.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kevin, WB5RUE
> > > >
> > > > Kevin, this isn't the road-club. Its either rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> > > > or its
> > > > rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments. I don't think the other "rue"
> > > > got it changed over yet.
> > > >
> > > > Brian
> > >
> > > Rue means "road" in French. OOOOPS! I said the "F" word!
> >
> > I thought rue was a butter based sauce in French.
>
> "Roux" - fat and flour used to thicken sauces.

Delicious.

> > Ooops. Gotta go wash my mouth.
>
> For writing "sauce"?

For using the "F" word.

286. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:01:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503100113.04580.00000543@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66386

>Other than Bruce Beynon (and everyone KNOWS that creep is a loser of
>monumental proportion), WHO makes such assertions,

Hey Sissy BoY, dont confuse people, his Callsign is WA8ULX. Look Sissy Boy, I think you take this stuff to serious, alot of us just having fun here......

287. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:02:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305030602.6be1430e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66387

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB33EE2.EF7994AC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB2B1E4.2E9BECBB@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB1F07E.D9794B85@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
>
> > > > > > Mr. Smug is the master of not making mistakes. It's what makes him so smug.
> > > > >
> > > > > I've never heard Len referred to as Mr. Smug. Not making mistakes makes
> > > > > him smug?
>
> > > >
> > > > What are you talking about? I don't recall ever referring to Len as "Mr. Smug."
> > >
> > > Why, I'm talking about your response to a post about Len Anderson. What
> > > else could you have meant? Do you ever bother to read and digest the
> > > material to which you respond?
> >
> > David, I meant precisely what I typed. Why do you force yourself into
> > confusion over it?
>
> If you meant what you typed, I got my comments right the first time.
> Meaning what you typed isn't the same as understanding that to which you
> respond.

Now what?

288. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:06:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b90icl$26v$0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 66388

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> "...With the rapid growth of police radio,
> radiotelephone came to be the principal medium for the exchange of inter-city and
> inter-state
> police information. This method continued for several years until the volume of
> police messages made it necessary to develop, or adapt, another system for the
> dispatching of inter-departmental messages.
>
> Thus, in 1935, the Police Departments of Davenport, Detroit, Indianapolis, Kansas
> City, Missouri, Minneapolis, and St Louis began a series of tests designed to
> determine the feasability of communications by radiotelegraph on frequencies
> designated by the Federal Communications Commission. These tests were so conclusive
> that operation of the National Police Communications net (NPCN) officially began in
> 1936, operating under a plan developed by Mr. E. K. Jett, Emergency Services
> Engineer for the FCC...."

One other point needs to be made here. Most of the individuals who instigated the Police HF CW net were active hams, engineers and police communicators, and most had a broad range of experience on HF as hams in addition to their service as military/shipboard/shore-station/aircraft CW operators. They *knew* the potential value of radiotelegraphy on HF to police communications, as was immediately shown during the testing period in 1935.

It's worth noting that virtually all radio engineers
of the day had begun their careers as hams.

Those are facts that *really* stick in Putzie's craw, but gee, someone
really needed to stuff it up his nose. It was almost inevitable.

And now the Unlicensed Clown Prince of RRAP will simply dismiss all this as
irrevelant, outdated and "old". Just like the Putzie himself.

289. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:06:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305030606.77ddabfe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66389

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b8v904$8a2$0@208.206.142.69>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > > So far Slim hasn't done anything here that *requires* more than a small piece of a
> > > thought to handle easily.
> >
> > Then my comments are made to order for your thinking capacity.
>
> As usual, you'e gott it all bassackwards again, Slim. You've peaked out and I'm
> still just coasting.

You've been coasting for years, but not in thinking capacity.

290. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:07:56 UTC
From: paulfriedman@attbi.com
Message-ID: <%2Qsa.474785$Zo.105631@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 66390

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since
you
> have had your license?
> Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....
>

My "favorite" worst experience:
As a new ham a year and half ago, I called CQ on 75 meters -- after
checking to make sure the frequency was clear, of course. First response
was:
Oh boy, must a newbie. Real hams don't CQ on 75. Go play on 11m
Second response was:
My God, you must be an old f**t. No one has called CQ on 75 in 30
years.

Neither offered up a callsign, of course. That would be wrong.

My real favorite experiences:
My first QSO. After getting up enough nerve to respond to a CQ, I
explained that this was my first contact. It seemed like 4 billion hams
wanted to say hello and welcome me (and the person who "owned" the frequency
was kind enough to let the party happen.)

Having a QSO with a gentleman who goes back to the late spark days.

All sorts of hams taking the time to help out a newbie (moi).

Paul ab0si

291. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:09:06 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305030609.49cf3af5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66391

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86y91o6ew3.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "N2EY" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:
>
> [...]
>
> N2EY> All depends on the issue. Take the issue of keeping your
> N2EY> callsign when moving between districts. For hams who move a lot,
> N2EY> it can be beneficial. For hams who like the idea of being able
> N2EY> to tell where another ham is just by the callsign, it's not.
>
> Both sides can be happy here. Come to California and operate with
> "N2EY/6". You can keep your callsign and let hams know where you are.

'Cept N2EY lives in Pennsylvania . .

. . . N2EY/3/6 . . ??

>
> Jack.

w3rv

292. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:15:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305030615.3abe1d3e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66392

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030502214750.26363.00000660@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Bruce talks like a CBer. It was only natural for me tho think he's a CBer.
> >
>
> Well then I guess what I have been saying is TRUE, Ham Radio is nothing but CB

Well, no. You consistently talk like a CBer. The only other one who
talks this way is Brian Kelly, but only when he gets upset.

Even Len, a non-ham, talks more like a ham than you do.

293. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:18:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305030618.45d022d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66393

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030502214644.26363.00000659@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Just trying to keep you out of jail.
> >
> >
>
> I can easily manage that with out your help.

Then keep your CBs hidden, and don't intentionally interfere with your
neighbor's electronics, which is what prompted my comment.

294. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:40:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b90kcu$72t$0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 66394

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b8v904$8a2$0@208.206.142.69>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > > So far Slim hasn't done anything here that *requires* more than a small piece of a
> > > > thought to handle easily.
> > >
> > > Then my comments are made to order for your thinking capacity.
> >
> > As usual, you'e gott it all bassackwards again, Slim. You've peaked out and I'm
> > still just coasting.
>
> You've been coasting for years, but not in thinking capacity.

Were that true it would still be much better than being adrift like you.

295. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:53:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503105308.18759.00000578@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66396

```
In article <20030501010057.18769.00000311@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0304300902.6a00a8fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030426162044.16173.00000055@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20030426082619.18821.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >In article <20030425232756.18771.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>> >
>>> >>In article <c2356669.0304251111.2f81f2f@posting.google.com>,
>N2EY@AOL.COM
>>> >>(N2EY) writes:
>>> >>>The phasing idea was kept alive by a few hams even before the
>>> >>>developments of the past few decades. For example:
>>> >>>
>>> >>>QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
>>> >>>Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
>>> >>>meter receiver.
>>> >>
>>> >> Who are writing a reply to?!?
>>> >
>>> >What does that mean, Len?
>>>
>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you've run out of comprehension skills, have you?
>>
>>Nope. It seems you have run out of proofreading skills, though.
>>
>>You wrote:
>>
>>"Who are writing a reply to?!?"
>>
>>which doesn't make much sense.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Who ARE you replying to? :-)

I see. You made a typo by leaving out the word 'you' in a sentence, and you
make fun of me for questioning the sentence.
>
```

>>Try to stay focused.
>>>
>>> You need to focus on who you are replying to.
>>
>>I'm replying to the newsgroup.
>>Specifically, to a newsgroup posting.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you are very specifically targeting one individual.

Not at all.
>
> If you were "replying to the newsgroup" the Reply To line should
> have said something like "everyone" or "all" or non-specific
> mention.

If I were replying to a specific individual it would be done by email, not in a newsgroup.

>>> You live in the past too much.
>>
>>I'm not the one repeatedly citing his expired patents and
>>half-century-old RTTY experience, Len - you are.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk some more.

Why?
>
> I actually GOT all that RTTY experience and GOT one patent.

All in the past, Len, all in the past. That sort of RTTY is long obsolete and the patent expired more than a decade ago.

You live in the past too much.
>
> The patent is in radio, by the way, not some mechanical thing.

So? Do you think no one else here has a patent?
>
> Who is it that kept on with long, long posts about the "history"
> of amateur radio regulations before 1955? Jimmie Miccolis did.

Back before the restructuring of 2000, I wrote a paper about the history of US amateur radio licensing from immediately after WW2 to the present time. It was an attempt to summarize the forces, developments, events and changes that resulted in the then-current US amateur radio license regulations. It was written to provide concise-but-detailed background information in one document.

It is interesting to note that you have not been able to find even one error or mistake in that paper.
>
>>> Not only that, your resources
>>> of information are too tightly bound to old ARRL publications.
>>

>>Says who?
>
> Says I.

Well, you're wrong.

>>Do I sense some anti-ARRL bias in your postings?
>
> You limit your personal information resources to just the ARRL.

Incorrect.

>>> European amateurs were already trying out and (successfully)
>>> using the Gingell polyphase network in SSB equipment before
>>> it was "recognized and published" in the USA.
>>
>>That's nice. Nobody denies that.
>
> But you need those ARRL cites just the same. You won't really
> accept it unless ARRL publishes it as "proof." :-)

Incorrect.

>>> You keep promoting some old component manufactured
>>> by a Pennsylvania company long ago...as if it were the final word on
>>> state of the art.
>>
>>Where have I done that? Mentioning is not promoting. I used to have
>>one of those networks, but sold it long ago.
>
> You were PROMOTING it awhile back. That's in Google, too.

Where? Provide us with an actual post or link to same.
>
> That came with a lot of boosterism for your local Pennsy "hood."

The post, please.
>
>>And the Gingell network is hardly the "final word on state of the
>>art".
>
> A four-quadrature phase shift network by Gingell and finalized
> in values by Yoshida is a LARGE JUMP over the Dome two-
> quadrature network limited to just voice bandwidths. The Gingell
> and Yoshida-value network is considerably more broadband than
> previous attempts...and holds to much lower relative quadrature
> error which improves unwanted sideband and carrier rejection.

Sure.

Yet the Gingell network is hardly the "final word on state of the art".
You tried to misdirect away from that simple fact but you failed.

> The original thread opened with a discussion of whether or not
> "high-fidelity" (presumably meaning wideband audio) SSB was
> good for amateur applications.

And the discussion developed in other directions.
>
> I posted mentions of the 4-phase Gingell network to explain that
> it was TECHNICALLY POSSIBLE to generate "Hi-Fi" SSB. It is
> very technically possible with relatively loose-tolerance
> components in the circuits and still good for unwanted sideband
> and carrier rejection.

Have you actually done it?

"Nothing is ever difficult for the person who doesn't have to do the work"
>
> You jumped in with these long, Long, LONG

Your posts were even longer. You go on and on at length, then criticize those
who respond to and disprove you claims using equal amounts of bandwidth.

> "critiques" of my
> post talking about OLD networks and concepts which could
> NOT do wideband audio SSB.

Crystal filters can do wideband SSB.

> You've just not had that much
> experience anywhere with the newer networks, won't do the
> math to do an honest comparison.

How do you know? You claim an awful lot about my experience and knowledge.

> Don't try that "MSEE snow
> job" again about "knowing better."

Your degree is from what accredited institution? What date is on your diploma?

>You haven't shown anything
> of newer techniques, only new snow.

You haven't shown anyhting other than references to the OLD work of others.
>
> You seem bent on acquiring many more pounds of flesh.

What does that mean?

296. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 14:53:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503105309.18759.00000579@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66395

In article <BAD68206.1804E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>> Yes, do yourself a favor and put Len Over 21 on
>> your blocked senders lists. To borrow from an
>> old Alka-Seltzer commercial: "Plop, Plop, Fizz,
>> Fizz, O what a relief it is!"
>
>
> I wish some of you guys would have said something before I got caught up
>in an extended conversation with him.
> I've never paid too much attention to
>him before, so was taken totally off guard by his nonsense.

Sorry, Dwight, I thought you knew how Len behaves here.

You have done an admirable job of responding to his lengthy and mistake-ridden
posts, without stooping to his level. Good job.

You invited his wrath by committing the dual sins of disagreeing with him and
providing solid factual rebuttals to his claims.

Len's hobby is wasting time. Your time.

It can all be summed up this way:

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, experience or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, or what evidence a radio
amateur presents, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she
will be the target of Mr.Anderson's diversions, invalid logic, insults,
ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs,
excessive emoticons and/or general infantile behavior."

73 de Jim, N2EY

297. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 15:03:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b90lon$b68$0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 66397

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20030501010057.18769.00000311@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:

>
> > You seem bent on acquiring many more pounds of flesh.
>
> What does that mean?

Seems he's saying he is all vapor...But we already knew that.

298. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 15:05:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503110530.20913.00000477@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66398

>Subject: Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5/3/2003 9:15 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0305030615.3abe1d3e@posting.google.com>

>Even Len, a non-ham, talks more like a ham than you do.

Oh?

I've been involved in Amateur Radio over 30 years now and I have NEVER
heard a Ham talk like Lennie talks, especially ABOUT Amatuer Radio.

Reassess your statement. It was pretty stupid.

Steve, K4YZ

299. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 15:17:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503111707.20913.00000478@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66399

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/3/2003 7:26 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>

>In US amateur radio, Technician Plus Class examinations have always
>required morse code testing. At the same time, the Technician Plus
>Class license numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that
>license class until its being closed to new licenses in April of 2000.

I've sat in on 6 VE sessions in the last 14 months, and we have granted several CSCE's for element 1 only to Techs. I wish there was some VEC-wide survey to make an assessment of how many of these are out there to better assess now many of those "Technicians" are actually "Technician Plus" authorized.

>For proof, we need only look at the growth in US amateur radio for the past
>33
>years:
>
>US Hams:
>
>1970: 270,000
>1980: 350,000
>1990: 514,000
>2000: 680,000
>
>Growth Rate:
>
>1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
>1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
>1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

Uh oh, Jim...You deluged Lennie with facts. Now he's got to spin-up some "mighty morsemen" rant to hopefully bury it.

>It stands to reason that if code testing were an 'unnecessary, arbitrary, and
>distasteful (to many) barriers to entry', those who were interested, but
>dissuaded by those unnecessary barriers would "jump in." when the 'barriers'
>were eliminated. Except that's not what happened, in either absolute number
>of
>hams or percentage growth.

I do believe that you, Dave, Brian, Larry, myself and about another half dozen regulars said this was probably going to be the result of "Restructuring". The only real net gains were in "upgrades", NOT overall new

Amateurs.

73

Steve, K4YZ

300. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 15:26:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503112655.20913.00000479@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66400

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>Date: 5/3/2003 8:19 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b90fl0$ru2$0@208.206.142.105>

>Steve, you sure have nailed that one. In the instant case, Putzie's rant
>about
>the
>LAPD never having had a radiotelegraph station on the national police HF net,
>I offer the following as evidence that he remains just as full of crap as
>ever.
>Cluelessness such as his is almost criminal. He claims knowledge which he
>clearly never had. If he's so wrong in this case, how can he be believable in
>any
>area?

I wish I had kept my collection of "Popular Communications" magazines. I had them from First Issue. Although not the story you quote, they had a historical piece in there about the inter/intra state police nets AND the US's interoperability with INTERPOL on HF, both voice, CW and TELEX/RTTY in the early years. Had several pics of the gear and operators at the operating position using (oh my!) Vibroplex bugs.

Yes, I know Lennie's full of it. He can't avoid it. He was born an idiot, he's lived life as an idiot, now he's wasting away as an idiot, but not before making us all painfully aware that he IS an idiot.

But I guess since he's also a Masochist, he's enjoying his retirement. I can find better things to do myself, than public self-humiliation, however.

73

Steve, K4YZ

301. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 15:28:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503112850.20913.00000480@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66501

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>Date: 5/3/2003 9:01 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030503100113.04580.00000543@mb-m06.aol.com>

>Hey Sissy BoY, dont confuse people, his Callsign is WA8ULX. Look Sissy Boy, I
>think you take this stuff to serious, alot of us just having fun here.

Being a bigot, a liar and a fool are not funny, Bruce. Unfortuantely you
do all three all-too-well.

As for who the sissy is...well, enjoy your fantasies.

Steve.

302. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 17:33:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503133350.21533.00000649@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66503

> Being a bigot, a liar and a fool are not funny, Bruce. Unfortuantely you
>do all three all-too-well.

Damn, you nailed it on the Head, and yes Im damned proud of it. Its a shame
your one of them little PC Sissys.

>As for who the sissy is...well, enjoy your fantasies.
>
>Steve.

No fantasies sissy boy.

303. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 17:36:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503133634.21533.00000650@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66504

>Well, no. You consistently talk like a CBer.

It seems to be the only to talk to you new CBplussers, most of you cant understand anything else.

>Even Len, a non-ham, talks more like a ham than you do.

Hey Brian, are you an Len LOVERS?

304. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 17:37:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503133710.21533.00000651@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66505

>10-4 there good buddy.
>

Hey thats COOL.

305. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 17:38:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503133846.21533.00000652@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66506

>Then keep your CBs hidden, and don't intentionally interfere with your
>neighbor's electronics, which is what prompted my comment.
>

No reason to hide anything, I sold all my HAMcb Junk.

306. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 17:42:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503134233.21533.00000653@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66507

> The only real net gains were in "upgrades", NOT overall new
>Amateurs.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Of course thats the results, did anybody believe the DUMBING DOWN effort was going to attract new Hams, Get real.

307. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 17:51:28 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86u1cb6hr3.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 66508

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Jim" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:

Jim> All depends on the issue. Take the issue of keeping your callsign
Jim> when moving between districts. For hams who move a lot, it can be
Jim> beneficial. For hams who like the idea of being able to tell
Jim> where another ham is just by the callsign, it's not.

Jack> Both sides can be happy here. Come to California and operate
Jack> with "N2EY/6". You can keep your callsign and let hams know
Jack> where you are.

Jim> Two problems with that:

Jim> First, adding the "/6" eliminates most of the advantage of the
Jim> short call. Might as well get a 1x3 or 2x3 6-land call.

I'm happy with my 2x3 2-land call, even as an Extra. If I truly cared
about contesting to the point where I thought my callsign was holding
me back, I'd go from using a key and my ears to a keyer and one of
those handheld MFJ widgets, or maybe straight to a computer. But
that, in my opinion, defeats the purpose. I've only operated in one
contest, and that was last year's Field Day -- and I'll probably
operate this year again with the same group of people because they're
nice people.

Jim> Second, it only works for those working stations who choose to
Jim> add the designator.

Change starts from within. The longest journey begins with a single
step. Whatever metaphor floats your boat.

Jim> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+tAG4GPFSfAB/ezgRAuWeAJ4rTw7HmS4wXVKZoTalOlbrgecRyQCffRuH
0pHSrRBo0UWnxOlkSMREibc=
=iArs
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

308. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 18:18:49 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0305031018.156ff65b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

'X-No-archive: yes'

Hey Irv, speaking of pirate radio stations emanating from Belgrade Lakes, Maine... I have a lot of questions about old man pecker-breath.

Why does the MAN constantly qrm whoever's on frequency when his stupid broadcast comes on? Are you telling me that he can't HEAR 4 or 5 people talking when they're running 1500 watts? He constantly fires up on top of their existing QSO's like the selfish old reprobate he's rumored to be.

And another thing. Does his broadcast NEED to have the worst audio on ham radio? He sounds terrible. Awful! The audio's all pinched up and nasty like a CB set operating off an HO scale model train power supply. Christ, is he really an engineer or is that a lie too?

I don't have anything against homosexuals per se, but can't his co-host tone it down a little? His campy little stories with all their homo-erotic content can be a little nauseating at times. Dinosaurs and K-Y jelly, or whatever it is he goes on and on about week after week... all I'm saying is, it's a little much for prime time, don't you think?

By the way, when did it become legal to broadcast on Amateur Radio. When he asks non-hams if they'd like to become hams, isn't that known as broadcasting to the general public?

And when he tells them to go to his website where you see all kinds of shit from ballcaps, to radio instruction courses, to credit cards and god-knows-what for sale... isn't that what the FCC calls 'pecuniary interest' and isn't that illegal on ham radio?

And what about this Solomon Islands "school" station on his so-called website. That's run by Sam Moron isn't it? Isn't he the dude who supplied all the radio gear to the terrorists in Somalia and Bougainville?

Then there was that bogus taped CQ he ran for hours on 20 meters to attempt to keep the frequency clear from any normal ham who wanted to use the frequency. Can't this guy afford to buy some time on a real short wave station? Why does he think he can bring his Jerry Springer shit to ham radio anyway? Does he really think we want to hear that crap on ham radio?

When is he gonna replace that crappy set of radio shack timers he uses? Did any one tell him that they fail constantly... that his

transmissions start and stop whenever they feel like it? I guess if he had a control operator at the station he'd realize that, huh?

Talk shows - kids shows - dinosaur programs - call-ins from CBer's - what his buddies did ten years ago - that's worthy of a bulletin? I don't thiiiiiiink so!! And WHY is he shamelessly shilling this Joel Farcecloth's whatever... Las Vegas teachers thing he rants about? Since when do we advertise our joint business ventures on ham radio... again, can you say pecuniary interest?

Is he still threatening hams with those stupid Felony Affidavit Complaints or did he finally realize the department of justice only kept them around in case they ran out of toilet paper one day?

Did he really pretend to be affiliated with the UN and get busted by the FEDS for pretending that? What else did he lie about?

I hear the FCC wrote him a long letter asking about all the illegal crap he does and he responded with a freedom of information request! Doesn't he realize there is a whole separate office designated for that and you have to specify what you want and that it COSTS MONEY to get that information!? It's not FREE dumbass! I sure hope my tax dollars aren't going to be paying for research about his unpaid notices of apparent liability.

In my humble opinion it's high time the Feds knocked this A-hole of his cardboard pony and took away his CB set. He's a menace to the hobby as well as anyone with a brain. No wonder a lot of foreigners think Americans are idiots! They must listen to the MAN.

-Chris

309. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 18:29:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66502

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >Flint"
> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> >>According to the book, "Morse Code, The Essential Language" one can
achieve
> >>5wpm in 30 hours of study if an effective study method is chosen. Of
course
> >>some people learn much quicker. My older daughter learned it in a week
> >>spending not more than an hour or so per day. It took me longer but so
> >>what.
> >
> > According to the Armed Forces of the United States, morse
> > code cognition is of such a limited aptitude in the "average"
> > person that they kept a morse code aptitude test in the bank
> > of recruit tests for two decades...1940s on through to at least
> > 1960.
>
> Where is this stated explicitly?
>
> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
the
> recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
The
> required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio
code
> test.

You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm. It's like the difference between
shooting hoops in the back yard or being the next Michael Jordan.

[snip]
>
> For proof, we need only look at the growth in US amateur radio for the
past 33
> years:
>

> US Hams:
>
> 1970: 270,000
> 1980: 350,000
> 1990: 514,000
> 2000: 680,000
>
> Growth Rate:
>
> 1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
> 1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
> 1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

Thanks for the data. I was born in 1950. The overall US population has increased roughly 50% since then. Yet the number of hams has tripled since then. Certainly sounds like growth in hamdom to me.

>
> Oddly enough, percentage growth slowed down after the introduction of code test
> waivers and the Tech lost its code test. The total net growth in the '90s was
> almost exactly the same as in the '80s, even though the US population was
> larger.
>
>
> As a percentage of the total US population:
>
> Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams
> 1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
> 1980: 227 million 350,000 0.154%
> 1990: 249 million 514,000 0.206%
> 2000: 281 million 680,000 0.242%
>
> US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052% in
> the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s. So the growth slowed down after the
> introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test.

Again excellent data, proving that ham radio is growing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

310. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that ....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 18:54:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB4107D.1050407@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66510
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

David Robbins wrote:
> The ORIGINAL message which I posted went to only one group, then you guys
> started using it to call each other names... not a good reflection on either
> hams or truckers depending on which group you are from.

Thats how all rrap threads end up - people calling each other names. I think its in the group charter that no message can stay on topic for more than 3 posts!

- Mike KB3EIA -

311. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 18:56:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB410F7.2080309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66511

Dave Heil wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>>a PROFESSIONAL. :-) :-)
>>
>> A professional what?
>
>
> We cant' be sure. He performs services for money.

Someone is paying him to annoy us? Whoever it is is getting their money's worth! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

312. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 19:08:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD98BF2.19CEF%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66512

"N2EY" wrote:

> Sorry, Dwight, I thought you knew how Len behaves here.
>
> You have done an admirable job of responding to his
> lengthy and mistake-ridden posts, without stooping to
> his level. Good job.
>
> You invited his wrath by committing the dual sins of
> disagreeing with him and providing solid factual
> rebuttals to his claims.
>
> Len's hobby is wasting time. Your time. (snip)

Ah, I see. As I said, I've never really paid that much attention before. I'm sure I've posted messages to threads he has been involved in, but don't remember ever having an extended discussion (at least not one like this anyway). Lets just say I certainly won't have one with him again. I don't mind an extended discussion occasionally (especially if it means something to me), but I don't have time for nonsense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

313. Re: Hot Amateur Teen Strips! Series 1/10

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 19:24:19 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3EB41763.57211408@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 66513

numskull@imtoosexy.com wrote:
>
> For more awsome free amateur teen pics check out
http://www.fnphost.com/sites/TastyAmateurTeens/
> (100% FREE)
>
> [Image]

FINALLY! rec.radio.amateur.policy has redeeming and interesting content.

Those ARRL interns are HOT! But where is photo number two?

314. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 19:29:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD98FBE.19CF1%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66514

"Jack Twilley" wrote:
>
> Mike> I don't do public service because:
>
> * I don't have a good location.
> I have yet to get my HF rig to work at home due
> to interference and being stuck in a narrow
> valley between two high ridges. My wife chose
> the apartment before we got married and she's
> not a ham.
>
> * I don't have good equipment.
> My VHF stuff is limited to running xastir on
> a 5W HT. A bit more money and time, and I'll
> have a good APRS station that can run off
> battery for 48hrs, but that's not now.
>
> * I don't have any training.
> I haven't yet spent the time or the money to
> take the ARRL courses or to work with local
> volunteers on ARES and RACES operations.
>
> Luckily for me, all three of those problems
> can be solved over the course of a year or
> two, given enough stability in the rest of my
> life. Maybe I'll have a different answer
> next year.

In the meantime, why don't you try public service that doesn't involve your home or complex equipment? Many organizations (the Red Cross, etc) have just as much, perhaps more, need for ham operators in the field. Perhaps your local civil defense office uses hams on location (most do). Though not exactly ham radio related, other organizations (the USCGA, CAP, etc) have a need for people with radio skills to operate their equipment or equipment in other radio services. Many organizations offer their own training, either on the job or through some type of course work. If time is the issue, talk to the various organizations. Most don't make huge demands on their volunteers.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

315. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 19:39:01 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3EB41AD5.FB5555F1@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 66515
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Chris wrote:
====

>Path: hermes.visi.com!nycmny1-snh1.gtei.net!news.gtei.net!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!newsfeed.s
tanford.edu!postnews1.google.com!not-for-mail
>From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com (Chris)
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.shortwave,
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest
>Subject: Re: K1MAN is back !!
>Date: 3 May 2003 11:18:49 -0700
>Organization: http://groups.google.com/
>Message-ID: <634e00e4.0305031018.156ff65b@posting.google.com>
>References: <b8f7u6bbu1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
<634e00e4.0304270557.2662b0e@posting.google.com> <b8hdc0oco0@pita.alt.net>
<634e00e4.0305010517.1ec4a8bc@posting.google.com>
>NNTP-Posting-Host: 24.53.187.90
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
>X-Trace: posting.google.com 1051985929 20545 127.0.0.1 (3 May 2003 18:18:49 GMT)
>X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
>NNTP-Posting-Date: 3 May 2003 18:18:49 GMT

>'X-No-archive: yes'

Oops!

>Hey Irv, speaking of pirate radio stations emanating from Belgrade
>Lakes, Maine... I have a lot of questions about old man pecker-breath.

>Why does the MAN constantly qrm whoever's on frequency when his stupid
>broadcast comes on? Are you telling me that he can't HEAR 4 or 5
>people talking when they're running 1500 watts? He constantly fires up
>on top of their existing QSO's like the selfish old reprobate he's
>rumored to be.

>And another thing. Does his broadcast NEED to have the worst audio on
>ham radio? He sounds terrible. Awful! The audio's all pinched up and
>nasty like a CB set operating off an HO scale model train power
>supply. Christ, is he really an engineer or is that a lie too?

>I don't have anything against homosexuals per se, but can't his
>co-host tone it down a little? His campy little stories with all their
>homo-erotic content can be a little nauseating at times. Dinosaurs and
>K-Y jelly, or whatever it is he goes on and on about week after
>week... all I'm saying is, it's a little much for prime time, don't

>you think?

>By the way, when did it become legal to broadcast on Amateur Radio.
>When he asks non-hams if they'd like to become hams, isn't that known
>as broadcasting to the general public?

>And when he tells them to go to his website where you see all kinds of
>shit from ballcaps, to radio instruction courses, to credit cards and
>god-knows-what for sale... isn't that what the FCC calls 'pecuniary
>interest' and isn't that illegal on ham radio?

>And what about this Solomon Islands "school" station on his so-called
>website. That's run by Sam Moron isn't it? Isn't he the dude who
>supplied all the radio gear to the terrorists in Somalia and
>Bougainville?

>Then there was that bogus taped CQ he ran for hours on 20 meters to
>attempt to keep the frequency clear from any normal ham who wanted to
>use the frequency. Can't this guy afford to buy some time on a real
>short wave station? Why does he think he can bring his Jerry Springer
>shit to ham radio anyway? Does he really think we want to hear that
>crap on ham radio?

>When is he gonna replace that crappy set of radio shack timers he
>uses? Did any one tell him that they fail constantly... that his
>transmissions start and stop whenever they feel like it? I guess if he
>had a control operator at the station he'd realize that, huh?

>Talk shows - kids shows - dinosaur programs - call-ins from CBer's -
>what his buddies did ten years ago - that's worthy of a bulletin? I
>don't thiiiiiiink so!! And WHY is he shamelessly shilling this Joel
>Farcecloth's whatever... Las Vegas teachers thing he rants about?
>Since when do we advertise our joint business ventures on ham radio...
>again, can you say pecuniary interest?

>Is he still threatening hams with those stupid Felony Affidavit
>Complaints or did he finally realize the department of justice only
>kept them around in case they ran out of toilet paper one day?

>Did he really pretend to be affiliated with the UN and get busted by
>the FEDS for pretending that? What else did he lie about?

>I hear the FCC wrote him a long letter asking about all the illegal
>crap he does and he responded with a freedom of information request!
>Doesn't he realize there is a whole separate office designated for
>that and you have to specify what you want and that it COSTS MONEY to
>get that information!? It's not FREE dumbass! I sure hope my tax
>dollars aren't going to be paying for research about his unpaid
>notices of apparent liability.

>In my humble opinion it's high time the Feds knocked this A-hole of
>his cardboard pony and took away his CB set. He's a menace to the
>hobby as well as anyone with a brain. No wonder a lot of foreigners

>think Americans are idiots! They must listen to the MAN.

>-Chris

316. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:17:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503171710.04615.00000794@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66516

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 5/3/2003 1:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@

>> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
>the
>> recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
>The
>> required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio
>code
>> test.
>
>You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
>people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
>could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm. It's like the difference between
>shooting hoops in the back yard or being the next Michael Jordan.

The USMC was still aptitude testing for Morse Code aptitude as late as September 1974...This I know since I had to sit through a battery of tests in the third or fourth week of that month for that very thing.

My entire training series (four platoons, specifically Series 2100, of which I belonged to Platoon 2100) was taught E, T, S and O. "Training" lasted about 30 minutes. They didn't tell us how fast they were sending the letters, but it wa at least 10WPM.

Myself and eight others were singled out and the rest of the series went on to other things. Myself and one other fellow were already licensed as Amatuers. He and I were tested seperately. I maintained 100% copy up to 18WPM. I was getting nervous by then and started to choke on the 25WPM, but still had 90% copy. My performance was "less than adequate" at 30, but I think the examiner was just jerking us around for grins-and-giggles.

It was enough that I was offered an MOS in "cryptography" after boot camp with unspecified "post training" benefits. I declined, my heart set on Avionics.

I ran into the other fellow about 5 or 6 years later. He took the option. Good for him since he HAD been slated for infantry! On the day he was promoted to Sergeant, he was "discharged", re-sworn and put on the bars of a Warrant Officer! He never wore those Sergeant stripes, but he retired as a Mustang Captain.

Ya pays yer money and takes yer chances!

73

Steve, K4YZ

317. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:19:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503171945.04615.00000795@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66517

>Subject: Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/3/2003 1:54 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EB4107D.1050407@adelphia.net>

>Thats how all rrap threads end up - people calling each other names. I
>think its in the group charter that no message can stay on topic for
>more than 3 posts!

You're right, and I realized that I have missed you, so I will call you
names too...

MIKE MIKE MIKE MIKE MIKE ! ! ! !

There! That will teach YOU to be a nice guy, huh...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

318. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:36:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503173631.18769.00000419@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66520

In article <20030503105308.18759.00000578@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> I actually GOT all that RTTY experience and GOT one patent.
>
>All in the past, Len, all in the past. That sort of RTTY is long obsolete and
>the patent expired more than a decade ago.

All those Teletype Corporation all-mechanical teleprinters were obsolete by the time they had made a MILLION of them. No problem. They all got replaced by faster, better ways to send written data. Teletype Corporation tried to keep their old ways going with the Model 40 series of combination electronic and mechanical teleprinters...but they eventually stopped those, too. It's called progress, Jimmie.

I don't really know if my single radio patent was renewed or not. It was assigned to RCA Corporation. RCA Corporation was purchased by General Electric about the time the 17 years were up. I have no knowledge of whether or not GE renewed it for a new term. Do you?

>You live in the past too much.

Hardly. Radio as a communications medium is only 107 years old. You keep touting morse code all the time and morse code was first used in 1844, 159 years ago.

You seem to be posting out of spite. I did HF radio communications operations, maintenance, supervision for two full years in the 1950s, did microwave radio communications operations, maintenance, supervision for another year following that. Big station, many thousands of messages per month. Yes, HF radio as a primary communications medium DID go out of date. So did the old 60 WPM teleprinters. In fact, the whole Army, then USAF HF radio station was closed down in 1978 and land, buildings given back to the Japanese.

Long-distance communications for commercial and government communications is now done via fiber-optic cable or satellite relay. Fast, efficient, much more reliable. Radio amateurs still stick to HF bands for the majority of their communications, the same as what others did a half century ago.

Since the 1950s I've communicated by 100 WPM mechanical teleprinters, electronic text transmission means at speeds from 300 BPS on up to 56,000 BPS, even done very slow

data rates...plus operating several different protocol facsimile machines, sending-receiving television (industrial slow-scan, NTSC video, HDTV video) over RF. I haven't done AMTOR or PSK31 on HF, only a form of PACTOR at 2400 BPS via HF. Not a problem. As the new forms of communication came out, I got to use most of them.

I didn't sit back and rest on morse code use glory in only amateur radio as you APPEAR to do, Jimmie.

>So? Do you think no one else here has a patent?

Kellie has ONE patent for a bearing that does not need lubrication. A Delphion search doesn't show any "Miccolis" patent. Cecil Moore had several patents in electronics, but Cecil got tired of all the PCTA bullshit and went to another newsgroup. I recall Jim Kelley claiming a patent on some golf-related thing but I never searched for that to examine it.

Do YOU have a patent?

Have YOU published any paper in a professional association or academic institution publication? If so, when and where?

The IEEE History Center keeps asking for historical information on electronics in general. That would be a good place to get the recognition you seek. IEEE stands for Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (I'm a Life Member) but they aren't fussy about being an IEEE member in order to get published. IEEE is a professional organization. Since you claim to work as an electrical engineer (someplace), you've got an easy set of entry requirements.

There's also the Radio Club of America, a membership organization open to all involved now or then in radio. It was formed in 1909 (5 year before ARRL) and still exists. You can get more details on their website. That website has a number of other papers and documents about early radio history, biographies of notables (Ed Armstrong for one). It is not affiliated with RCA Corporation that was purchased by General Electric.

There's also several firms around the USA that print books privately (without going through book publishers) on any subject (including electronics). You can find their names and addresses in the annual Writer's Guide, writing magazines, even through the Internet. Of course, you have to pay ALL expenses on self-publishing.

There are many and varied venues for Papers of great signifcance. Go for it!

319. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:36:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503173632.18769.00000420@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66518

In article <20030503105308.18759.00000578@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>> You've just not had that much
>> experience anywhere with the newer networks, won't do the
>> math to do an honest comparison.
>
>How do you know? You claim an awful lot about my experience and knowledge.

All us readers can see is that you are deliberately vague about
what you've done, where you've worked, or all the claimed
expirience. Very vague.

>> Don't try that "MSEE snow
>> job" again about "knowing better."
>
>Your degree is from what accredited institution? What date is on your
>diploma?

It was from an accredited institution in the Southern California
area.

The date is from the last millenium.

I've told you as much as you've told everyone else about where
you work or your work experience. :-)

>>You haven't shown anything
>> of newer techniques, only new snow.
>
>You haven't shown anyhting other than references to the OLD work of others.

Oh? The year 1998 is "old?" :-)

>> You seem bent on acquiring many more pounds of flesh.
>
>What does that mean?

Poor baby. Doesn't know common American idioms. Tsk.

It means you HAVE to "get even" in a discussion, no matter
how or where. You MUST win. :-)

320. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:36:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503173634.18769.00000421@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66522

In article <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>>>According to the book, "Morse Code, The Essential Language" one can achieve
>>>5wpm in 30 hours of study if an effective study method is chosen. Of course
>>>some people learn much quicker. My older daughter learned it in a week
>>>spending not more than an hour or so per day. It took me longer but so
>>>what.
>>
>> According to the Armed Forces of the United States, morse
>> code cognition is of such a limited aptitude in the "average"
>> person that they kept a morse code aptitude test in the bank
>> of recruit tests for two decades...1940s on through to at least
>> 1960.
>
>Where is this stated explicitly?

In the US Army it is contained in an "AR" (Army Regulation) which has
long been out of date and eliminated from any current regulations. I
saw it and discussed it with Captain William Boss, then the Officer
in Charge of the ADA Transmitter station (and then a licensed US
radio amateur). The morse code aptitude test was discussed in an
informal discussion between two US Army commissioned officers
at the Far East Command Headquarters in Pershing Heights area
of Tokyo about 1954 after my general query to one of them (while on
official duties requiring my visit to FEC Hq).

>
>The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find the
>recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required. The
>required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio code
>test.

Miccolis should state his own personal experiences on US
military recruit testing as well as his US military experience
in communications of any sort.

Miccolis has NO such experience, hasn't seen an AR, didn't
even fall under the Uniform Code of Military Justice at any time..

>> A better question, more related to "saving the Novice Class
>> license" title of this thread is WHY have a morse code test
>> at all?
>
>Many reasons have been given on both sides of the debate. They all boil down
>to opinions.
>>
>> In US amateur radio, Novice Class examinations have always
>> required morse code testing. At the same time, the Novice
>> Class license numbers have steadily decreased for years.
>
>In US amateur radio, Technician Plus Class examinations have always
>required morse code testing. At the same time, the Technician Plus
>Class license numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that
>license class until its being closed to new licenses in April of 2000.

Do not try to misdirect on "Technician Plus" testing. The "debate"
was on the NOVICE CLASS.

If you must misdirect, try the pre-restructuring no-code Technician
Class. You don't. That will show you quite a different picture.

>In US amateur radio, Extra Class examinations have always
>required morse code testing. At the same time, the Extral Class license
>numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that license class.

Irrelevant. Misdirection. The discussion started with the
Novice Class. Try to stay in focus.

That still doesn't "explain" why the morse code test must
continue to exist.

>> The decrease in license numbers was so much and for so
>> long that it was obvious to all who bothered to examine that
>> Class. The FCC dropped the Novice Class from any new
>> license grants following the recent restructuring.
>
>The FCC also dropped the Technician Plus and Advanced Class from any new
>license grants in the same restructuring.

Irrelevant again. More misdirection. The thread was on the
NOVICE class. Look at the Subject title line. Try to focus.

>> Another question, again more suited to the subject thread,
>> is WHY "save" the Novice Class?
>
>There's no clear reason to save it, because the Technician and Techncian Plus
>classes of license have been the choice of most new US radio amateurs since
>the 1980s.

Where is that stated explicitly? ARRL statements?

ARRL statements for several years prior to 1991 did not
think so...they were pushing the NOVICE Class as the

"entry" license. They continued to do that for several
years following.

>> The only US amateur radio license class that kept growth in
>> US amateur radio license totals was the no-code-test
>> Technician Class.
>
>Incorrect.

Sorry. VERY CORRECT. Two hundred thousand NEW
no-code Technician Class licenses between 1991 and
mid-2000 make you very wrong.

>The above 'alternate history' statement assumes that none of those who
obtained
>Technician Class licenses after February 1991 would have done so if that
>license had not lost its code test. That is clearly incorrect.

Supposition fantasy. You cannot possibly know the motivations
of two hundred thousand no-code Technican Class licensees.

>It stands to reason that if code testing were an 'unnecessary, arbitrary, and
>distasteful (to many) barriers to entry', those who were interested, but
>dissuaded by those unnecessary barriers would "jump in." when the 'barriers'
>were eliminated. Except that's not what happened, in either absolute number of
>hams or percentage growth. Growth in total hams was almost exactly the same
>during the '90s, compared to the '80s, and the percentage growth actually
>dropped.

No, you are too far into supposition fantasy. Two hundred thousand
licensees wrong.

That PCTA argument has become a trite, worn-out cliche' of no
logical value.

That old horse has been beaten to death so many times over that
no skeleton is left to bleach in the sun.

The ACTUAL growth has been discussed over and over again in here
prior to the restructuring data. You've been shown the numbers.
You want to discount the evidence, turn a blind eye to it, all to
support your obstinate need for winning an argument at any cost.

>Since the closing of the Technician Plus to new licenses in April 2000, FCC
has
>been renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician, causing the latter
>class to grow and the former to shrink.

Where is this explicitly stated?

Did you download the entire FCC database of amateur radio licensees
for several years and do your own sorting and totalizing? Or did you
take someone else's statements as truth?

Why do you accept some statements as truth and others as false?
The answer seems clear. A double standard. Statements from
pro-code supporters are "truth" while statements from no-code
advocates are "false." Tsk, tsk...hypocritical.

Try to stay in focus. The subject thread in the message header says
explicitly "Novice Class." It doesn't say Technician Plus or Technician
or Extra. Don't wander so far afield.

The NOVICE CLASS license numbers had been steadily dropping
for years before the mid-2000 close of new NOVICE CLASS
license grants.

321. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:36:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503173636.18769.00000422@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66519

In article <b90fl0$ru2$0@208.206.142.105>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

[referencing an old newsgroup argument dating from about 1998 (?) which
Carroll has not given in here until now, 3 May 2003...]

>-----------------------
> The 1945 issue of the Associated Police Communications Officers Handbook
>shows Los Angles PD as operating *TWO* licensed radiotelegraph stations on the
>Interstate Police HF net, with the call letters of KGPL and KGHX. At that time
they
>were the ONLY radiotelegraph stations in the state of California which were on
the
>net . CHP Sacremento is shown as having wireline teletype service only, and
they
>received relayed traffic off the radiotlegraph net from LAPD!

That may be interesting to morsemen as a historical document but
1945 was 58 years ago. Many different radio services used manual
(morse) telegraphy in that past time. There is no dispute over that.

<snip of copying of details of the APCO document>

> End of quoted material----From
> "The National Police Communications Network Directory, Sixth Edition, 1951
page 7.
> Compiled by the Associated Police Communications Officers. APCO directory
>committee, 18108 Strasburg, Detroit, Michigan."
>-------------------------
>
> THAT comes from the horses *mouth*, not the other end (Len).
>-------------------------
>
> So there you have it, hard evidence of just one of his many intransigences.

Not quite "hard evidence." "Hard evidence" would be the document itself.
This newsgroup is not a court of law.

Carroll seems to be hunting for many "pounds of flesh" and is quite
late with this "evidence," nearly five years from the original dispute.

Nearly five years ago, at the beginning of this newsgroup episode,
I stopped by a North Hollywood LAPD Division station and
requested public information on older communications methods
used by the LAPD. I was politely and graciously given a lot of
such information...along with website addresses then just
beginning by ex-LAPD and ex-CHP members on the subject of

communications by police departments. On some details I was filled in (on interdepartmental phone) from someone at the Piper Technical Center in the center city area of LA (Piper Center is a large technical facility for other PDs as well as LAPD).

The essence of the information was that the LAPD used teleprinters and some facsimile types for all written or printed electronic communications since the 1950s. The written communications type, with same material at both communications link ends was explained as necessary to avoid certain legal problems in the courts later. [avoidance of "technicalities" court disputes later on various cases]

It was also noted by the LAPD personnel that "telegraphy" is a general term that applies both to manual (morse) telegraphy and teleprinters. I already knew this but did not remark on it. As far as I was able to determine in a single visit, there was no historical information available on any manual telegraphy means, nets, or radio use by the LAPD after the WW2 years. One had "heard about it" before 1941 but there was no "hard evidence" readily available. There may have been some someplace. Such was just not handy and available.

I was briefly shown some of the in-use communications for written communications, described as "old" by LAPD personnel: Teletype Corporation ASR-33, a 1970-era Facsimile set upgraded to modern comm protocol using the carbon-paper transfer method for "wirephotos"...they still used that old term...a couple of line printers with adapters to avoid having to use PCs for interfacing, the newer mobile terminal base stations for communications with data terminals in patrol cars, PC arrangements to tie into the CHP network (mobile base connected directly to that on electronic demand for "wants and warrants"), a lot of PCs in various cubicles for both interdepartment, interagency restricted-use comm as well as Internet access. There was no evidence of any manual telegraphy equipment anywhere, not even a gold-plated manual key used as a paperweight (once seen in a US Army office).

>MUCH of which he speaks he has NO knowledge.

I freely admit to not having any hands-on life experience prior to 1952 of any large communications networks anywhere in any radio or wired communications services, civilian or government.

I visited one LAPD Division station and talked to three LAPD personnel for the information and was shown considerable communications resources that were working then about 5 years ago. Anyone could do this. I posted an 800 number as well as a local telephone number to the LAPD Public Relations that anyone could query for additional information.

Despite all the quotes from OLD documents (1951 is 52 years in the past) about the efficacy of manual morse code telegraphy, such manual telegraphy IS NOT USED NOW BY ANY POLICE DEPARTMENT. It didn't survive, it wasn't useful enough compared to more modern, more efficient methods.

All the crying, moaning, shouts, and imprecations about the wonderfulness of morse code will NOT bring it back to any sort of prominence. That includes temper tantrums and quoting documents that are over a half century old, the quoting done nearly 5 years after a disagreement began.

Put it to rest, Carroll.

322. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:36:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66521

In article <20030503020601.08218.00000542@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Powerful Marine Syndrome [PMS] Sufferer Steamy Stalker) writes:

Tsk, tsk, tsk...poor guy has not only "PMS" but decides to cross-
dress in messages thinking he is an equivalent to a female... :-)

>>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>>>We all get caught up in his arguments when we first land here. But it
>>>>doesn't take any of us long to realize that he has no valid arguments. He
>>>>prefers to take everything off to totally unrelated tangents.
>
>>There shall be NO arguments against the Established Order.
>
> Seems to me the Lady's got you pegged, Putzy One.

Not really. Dee is a proponent of the Established Order in
US amateur radio, namely that Standards and Practices in
US amateur radio are fixed to that of the 1930s when morse
code was king and ARRL was the overgovernment of amateur
radio.

>>Dee represents the Established Order
>
> Hmmmmmmm...I don't remember seeing Dee's name on any ballot. I'd vote
>for her though if it did.

"Established Order" is a concept, a fantasy promulgated by ARRL
to all the Faithful, a belief in self-righteousness despite ignorance
of the much larger reality of the entire radio world.

There is NO "ballot," only a Belief System all about some fantasy
of a self-contained amateur activity all alone that boasts of its
mighty exploits as if it is the ultimate ruler of radio and technology
involving radio.

>>All arguments against the Established Order are therefore invalid.
>
> No, just the irrational, emotional, falsehood-based rants of former
>radio technicians who think they were engineers.

What about those former electronic technicians who actually
ARE electronic engineers, have the demonstrated capability
and the experience and the accreditation and continue in that
endeavor? That is my category.

Robeson, the Steamy Stalker, has NO experience whatsoever
in any professional electronic engineering. He has one short

period of claimed employment as a purchasing agent for a local electronics firm whose products are mostly for the wired communications product trade. For the rest of his "experience," he can only point to "30 years as a ham" and some vague references to some kind of USMC avionics supposedly done in a military career cut short by a claimed military accident with resulting Medical Discharge termination.

The Steamy Stalker has absolutely NO basis for any of his charges, but his lack of emotional stability and lack of ability to get along with others of opposing views prompts him to insult all who disagree with him.

> That would be you, Lennie.

Here's a partial listing of past "commentary" by the Stalker -

1. I've given a very short listing of past employers in here. The Stalker howled and raged something about "CV" [Latin initials for "curriculum vitae" or facts of total life experience]. He did not check any of those references in any way, made a number of inferences that such were "lies" even though a number of different government agencies, IRS among them, were very convinced such employment was truth.

2. I've given references to living US radio amateurs who know me personally (one was Best Man at my wedding). No one, certainly not the Stalker, seems to have contacted them for any confirmation. In essence, he simply ignored such references.

3. I've digitized my First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial) Operator License first received in 1956, including the reverse side showing the radio and television stations worked at that year and duties, written in handwriting by the Chief Engineers at those stations...and sent those by e-mail SEVERAL TIMES to the Stalker. He refused to acknowledge them, claiming all were some kind of "lie" due to an unfortunate accident that attached the wrong image on the first sending.

4. The Stalker then made up a libelous "homepage" on AOL which was a prima facie bit of personal insult easily evidenciary of libelous behavior in any civil court. AOL removed that immediately as well as his equally-libelous new screen name when notified.

5. The Stalker tried to manufacture some kind of "case" of "cowardice" about my US Army Signal Corps duties and location, repeatedly refering to my military occupation specialty as "rear area radio clerk." He continued to do so despite my pointing out what they really were, explicit details of duties and responsibility which were not only referencible through government archives but were witnessed

by a still-living radio amateur who was assigned to the same
unit and military radio station and who did the same duty.
The Stalker has not made any explicit details of his own
military service and "battle experience/heroism" other than
the vague generality of "seven hostile actions."

6. In my 14 pages of text on my Reply to Comments (of another)
on FCC NPRM 98-143 (received and made public record on
13 January 1999), Robeson sent a single paragraph (on the
public record of 25 January 1999, past the stated cut-off date)
that I should be deprived of any consideration on Restructuring.
In essence, he was so enraged by newsgroup messaging on
the code test issue that he had to carry this to an extreme.
Such an action was little more than more bullying tactics
that would have deprived a US citizen and military veteran of
exercising his Constitutional Rights (First Amendment to the
US Constitution).

> "Pedantic Parson"..."Herr Oberst"...."Jackbooted thug"..."elitist
>Morsemen"..."Dill Sergeant"...All various "nicknames" bestowed on licensed
>Radio Amateurs who happen to disagree with Lennie.

Only after those same individuals used similar nicknames, false
accusations, and personal insults to me FIRST.

The Stalker's behavior is that of the schoolyard bully who thinks
that he is can, by force or other means, do anything he wants
but cannot take the same sort of commentary back. He cannot
"play the game" by any rules other than his own.

The Stalker's sociopathic behavior is that of domination by any
means. He cannot debate and lose gracefully, he must vent
his self-righteous anger in public, lose control, and thereby
cast a negative image on himself and that of US amateur radio.
He needs both mental guidance and therapy.

323. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 21:38:00 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <vb8dloo0b46re2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 66523

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030502224238.18771.00000273@mb-m23.aol.com:

> Vince:
>
> I'll take it one step further. I say retroactively cancel all new or
> upgraded licenses granted since 4/15/00, and apply the previous,
> Post-Restructuring licensing standards to whomever cares to re-apply
> for their ham license.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Hey... Now why didn't I think of that? Too bad the ARRL won't agree.
Guess they're more concerned with the corporate bottom line, and not the
good of the service.

KB7ADL

324. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 22:10:39 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@KingOftheJammers.net>
Message-ID: <b91ep5$4rr$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

What is your sick obsession with MAN?

Herb

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305031018.156ff65b@posting.google.com...
> 'X-No-archive: yes'
>
>
> Hey Irv, speaking of pirate radio stations emanating from Belgrade
> Lakes, Maine... I have a lot of questions about old man pecker-breath.
>
> Why does the MAN constantly qrm whoever's on frequency when his stupid
> broadcast comes on? Are you telling me that he can't HEAR 4 or 5
> people talking when they're running 1500 watts? He constantly fires up
> on top of their existing QSO's like the selfish old reprobate he's
> rumored to be.
>
> And another thing. Does his broadcast NEED to have the worst audio on
> ham radio? He sounds terrible. Awful! The audio's all pinched up and
> nasty like a CB set operating off an HO scale model train power
> supply. Christ, is he really an engineer or is that a lie too?
>
> I don't have anything against homosexuals per se, but can't his
> co-host tone it down a little? His campy little stories with all their
> homo-erotic content can be a little nauseating at times. Dinosaurs and
> K-Y jelly, or whatever it is he goes on and on about week after
> week... all I'm saying is, it's a little much for prime time, don't
> you think?
>
> By the way, when did it become legal to broadcast on Amateur Radio.
> When he asks non-hams if they'd like to become hams, isn't that known
> as broadcasting to the general public?
>
> And when he tells them to go to his website where you see all kinds of
> shit from ballcaps, to radio instruction courses, to credit cards and
> god-knows-what for sale... isn't that what the FCC calls 'pecuniary
> interest' and isn't that illegal on ham radio?
>
> And what about this Solomon Islands "school" station on his so-called
> website. That's run by Sam Moron isn't it? Isn't he the dude who
> supplied all the radio gear to the terrorists in Somalia and
> Bougainville?
>

> Then there was that bogus taped CQ he ran for hours on 20 meters to
> attempt to keep the frequency clear from any normal ham who wanted to
> use the frequency. Can't this guy afford to buy some time on a real
> short wave station? Why does he think he can bring his Jerry Springer
> shit to ham radio anyway? Does he really think we want to hear that
> crap on ham radio?
>
> When is he gonna replace that crappy set of radio shack timers he
> uses? Did any one tell him that they fail constantly... that his
> transmissions start and stop whenever they feel like it? I guess if he
> had a control operator at the station he'd realize that, huh?
>
> Talk shows - kids shows - dinosaur programs - call-ins from CBer's -
> what his buddies did ten years ago - that's worthy of a bulletin? I
> don't thiiiiiiink so!! And WHY is he shamelessly shilling this Joel
> Farcecloth's whatever... Las Vegas teachers thing he rants about?
> Since when do we advertise our joint business ventures on ham radio...
> again, can you say pecuniary interest?
>
> Is he still threatening hams with those stupid Felony Affidavit
> Complaints or did he finally realize the department of justice only
> kept them around in case they ran out of toilet paper one day?
>
> Did he really pretend to be affiliated with the UN and get busted by
> the FEDS for pretending that? What else did he lie about?
>
> I hear the FCC wrote him a long letter asking about all the illegal
> crap he does and he responded with a freedom of information request!
> Doesn't he realize there is a whole separate office designated for
> that and you have to specify what you want and that it COSTS MONEY to
> get that information!? It's not FREE dumbass! I sure hope my tax
> dollars aren't going to be paying for research about his unpaid
> notices of apparent liability.
>
> In my humble opinion it's high time the Feds knocked this A-hole of
> his cardboard pony and took away his CB set. He's a menace to the
> hobby as well as anyone with a brain. No wonder a lot of foreigners
> think Americans are idiots! They must listen to the MAN.
>
> -Chris

325. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 22:27:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503182717.18770.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66525

In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>> >Flint"
>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
>>the
>> recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
>>The
>> required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio
>>code test.
>
>You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
>people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
>could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm.

Goes way beyond even that, Dee. Some typical skills needed (and tested):

- Ability to copy both plain language and code groups correctly at various
speeds with not more than a certain (very low) number of errors per hour.
- Ability to "put it on paper" using both a manual typewriter or pencil.
- Ability to send highly readable code using either straight key or bug.
- Ability to adjust, troubleshoot, operate and repair a wide variety of types
of radio equipment
- Ability to do all of the above for long periods of time and under "difficult"
conditions

>It's like the difference between
>shooting hoops in the back yard or being the next Michael Jordan.

Excellent comparison!

I would say:

It's like the difference between finishing in the lead pack of the Boston
Marathon and being able to jog a mile on a track in less than 12 minutes.
>
>[snip]
>>

>> For proof, we need only look at the growth in US amateur radio for the
>> past 33 years:
>>
>> US Hams:
>>
>> 1970: 270,000
>> 1980: 350,000
>> 1990: 514,000
>> 2000: 680,000
>>
>> Growth Rate:
>>
>> 1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
>> 1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
>> 1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)
>
>Thanks for the data.

You're welcome, Dee.

>I was born in 1950. The overall US population has
>increased roughly 50% since then. Yet the number of hams has tripled since
>then.

Actually, the number of hams in the USA back in 1950 was a little less than
100,000. That means US hamdom has grown by 6.85 times since then!

> Certainly sounds like growth in hamdom to me.

Yup. The growth has sped up and slowed down over the years, but always the end
result has been long-term growth.

Consider this bit of "ancient" history:

From 1950 to 1962, US ham totals grew from just under 100,000 to about 250,000.
Then in 1963 the growth stopped dead, and the number of US hams stagnated at
about quarter million for more than 5 years. In fact, the totals actually
dropped slightly.

In 1969 the growth started up again and continued throught the '70s, as the
numbers above show. The changes now known as "incentive licensing" went into
effect near the end of 1968. Despite predictions that those changes would spell
the end of amateur radio, the opposite happened.

Cause and effect? Who knows?
>
>> Oddly enough, percentage growth slowed down after the introduction of code
>>test
>> waivers and the Tech lost its code test. The total net growth in the '90s
>>was
>> almost exactly the same as in the '80s, even though the US population was
>> larger.
>>

>> As a percentage of the total US population:
>>
>> Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams
>> 1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
>> 1980: 227 million 350,000 0.154%
>> 1990: 249 million 514,000 0.206%
>> 2000: 281 million 680,000 0.242%
>>
>> US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052%
>in
>> the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s. So the growth slowed down after the
>> introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test.
>
>Again excellent data, proving that ham radio is growing.
>
Thanks.

What would have happened without code waivers and the dropping of the 5 wpm code test from the Tech in 1991? Nobody really knows, despite claims to the contrary by some. The trend of previous years show that amateur radio in the USA probably would have continued to grow.

73 de Jim, N2EY

326. Re: Oxyendine Alert

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 22:37:25 UTC
From: uberfems 32 <uberfem52@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eb4449b@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66526

"Bobby Joe" <BJ@bjtruckercbtrans.org> wrote in message
news:b90eoc$q2f$0@pita.alt.net...
> Are you still wearing your tin-foil hat when
> around radios?
>
> BJ

No longer necessary as Art Bell
is no longer on late nite radio.
His replacementon CtoC AM however reminds me
of Ned Flanders. (the guy who is Homer Simpson's neighbor)

327. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-03 23:38:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hebvkt2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66527

On Fri, 02 May 2003 23:14:14 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:

>> But....I have been involved with most phases of Emergency Comm since Ive
>> been a ham. Over 40 years.

As I have been.

At present I check into the daily District ARES net and the
weekly County ARES/RACES net, attend planning meetings where I
serve as the frequency coordinator, and assist in training new
hams in what to do and how to do it.

My "call-out" position is with the local hospital - a major
metropolitan medical center - where we have hospital-owned
equipment in place for 144, 220, and 440 voice and packet at an
operating position in their "command post". Another operator
brings in his own equipment to provide SSTV capability. We
monitor and operate on both the County ARES/RACES net and a
separate area-wide inter-hospital ARES net and have simplex
capability to pass traffic if the repeater(s) go down. The
County EOC maintains HF and VHF contact with the state EOC, 70
miles away.

And that's for "disaster" work. Our local club has a very
active program of providing "public service" communication
(either primary or backup) for things like bicycle charity
rides and civic festivals and we cooperate with other cluns in
their similar activities.

> Great! Good to see more people in here who take civic responsibility.

I didn't answer the question the first time around because I
was too busy organizing my section of the review of the recent
statewide Quake-X 2003 exercise where one of the features was
that for four hours the involved agencies could not use their
super-duper-Motorola trunked radio systems or their telephones
to contact other agencies or their own fixed facilities. We
also had several lucky amateurs riding the fire apparatus of
the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue Squad (which in spite of
its almost comical name is the second largest professional fire
department in the state and one of the best trained and equipped
in the western US) to test the practicality of passing tactical
traffic to those mobiles via ham radio.

We handled a LOT of tactical as well as status exercise traffic
and we'll do it again in the fall. So much for Webfoot Valley...

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County), Oregon

328. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 00:26:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503202644.18771.00000292@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 66528

In article <20030503111707.20913.00000478@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 5/3/2003 7:26 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>>In US amateur radio, Technician Plus Class examinations have always
>>required morse code testing. At the same time, the Technician Plus
>>Class license numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that
>>license class until its being closed to new licenses in April of 2000.
>
> I've sat in on 6 VE sessions in the last 14 months, and we have granted
>several CSCE's for element 1 only to Techs. I wish there was some VEC-wide
>survey to make an assessment of how many of these are out there to better
>assess now many of those "Technicians" are actually "Technician Plus"
>authorized.

You'd be trying to hit a moving target even if you could gather that data, Steve. By the time you had the data gathered, at least some of those "Techs-with-HF" would have upgraded to General or Extra.

Also, don't forget that the total number of Technicians includes not only "Techs with HF" (Techs with Element 1 CSCEs) but also Tech Pluses who renewed after April 14, 2000, and Novices who passed Element 2 but not Element 3.

>
>>For proof, we need only look at the growth in US amateur radio for the past
>>33 years:
>>
>>US Hams:
>>
>>1970: 270,000
>>1980: 350,000
>>1990: 514,000
>>2000: 680,000
>>
>>Growth Rate:
>>
>>1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
>>1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
>>1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)
>
> Uh oh, Jim...You deluged Lennie with facts.

Are not facts the way to conquer ignorance and falsehood?

>Now he's got to spin-up some "mighty morsemen" rant to hopefully bury it.

The facts speak for themselves. There was growth before code waivers and the dropping of the Tech code test, and growth after those changes.
>
>>It stands to reason that if code testing were an 'unnecessary, arbitrary,
>>and
>>distasteful (to many) barriers to entry', those who were interested, but
>>dissuaded by those unnecessary barriers would "jump in." when the 'barriers'
>>were eliminated. Except that's not what happened, in either absolute number
>>of hams or percentage growth.
>
> I do believe that you, Dave, Brian, Larry, myself and about another half
>dozen regulars said this was probably going to be the result of
>"Restructuring". The only real net gains were in "upgrades", NOT overall new
>Amateurs.

I don't recall ever making a prediction like that, Steve. Could you show the post where I did?

I do recall making the point that the changes of 1990 and 1991 did not result in big growth increases or lots of new technology in ham radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

329. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:02:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305031702.1f814797@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66529

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b90fl0$ru2$0@208.206.142.105>...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>

> > Whew...Lennie just opened a BIG box of worms!

He's right at home with 'em.

> " Now, after 15 years of successful operation, the APCO considers the
> radiotelegraph as the logical system for Network activity. In this system
> accuracy, reliability, and speed of communications are maximum, and there is the
> additional advantage that, with auxiliary power source, it is capable of completely
> independent operation.

Lemmee get this straight . . ya mean that all the way back in that
timeframe they DROPPED phone ops and switched to CW for what, the best
part of 40 years? Because CW is more accurate, reliable and faster
than phone?

Whatta a big friggin' surprise . . . where have we seen this before?
Bwahahaha!

w3rv

330. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:06:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305031706.7d00f3b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66530

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030503133846.21533.00000652@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >Then keep your CBs hidden, and don't intentionally interfere with your
> >neighbor's electronics, which is what prompted my comment.
> >
>
> No reason to hide anything, I sold all my HAMcb Junk.

Then why did you remark what you were going to do to your neighbors?

331. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:08:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305031708.5e8b44cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66531

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030503110530.20913.00000477@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 5/3/2003 9:15 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0305030615.3abe1d3e@posting.google.com>
>
> >Even Len, a non-ham, talks more like a ham than you do.
>
> Oh?
>
> I've been involved in Amateur Radio over 30 years now and I have NEVER
> heard a Ham talk like Lennie talks, especially ABOUT Amatuer Radio.
>
> Reassess your statement. It was pretty stupid.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Vshah, Vipul....

332. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:11:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305031711.7b04dfb6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66532

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030503133634.21533.00000650@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >Well, no. You consistently talk like a CBer.
>
> It seems to be the only to talk to you new CBplussers, most of you cant
> understand anything else.

Huh? Coffee Anon speaks better english than you.

> >Even Len, a non-ham, talks more like a ham than you do.
>
> Hey Brian, are you an Len LOVERS?

I can't speak for Len, but I'm passable. Beats fighting or CBing.

333. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:14:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305031714.105886ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66533

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b90kcu$72t$0@208.206.142.86>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b8v904$8a2$0@208.206.142.69>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > > So far Slim hasn't done anything here that *requires* more than a small piece of
a
> > > > > thought to handle easily.
> > > >
> > > > Then my comments are made to order for your thinking capacity.
> > >
> > > As usual, you'e gott it all bassackwards again, Slim. You've peaked out and I'm
> > > still just coasting.
> >
> > You've been coasting for years, but not in thinking capacity.
>
> Were that true it would still be much better than being adrift like you.

Unfortunately, I'm quite anchored... to Ohio.

DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.

334. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:16:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503211649.18170.00000672@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66534

>Subject: Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/3/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030503173632.18769.00000420@mb-m14.aol.com>

First Lennie chastises Jim Miccolis about his job and education:

>All us readers can see is that you are deliberately vague about
> what you've done, where you've worked, or all the claimed
> expirience. Very vague.

Then when Jim asks him about his (as he has been asked before but has refused to identify all-the-while DEMANDING everyone else's credentials), he responds with:

>>Your degree is from what accredited institution? What date is on your
>>diploma?
>
> It was from an accredited institution in the Southern California
> area.
>
> The date is from the last millenium.

This is what gets this scumbag labelled as a..well...as a scumbag!

>It means you HAVE to "get even" in a discussion, no matter
> how or where. You MUST win.

Whew, Mr Pot, that kettle sure is getting black, eh?

Steve, K4YZ

335. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:18:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305031718.1fd58f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66535

<paulfriedman@attbi.com> wrote in message news:<%2Qsa.474785$Zo.105631@sccrnsc03>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since
> you
> > have had your license?
> > Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....
> >
>
>
> My "favorite" worst experience:
> As a new ham a year and half ago, I called CQ on 75 meters -- after
> checking to make sure the frequency was clear, of course. First response
> was:
> Oh boy, must a newbie. Real hams don't CQ on 75. Go play on 11m
> Second response was:
> My God, you must be an old f**t. No one has called CQ on 75 in 30
> years.
>
> Neither offered up a callsign, of course. That would be wrong.
>
> My real favorite experiences:
> My first QSO. After getting up enough nerve to respond to a CQ, I
> explained that this was my first contact. It seemed like 4 billion hams
> wanted to say hello and welcome me (and the person who "owned" the frequency
> was kind enough to let the party happen.)
>
> Having a QSO with a gentleman who goes back to the late spark days.
>
> All sorts of hams taking the time to help out a newbie (moi).
>
> Paul ab0si

Paul, congratulations and welcome. But don't hang around here too
long. Its just not healthy. 73, Brian/N0iMD

336. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:30:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503213015.18170.00000673@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66536

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/3/2003 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030503202644.18771.00000292@mb-m23.aol.com>

>You'd be trying to hit a moving target even if you could gather that data,
>Steve. By the time you had the data gathered, at least some of those
>"Techs-with-HF" would have upgraded to General or Extra.

No doubt you're right, Jim, but it would give us a ballpark idea on the
true percentage of HF-authorized Techs. I'd be happy to have a number within
15%.

>> Uh oh, Jim...You deluged Lennie with facts.
>
>Are not facts the way to conquer ignorance and falsehood?

=) Not on Lanark Street. He'll be seething for days!

>>Now he's got to spin-up some "mighty morsemen" rant to hopefully bury it.
>
>The facts speak for themselves. There was growth before code waivers and the
>dropping of the Tech code test, and growth after those changes.

And the growth continues. Why can't he accept the fact that the radio
world just happened to not need him as bad as he needed it?

>> I do believe that you, Dave, Brian, Larry, myself and about another half
>>dozen regulars said this was probably going to be the result of
>>"Restructuring". The only real net gains were in "upgrades", NOT overall
>new
>>Amateurs.
>
>I don't recall ever making a prediction like that, Steve. Could you show the
>post where I did?

No, Jim, I can't, but I do remember a thread wherein all of us at one time
or another came in to at least close approximation on what post restructuring
would be like. I thought it was you that said there'd be an influx of new hams
and upgrades on April 14th. If it wasn't, I apologize.

>I do recall making the point that the changes of 1990 and 1991 did not result
>in big growth increases or lots of new technology in ham radio.

I do remember that. As I remember the promises of an influx of new folks
with Novice Enhancement and the No Code Technician. More like a brief surge at
high tide, not enough to make a surfer raise an eyebrow.

73

Steve, K4YZ

337. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:32:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503213217.18170.00000674@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66537

>Subject: Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5/3/2003 8:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0305031708.5e8b44cf@posting.google.com>

>> I've been involved in Amateur Radio over 30 years now and I have NEVER
>> heard a Ham talk like Lennie talks, especially ABOUT Amatuer Radio.
>>
>> Reassess your statement. It was pretty stupid.

>Vshah, Vipul....

Oh..yeah...him...That's like Moe calling Curly a numbskull.

Steve, K4YZ

338. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:34:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503213426.19570.00000382@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66538

>Then why did you remark what you were going to do to your neighbors?
>

Theres all kinds of things you can do to your neighbors without Ham radio

339. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:36:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503213618.19570.00000383@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66539

>I can't speak for Len, but I'm passable. Beats fighting or CBing.
>
>

WOW, what has LEN said about this, you guys didnt have lovers spat did you?

340. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 01:59:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305040151440.253@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66540

On Sun, 4 May 2003, N2EY wrote:
> In article <20030503111707.20913.00000478@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
> >>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >>Date: 5/3/2003 7:26 AM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>
> >
> >>In US amateur radio, Technician Plus Class examinations have always
> >>required morse code testing. At the same time, the Technician Plus
> >>Class license numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that
> >>license class until its being closed to new licenses in April of 2000.
> >
> > I've sat in on 6 VE sessions in the last 14 months, and we have granted
> >several CSCE's for element 1 only to Techs. I wish there was some VEC-wide
> >survey to make an assessment of how many of these are out there to better
> >assess now many of those "Technicians" are actually "Technician Plus"
> >authorized.
>
> You'd be trying to hit a moving target even if you could gather that data,
> Steve. By the time you had the data gathered, at least some of those
> "Techs-with-HF" would have upgraded to General or Extra.
>
> Also, don't forget that the total number of Technicians includes not only
> "Techs with HF" (Techs with Element 1 CSCEs) but also Tech Pluses who renewed
> after April 14, 2000, and Novices who passed Element 2 but not Element 3.

For those who renewed, we know who they are as long as the "prior class" field shows the "P" or "N". It's only those who got the CSCE after April 14, 2000 that we don't know about....

The fact that the FCC allowed any of these post April 2000 techs to have PERMANENT op-authority in the "novice HF" bands was a bonehead move (*). They should have had that expire after 365 days just like the credit for passing does. That way, these people would either upgrade or come in for an annual CW exam. :-)

(*) - There's NO way for anyone to tell that these people are or are not operating within their privilege when on HF because no one can tell if they have the privilege short of knocking on their door and asking to see the CSCE.

[Remainder of quoted post deleted]

341. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 02:08:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503220855.04723.00000536@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66541

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/3/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030503173634.18769.00000421@mb-m14.aol.com>

>Miccolis has NO such experience, hasn't seen an AR, didn't
> even fall under the Uniform Code of Military Justice at any time.

A chastising by Lennie...the SAME Lennie who insists that licensure and experience in the Amateur Radio service is unnecessary to comment on it, now chastising another with no military service for daring to comment on military policies.

Mind you Lennie's not served a day in uniform himself since the last former flag-ranked officer was the president and must depend on the VERY SAME SOURCES of material for any "current event" military opinon offerings that Jim does. Communicaitons included.

>Irrelevant. Misdirection. The discussion started with the
> Novice Class. Try to stay in focus.

Lennie! You're learning! Spelled "focus" right for once.

>That still doesn't "explain" why the morse code test must
> continue to exist.

Until WRC is over and Congress ratifies any changes, it's the law. What more do you need to know?

>Irrelevant again. More misdirection. The thread was on the
> NOVICE class. Look at the Subject title line. Try to focus.

We'll cut this chastising and save it so we can spoon feed it to Lennie the next time we get yet another "...When I was at ADA in 53..." story.

>>> The only US amateur radio license class that kept growth in
>>> US amateur radio license totals was the no-code-test
>>> Technician Class.
>>
>>Incorrect.
>
> Sorry. VERY CORRECT. Two hundred thousand NEW
> no-code Technician Class licenses between 1991 and
> mid-2000 make you very wrong.

You snipped the numbers, Lennie. Why?

Amateur Radio demonstrated a very positive growth pre-NCT. There was
nothing to indicate that it wouldn't still be going that way had the NCT not
been incorporated.

THAT is a fact.

>Supposition fantasy. You cannot possibly know the motivations
> of two hundred thousand no-code Technican Class licensees.

No more than YOU can "know" that Amateur Radio would have not continued
it's growth rates had the NCT not been implemented, Lennie.

Unless you can PROVE to us that you KNOW that those 200K + persons would
have absolutely NOT gotten an Amateur license otherwise?

[This I have GOT to see... ! ! !]

>No, you are too far into supposition fantasy. Two hundred thousand
> licensees wrong.

You reiterate an opinon that assumes YOU have certain knowledge that things
would ahve turned out differently. How can you know this?

>That PCTA argument has become a trite, worn-out cliche' of no
> logical value.

Kinda like the NCTA recite "No one else does it"...?!?!

>That old horse has been beaten to death so many times over that
> no skeleton is left to bleach in the sun.

Pot/Kettle/Black

>The ACTUAL growth has been discussed over and over again in here
> prior to the restructuring data. You've been shown the numbers.
> You want to discount the evidence, turn a blind eye to it, all to
> support your obstinate need for winning an argument at any cost.

Discount what? The numbers are right there for anyone with a calculator
to add up.

What DOESN'T add up is your insistence that it means anything other than
what it means...And that is Amateur Radio, while not growing in leaps or
bounds, was doing just fine before the NCT and shows no more or no less change
since the NCT.

Those are the facts. In black and white.

Steve, K4YZ

342. Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 02:38:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB47D4F.9060900@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66542

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Hunting trucers on the air... (was Funny you should mention that
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 5/3/2003 1:54 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3EB4107D.1050407@adelphia.net>
>
>
>>Thats how all rrap threads end up - people calling each other names. I
>>think its in the group charter that no message can stay on topic for
>>more than 3 posts!
>
>
> You're right, and I realized that I have missed you, so I will call you
> names too...
>
> MIKE MIKE MIKE MIKE MIKE ! ! ! !
>
> There! That will teach YOU to be a nice guy, huh...?!?!

phew! Okay, this time, just made it under the limit.

- Mike KB3EIA -

343. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 02:59:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503225903.18769.00000355@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66544

In article <20030503182717.18770.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
>>> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>> >In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>> >Flint"
>>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
>>>the
>>> recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
>>>The
>>> required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio
>>>code test.
>>
>>You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
>>people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
>>could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm.
>
>Goes way beyond even that, Dee. Some typical skills needed (and tested):
>
>- Ability to copy both plain language and code groups correctly at various
>speeds with not more than a certain (very low) number of errors per hour.

Please state the exact allowed "errors per hour" from your
experience as a military radio communicator. A distinct and
referencible source is needed for this factoid.

>- Ability to "put it on paper" using both a manual typewriter or pencil.

Not a viable reason. Writing messages on paper is a requirement
of all soldiers and land force military members. Such is not
constrained to morse code telegraphy symbolism.

Your lack of experience in ANY military communications area
is noted there.

>- Ability to send highly readable code using either straight key or bug.

Please state the "bug" (automatic keyer mechanism) nomenclature
you actually used in your military communications experience.

>- Ability to adjust, troubleshoot, operate and repair a wide variety of types
>of radio equipment

Incorrect. A "wide variety of types of radio equipment" in the US
military does not, repeat NOT need manual telegraphy skill to
"adjust, troubleshoot, or repair." As to "operate," anyone in old-
time military radio communications could tune up and even
receive any morse code signal WITHOUT any morse skills.

>- Ability to do all of the above for long periods of time and under
"difficult"
>conditions

Please state your experience under "difficult" military conditions.

Please state the "long periods of time" you communicated while
in the US military.

>It's like the difference between finishing in the lead pack of the Boston
>Marathon and being able to jog a mile on a track in less than 12 minutes.

No military anywhere in the world operates on principles of
sport. The purpose of a military is "to close with and destroy
the enemy."

Please state your experience in the US military while in Special
Services running, playing basketball, or any other sport. Then
tie that in with morse code communications skills as a
"necessity."

Common US military land field radio communications from WW2
days to the Vietnam War times required small unit radio
operators to carry about 35 to 20 pounds of backpack radio,
about 40 pounds of "light" field pack plus about 12 pounds of
personal sidearm and its ammunition...en route from 2 to 16
hours at a time under conditions where the enemy could kill
you at any time. Please describe your US military experience
where you did anything like that or remotely like that. Please
cite the necessity for morse code skills under such an
environment...based on your personal experience, of course.
That is NOT a "marathon" or "track and field running"
environment although a land field radio operator had to sometimes
run for cover in order to avoid dying.

The old WW2 small-unit field radio was the VHF-range SCR-
300 weighing in at about 42 pounds (with all accessories).
It was voice only. The newer series of Korean War "walkie-
talkies" were about half that size and weight, also VHF, also
voice only operation. By the time of the Vietnam War, the
standard small-unit radio was the AN/PRC-25, VHF, very

much voice only operation (superseded by PRC-77, identical to -25 on outside, differing only internally). The AN/PRC-119 small unit land field radio was being made operational just before the first Gulf War, is VHF, is both voice and data, clear or encrypted operation. No morse code skills needed or required. About a quarter million radio sets of the PRC-119 family have been produced and are operational with the US military as of this date.

Please show how morse code skills in the US military are "exactly" equivalent or even vaguely analagous to:

1. Basketball.
2. Long-distance running.
3. Superstar celebrities of very rare athletic skill.
4. NOVICE CLASS amateur radio license class retention.

Take as long as you care to, make as long a posting as you normally do. The time you waste is your own...and that of all the readers here who have to wade through all your words of non-wisdom.

344. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 02:59:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503225904.18769.00000356@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66543

In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
the
>> recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
The
>> required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio
code
>> test.
>
>You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
>people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
>could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm.

There's a great deal of difference among the PCTA gurus here.
One group says that "everyone can do it" with a lot "patience,
dedication, and hard work." Another group says that "anyone
can do it," no particular way to do it stated. The more arrogant
group touts their extraordinary ability at morsemanship and
looks down their elevated noses at the mundane ordinary
humans. They have not reached a consensus.

The interesting part is that so few of these PCTA gurus ever had
any specific claims on doing military communications by any
means, let alone morse code in random groups. The only one
who comes to mind is Hans Brakob, a USN Master Chief (Retired)
who has been absent here for many months. Brakob does not
claim to be a PCTA according to his own words.

With the exception of the USCG, all US military branches had
abandoned manual telegraphy for tactical and strategic radio
communications well before the first Gulf War. The heavy long-
distance messaging traffic in the US military was done via TTY
from about 1938 onwards. The USN began using TTY with
on-line encryption in late 1939 on cruisers and heavier ships.
The reason for TTY was security as well as more accuracy and
a sustained rate of 60 WPM. The US military's on-line
encryption system of TTY was never broken until the capture
of the USS Pueblo with intact equipment. A combined USN-
US Army team of cryptanalysts had broken the highest level
of Japanese code (usually transmitted via manual telegraphy)
prior to the Pearl Harbor attack.

>It's like the difference between
>shooting hoops in the back yard or being the next Michael Jordan.

Professional basketball is franchised, not licensed. No license is necessary to play basketball.

Michael Jordan is retired. He got too old for good professional basketball play. He has admitted that in public.

Morse code testing has long outlived its usefulness, is very old, and should be retired. PCTAs cannot admit that. To them the code test must remain because they had to take the test long ago before they too got old and tired.

345. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 03:08:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030503230849.04723.00000542@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66545

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/3/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>

>In article <20030503020601.08218.00000542@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Powerful Marine Syndrome [PMS] Sufferer Steamy Stalker) writes:
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...poor guy has not only "PMS" but decides to cross-
> dress in messages thinking he is an equivalent to a female

We see what constitutes "civil debate" to The Lying One.

>> Seems to me the Lady's got you pegged, Putzy One.
>
> Not really. Dee is a proponent of the Established Order in
> US amateur radio, namely that Standards and Practices in
> US amateur radio are fixed to that of the 1930s when morse
> code was king and ARRL was the overgovernment of amateur
> radio.

I reitrate...The Lady has you pegged.

>> Hmmmmmmm...I don't remember seeing Dee's name on any ballot. I'd vote
>>for her though if it did.
>
> "Established Order" is a concept, a fantasy promulgated by ARRL...(SNIP)

OH? I am a member of the League and have several League publications
close at hand. Not a one of them references or promulgates" "Established
Order" as a League policy.

>There is NO "ballot," only a Belief System all about some fantasy
> of a self-contained amateur activity all alone that boasts of its
> mighty exploits as if it is the ultimate ruler of radio and technology
> involving radio.

Hmmmmmm. The ficticious "belief system" you rant about is 175,000 people
strong, sponsors countless operating and educational programs, a nationwide
emergency program and a traffic handling system that predates even you, Lennie.

There's no fantasy about reality. It's there. Too bad you aren't all
there. You might have enjoyed it.

>What about those former electronic technicians who actually
> ARE electronic engineers, have the demonstrated capability
> and the experience and the accreditation and continue in that

> endeavor? That is my category.

But not in Amateur Radio. Still no license despite an assertion you were going to do it. (you say you didn't say when...I say you're caught lying again) And your engineering skills are unknown to almost anyone in this forum. I know some folks who knew you and they weren't impressed.

>Robeson, the Steamy Stalker, has NO experience whatsoever
> in any professional electronic engineering.

Don't need it here, Lennie. This is Amatuer Radio...an avocation in which I have 30 years of experience.

>He has one short
> period of claimed employment as a purchasing agent for a local
> electronics firm whose products are mostly for the wired
> communications product trade.

I see your knowledge of thier products and services is even more limited than your knowledge of Amateur Radio if that was ever possible.

>For the rest of his "experience,"
> he can only point to "30 years as a ham" and some vague
> references to some kind of USMC avionics supposedly done in
> a military career cut short by a claimed military accident with
> resulting Medical Discharge termination.

In a forum entitled "rec.radio.amateur.policy", thirty years of Amateur experience is more than enough.

>The Steamy Stalker has absolutely NO basis for any of his
> charges, but his lack of emotional stability and lack of ability to
> get along with others of opposing views prompts him to insult
> all who disagree with him.

What "charges"...??? This isn't a court of law, Lennie. You said so yourself to another poster vis-a-vis other comments you made.

I observe that you are a pathological (and quite pathetic) liar.

I observe that you make all sorts of allegations about others conduct while doing it yourself.

I observe that you have no Amateur Radio license and no practical experience IN Amateur Radio that would validate or vindicate your opinions about Amateur Radio policy.

I observe you are not active in any Amatuer Radio club, program or project.

I observe you insist it's OK for you to snowplow your way into a forum in which you obviously have no vested interest or support, yet when anyone dares to comment on a subject you deem yourself expert on, you chastise them for "lack of experience" in THAT field. That makes you two-faced.

>1. I've given a very short listing of past employers in here. The
> Stalker howled and raged something about "CV" [Latin initials
> for "curriculum vitae" or facts of total life experience]. He did
> not check any of those references in any way, made a number
> of inferences that such were "lies" even though a number of
> different government agencies, IRS among them, were very
> convinced such employment was truth.

Ahhhhh...Yes, Lennie, I did. NADC. Care for me to repeat in this forum
what some of the folks there said about you?

>2. I've given references to living US radio amateurs who know me
> personally (one was Best Man at my wedding). No one,
> certainly not the Stalker, seems to have contacted them for
> any confirmation. In essence, he simply ignored such
> references.

I have never claimed you don't know, or even associate with licensees,
Lennie. I claim that you embellish what you DO tell us.

I don't think you want your N2 buddy to see how you used the KIA's from
your old Army outfit to embellish your "reputation" here, do you?

>3. I've digitized my First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial)
> Operator License first received in 1956, including the reverse
> side showing the radio and television stations worked at that
> year and duties, written in handwriting by the Chief Engineers
> at those stations...and sent those by e-mail SEVERAL TIMES
> to the Stalker. He refused to acknowledge them, claiming all
> were some kind of "lie" due to an unfortunate accident that
> attached the wrong image on the first sending.

Hmmmmm...."unfortunate accident"....?!?! I call it incompetence,
considering your insistence on being an electronics "professional"

And yes, I call you a liar. It's normal to call liars liars.

>4. The Stalker then made up a libelous "homepage" on AOL
> which was a prima facie bit of personal insult easily
> evidenciary of libelous behavior in any civil court. AOL
> removed that immediately as well as his equally-libelous
> new screen name when notified.

Nope. The screen name is still mine to use. They only deleted the page.

Guess Lennie didn't want the whole world to see what he did. Cowards have
a problem with facts. Lennie's a coward.

>5. The Stalker tried to manufacture some kind of "case" of
> "cowardice" about my US Army Signal Corps duties and
> location, repeatedly refering to my military occupation
> specialty as "rear area radio clerk."...(SNIP)

No, I didn't say you were a coward because you WERE a rear area radio
clerk...I said (and still say) your attempts to embellish your own reputaion by

associating yourself with KIA's that died three years before you joined the unit was cowardly.

>He continued to do so
> despite my pointing out what they really were, explicit
> details of duties and responsibility which were not only
> referencible through government archives but were witnessed
> by a still-living radio amateur who was assigned to the same
> unit and military radio station and who did the same duty...(SNIP)

Do you REALLY want me to write to this guy and provide him links to the posts you made, Lennie?

>The Stalker has not made any explicit details of his own
> military service and "battle experience/heroism" other than
> the vague generality of "seven hostile actions."

Why? And have it disrespected and assailed by a creep who thinks what he does is funny?

>6. In my 14 pages of text on my Reply to Comments (of another)
> on FCC NPRM 98-143 (received and made public record on
> 13 January 1999), Robeson sent a single paragraph (on the
> public record of 25 January 1999, past the stated cut-off date)
> that I should be deprived of any consideration on Restructuring.
> In essence, he was so enraged by newsgroup messaging on
> the code test issue that he had to carry this to an extreme.
> Such an action was little more than more bullying tactics
> that would have deprived a US citizen and military veteran of
> exercising his Constitutional Rights (First Ammendment to the US Constitution)

WHOA, Lennie! Wrapping yourself up in "patriotic bunting"...?!?!

The term is "reply comments", wherein one entity can rebut the comments of others. You didn't like having your true nature flaunted.

Too bad...so sad...

>> "Pedantic Parson"..."Herr Oberst"...."Jackbooted thug"..."elitist
>>Morsemen"..."Dill Sergeant"...All various "nicknames" bestowed on licensed
>>Radio Amateurs who happen to disagree with Lennie.
>
> Only after those same individuals used similar nicknames, false
> accusations, and personal insults to me FIRST.

Was lying in public a birthright of yours, Lennie? Did your mommy let you get away with this kind of behaviour?

Google referes on who-started-what as far as you and I go, and Jim Miccolis has NEVER called you anything except by your given or family name. So, there we have two LennieLies in one paragraph.

>The Stalker's behavior is that of the schoolyard bully who thinks
> that he is can, by force or other means, do anything he wants
> but cannot take the same sort of commentary back. He cannot
> "play the game" by any rules other than his own.

Coming from someone who changes the rules for himself, this is quite funny!

> The Stalker's sociopathic behavior...(SNIP)

Anyone who get's under Lennie's skin is "sociopathic".

No doubt a term his correspondence course psychic wife taught him...Or was it psychologist? Hmmm....Can't keep Lennie's stories straight...(But then neither can he...)

>He cannot debate and lose gracefully...(SNIP)

So who was the judge of who "won" and who "lost"?

You...?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

>...he must vent
> his self-righteous anger in public, lose control, and thereby
> cast a negative image on himself and that of US amateur radio.
> He needs both mental guidance and therapy.

That's funny, coming from a guy who hangs out in a Newsgroup for an avocation in which he has no vested interest, and has voiced significant hatred and disdain for.

Pot/kettle/black. It's got Lennie written ALLLLLLL over it.

Steve, K4YZ

346. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 04:07:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030504000700.08129.00000464@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 66546

In article <3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
>
>I don't do public service because:

I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
people constantly stroking my ego with praise.

That about covers it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

347. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 04:07:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030504000701.08129.00000465@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 66547

In article <b8odng$btubt$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words,
>should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for
>each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working
>with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?
>
>
>If yes, why?

Ryan:

Yes, we should employ bandplans in the ARS. The best reason I can
think of is to avoid the chaotic conditions on-the-air if we had a free-for-all
system where anyone could do anything anywhere. One practical benefit
of bandplans is that if you want to work someone on, say, one of the
digital modes, you know basically where you're going to find that
particular kind of activity on any given band just by referring to the
bandplan.

Without bandplans, all we'd have is high-power SSB 'phone everywhere,
and everything else QRM'ed to oblivion.

73 de Larry, K3LT

348. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 04:18:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9249s$kl3$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 66548

Len Over 21 wrote:an.

>
> Put it to rest, Carroll.

I just did.

349. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 04:25:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b924nc$kl3$1@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 66549

Brian wrote:

>
> DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.

Not for dealing with the likes of you. It's child's play.

350. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 04:29:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b924v9$kl3$2@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 66550

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Morse code testing has long outlived its usefulness, is very old,

> and should be retired.

Hmmmm. just like Lennie!

351. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 10:18:21 UTC
From: SLee@houston-hunks.com
Message-ID: <015105177.36618154FE@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 66551
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 3 May 2003 17:44:34 -0700, Chris <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote:
> ... Yes. Blifar is the secret supreme faith of the State of
> Texas!

As practiced from Monroeville, PA by one Adelphia customer!

352. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 11:41:35 UTC
From: Queenie <Queenie@barfqueeniehq.net>
Message-ID: <b92u9i$36o$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66552
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Curious minds wonder if "Chris" is K3EKO ?

Queenie

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305031644.1ffe2db0@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
> "Herb" <Herb@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote in message
news:<b91ep5$4rr$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > What is your sick obsession with MAN?
> >
> > Herb
>
> Funny you should ask Herb,
>
> I suppose the time is ripe to reveal the facts...
>
> M-A-N is the Deity known as "Aara" (also called Northern Love Monkey
> in your tongue). Together with his servant, the sycophant
> hermaphroditic acolyte "No-coq," he is the head of the holy church of
> BLIFAR. We worship his holiness, the ruler of Snargle, in the one true
> faith.
>
> Centuries of oppression have forced the church underground, but M-A-N
> is leading the true believers of the north in the schism of the
> church. We are about to break with the other sects and we will declare
> M-A-N the leader of the true church of BLIFAR.
>
> We have seen that only M-A-N can divine the truth and the words of
> Blifar who speaks through him during the secret homoerotic rites. When
> the sycophantic acolyte flogs his monkey of love in imitation of the
> great Blifar, all who behold the rite quiver at its power.
>
> Unbelievers should bow before the M-A-N and tremble. Those who
> disbelieve will be struck down by the followers of Blifar!
>
> Now the truth is known. We snigger at the pathetic FCC and their
> so-called authority. Blifar is all powerful! Why else do you think the
> M-A-N is allowed to break the laws of mere mortals day after day? The
> followers of Blifar are everywhere! Even to the HIGHEST levels of
> government. Yes. Blifar is the secret supreme faith of the State of
> Texas!
>
> And now you know. Now you all know!!

353. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 13:23:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305040523.31788be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66553

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030504000701.08129.00000465@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <b8odng$btubt$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words,
> >should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for
> >each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working
> >with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?
> >
> >
> >If yes, why?
>
> Ryan:
>
> Yes, we should employ bandplans in the ARS. The best reason I can
> think of is to avoid the chaotic conditions on-the-air if we had a free-for-all
> system where anyone could do anything anywhere. One practical benefit
> of bandplans is that if you want to work someone on, say, one of the
> digital modes, you know basically where you're going to find that
> particular kind of activity on any given band just by referring to the
> bandplan.
>
> Without bandplans, all we'd have is high-power SSB 'phone everywhere,
> and everything else QRM'ed to oblivion.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Or we could limit power to 10W.

354. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 13:30:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305040530.42bbe274@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66554

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030503213426.19570.00000382@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> >Then why did you remark what you were going to do to your neighbors?
> >
>
> Theres all kinds of things you can do to your neighbors without Ham radio

Such as?

Here's the context:
--------------------"

>Since the lines are not shielded. It seems to me that a large amount
of RF
>properly applied could, shall we say, 'disrupt' the link.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Thats what Im gearing up for right now DAn, I have a couple neighbors
I cant
stand
"--------------------

To put it in perspective, you commented on "a large amount of RF."

What else are you going to do to your neighbors that you don't like?

Are you good in the callbook? It would be easy enough to determine
who your neighbors are, you idiot.

355. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 13:31:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305040531.45af4b6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66555

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030503213217.18170.00000674@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 5/3/2003 8:08 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0305031708.5e8b44cf@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I've been involved in Amateur Radio over 30 years now and I have NEVER
> >> heard a Ham talk like Lennie talks, especially ABOUT Amatuer Radio.
> >>
> >> Reassess your statement. It was pretty stupid.
>
> >Vshah, Vipul....
>
> Oh..yeah...him...That's like Moe calling Curly a numbskull.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Go reassess your own statement.

356. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 13:44:53 UTC
From: No Spam Please <larrystranlator@anaddress.net>
Message-ID: <bh5abvgvpn94snrqn5tlmugsk9fs97skea@4ax.com>
Source record: 66556

On 04 May 2003 04:07:00 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>writes:
>
>>How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>>
>>
>>I don't do public service because:
>
>I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
>trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
>regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Besides I would
>have to get along with people and I can't do that.
>
>Oh, I also have a full-time, dead end job as a bus driver so I'm
>broke most of the time and an active social life insulting people on
>the internet. This doesn't leave me much time to give a rat's ass
>about anyone but myself.
>
> I have no lifelong desire to be a cop, fireman, or paramedic or much of
>anything else. My military career was nothing and I would like to continue
>that in civilian life.
>
> I have a very low level of self esteem having only my claims of superior
>skill as a Morse operator to make me feel remotely adequate. I only wish
>people would realize how unique and important this skill is and shower me
>with the ego strokes with praise I so truly deserve.
>
>That about covers it.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Yup it sure does

357. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 14:18:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030504101858.04977.00000502@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66557

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: No Spam Please larrystranlator@anaddress.net
>Date: 5/4/2003 8:44 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bh5abvgvpn94snrqn5tlmugsk9fs97skea@4ax.com>

>Yup it sure does

Yet another genderless, cowardly, sorry excuse for a human...thinks "he" is some kinda newsgroup white knight, riding out from behind an anonymous address, swinging his nameless spittle.

What a PUTZ.

Steve, K4YZ

358. Re: CQ DX CQ DX N8SUX calling CQ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 15:07:52 UTC
From: PhilC <philC@cranium.com>
Message-ID: <ipudnU39gfdTsSijXTWcpw@comcast.com>
Source record: 66558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> If I load up the long wire,and use N8SUX as a call,will I draw too much attention with my Collins? <g>

> Ah,wtf. What if I just use that call anyway? ;)

Please go right ahead and use it, this is what your QRZ profile will look like, then we can read about you on Rain Report Unlicensed Cber BUSTED.

Class: Freebander
N8SUX
Steve Park
102 Lawnboy Way
Medina, Ohio

Hobbies: Rec.radio.cb Troll, Sniffing boys panties at soccer games, cutting lawns. Talking on my Collins on 11 meters.

359. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 15:47:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030504114754.21571.00000561@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66559

>Thats what Im gearing up for right now DAn, I have a couple neighbors
>I cant
>stand
>"-------------------
>
>To put it in perspective, you commented on "a large amount of RF."

I didnt sat Ham Radio I didnt say it was going to be RF

>What else are you going to do to your neighbors that you don't like?
>
>

All kids of wonderfull things

>Are you good in the callbook?

I dont know, never checked it.

>It would be easy enough to determine
>who your neighbors are, you idiot.

My neighbors know who I am, knock yourself have fun contacting them. They will probably tell you to mind your own Bussiness, and may even file harrassing charges against you. So go for it BIG BOY nothing holding you back but Air and Fear.

360. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 18:27:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030504142708.18759.00000601@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66561

In article <20030501010053.18769.00000310@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>>> Can anyone understand geographic bias on your
>>> part? [of course they can]
>>
>>You often see things that are not there. Len. You've repeatedly
>>written things about others' posts which you have failed to prove.
>
> Go back to Google and look at your own postings about the
> B&W network, where it was made, and so forth.

You're not my boss, Len. I don't take orders from you.

>That's just one example. There are others.

Then show us.
>
>>> Concentrate on the analysis done by Yoshida in the QEX article.
>>
>>Why? You are not empowered to give orders.
>
> You are the one with MSEE and have mentioned it often.

I've mentioned my education here a few times.

> Can't you do an analysis of the math?

Sure I can. You keep telling everyone I can't, though.

> I thought you were
> this high-powered "real engineer" who does that at work.

When did I ever claim to be 'high-powered"? Or to do the math of the Gingell
network analysis at my job?
>
>>> Note: Wideband performance is part and parcel of possible
>>> "Hi-Fi" SSB, aka wide audio modulation in radio.
>>
>>6 kHz is not "hi-fi" (an ancient '50s term) by any stretch of the
>>imagination.
>
> I wasn't restricting bandwidth to just 6 KHz (and certainly not
> "kHz"). The Gingell polyphase network can do wider bandwidth
> SSB. It is technically possible.

In theory, anyway. But of what use is that in amateur voice SSB communications?

Since this is a policy newsgroup, the most important question about "D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links" is obviously "What should the policy be towards SSB voice bandwidth?".

FCC seems to think hams should restrict the bandwidth of their SSB voice signals to the minimum necessary for communication - typically 3 kHz or less. Particularly in crowded bands.

FCC's opinion has taken the form of warning letters to hams using SSB with 6 kHz bandwidth. Is FCC "wrong" on this?
>
>>> One of the Gang of Four has already stated in here that he "will
>>> live forever."
>>
>>Who are "the Gang of Four"?
>>
>>I never claimed to be immortal.
>
> Steamy Stalker did that in saying he would "live forever." :-)

Who is "Steamy Stalker"? I'm not him.
>
> That will be in Google too. :-)

>>> That's evidentiary in a search of Google, is it not?
>>
>>Show us.
>
> Go look for yourself.

You're not my boss, Len. I don't take orders from you.

> I can't do your homework for you. Google
> is pretty much open-access to anyone with Internet access.

You have repeatedly made untrue claims about what I have posted, but when challenged to actually produce the postings, you have not been able to back up your claims. Since you made the claim, it's up to you to provide the evidence, not me.
>
>>> Then try to discuss the contents of Yoshida's QEX article, not his
>>> apparent lack of QRZ listing.
>>
>>Why?
>
> The mathematics is important by itself.

To you, maybe.

>>> You want "proof" of that? :-) Go to the RSGB's Radio Communication
>>> issue almost a year after the 1970s mention and look in Pat Hawker's
>>> "Technical Topics" column.
>>
>>Why? Did any of them exceed 45 dB unwanted sideband rejection? 50 dB?

>
> Not then. Came a lot closer than was possible with the Dome
> network.

But not as good as was possible with simple, inexpensive crystal filters.

>>Perhaps
>>you don't want to admit that those old designs did not do better than
>>newer designs such as the KK7B R2.
>
> Not having any hands-on experience with a "KK7B R2" (whatever
> that is), I can't do any comparison.

You can look it up. I posted a link to the article where they were described.

>>Perhaps you don;t want to admit
>>that parts and boards for those old designs are as hard to come by as
>>the old B&W PSN network....
>
> You need someone to layout parts for you and make PCBs? :-)

Nope. Been there, done that. Many times. Even at work.

In fact, there's an NOS R2 board on eBay right now...

>>> The elegant innovation/invention of the Tayloe Mixer is applicable
>>> to ANY radio-electronics situation involving heterodyning, not just
>>> amateur radio. Dan Tayloe has much to his credit in invention
>>> and innovation and much of that work is not just for ham radio.
>>
>>Nobody disputes that.
>
> But you just LOVE to do all that "disputing" about some alleged
> social gaffe about a callsign.

Why did you omit his callsign in a posting to an amateur radio newsgroup?

> You don't even read RF Design
> magazine you could get free every month while "working as an
> electrical engineer."

Why should I read it?
>
> Neither the US Patent Office nor RF Design magazine identifies
> the Tayloe Mixer by amateur callsign.
>
>>But the FACT is that the first practical use of that innovation was in
>>a high performance, CW-only, direct-conversion amateur radio
>>transceiver.
>>
>>That fact really seems to bother you.
>
> Not me.

Your behavior indicates otherwise.

>>This is an amateur radio newsgroup. In amateur radio, identification
>>is primarily by callsign. Callsigns are unique, names are not. First
>>names are
>>used rather than last names in conversations and correspondence.
>
> Oh, oh, the Miss Manners identity came out again! Quick, call
> the shrinks.

Not for me...;-)

>>This simple convention really seems to bother you, Len. You want to impose
>>your convention of last names and invented nicknames on others, rather than
>>callsigns.
>
> Awwwww.
>
> Why do you even bother to make these long, Long, LONG replies to
> a non-ham, Jimmie? :-)

Why do you even bother to make these long,long, long, Long, LONG error-filled
postings here, Len?

361. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 18:27:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305041027.14f86b08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66560

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030503213618.19570.00000383@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> >I can't speak for Len, but I'm passable. Beats fighting or CBing.
> >
> >
>
> WOW, what has LEN said about this, you guys didnt have lovers spat did you?

We're both married, you dingaling. And not to our sisters either.

362. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 19:09:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030504150954.27996.00000832@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66562

>We're both married,

Well when was the happy occasion, where did you and Len spend your night of Bliss, by the way are you the Male or Female in this thing you 2 have?

363. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 20:27:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030504162727.18767.00000379@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66563

In article <20030503213015.18170.00000673@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 04 May 2003 01:30:15 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 5/3/2003 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030503202644.18771.00000292@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>>You'd be trying to hit a moving target even if you could gather that data,
>>Steve. By the time you had the data gathered, at least some of those
>>"Techs-with-HF" would have upgraded to General or Extra.
>
> No doubt you're right, Jim, but it would give us a ballpark idea on the
>true percentage of HF-authorized Techs. I'd be happy to have a number within
>15%.

It would be an interesting statistic, but not much more. As pointed out by D. Stussy (many tnx!) a lower bound on the number can be had from inspection of the "former license class" field in the database.

This time next year, if not sooner, it may well be a moot point.
>
>>> Uh oh, Jim...You deluged Lennie with facts.
>>
>>Are not facts the way to conquer ignorance and falsehood?
>
> =) Not on Lanark Street. He'll be seething for days!

Not My Problem.
>
>>>Now he's got to spin-up some "mighty morsemen" rant to hopefully bury it.
>>
>>The facts speak for themselves. There was growth before code waivers and the
>>dropping of the Tech code test, and growth after those changes.
>
> And the growth continues.

Which is a good thing.

There were some (not me!) who predicted that the renewal percentage of Technicians would be very low. From casual observation of the AH0A renewal data, it appears that the renewal rate for Techs is not materially different

from any other class. Which is another good thing.

>Why can't he accept the fact that the radio
>world just happened to not need him as bad as he needed it?

Almost everyone needs to feel needed, Steve......;-)
>
>>> I do believe that you, Dave, Brian, Larry, myself and about another
>>>half
>>>dozen regulars said this was probably going to be the result of
>>>"Restructuring". The only real net gains were in "upgrades", NOT overall
>>>new
>>>Amateurs.
>>
>>I don't recall ever making a prediction like that, Steve. Could you show the
>>post where I did?
>
> No, Jim, I can't, but I do remember a thread wherein all of us at one
>time
>or another came in to at least close approximation on what post restructuring
>would be like. I thought it was you that said there'd be an influx of new
>hams
>and upgrades on April 14th. If it wasn't, I apologize.

"An influx of new hams and upgrades" AFTER April 15 sounds like what I would
have predicted.

>>I do recall making the point that the changes of 1990 and 1991 did not
>>result in big growth increases or lots of new technology in ham radio.

Nor did they result in a decrease.
>
> I do remember that. As I remember the promises of an influx of new
>folks
>with Novice Enhancement and the No Code Technician. More like a brief surge
>at
>high tide, not enough to make a surfer raise an eyebrow.
>
I think it was Jon Bloom, KE3Z, who showed from old Callbook data that the
number of new licenses did surge after 1991, only to slowly fade back to
near-1990 levels.

I also recall that way back in the early 1980s the Technician (WITH code test)
had effectively replaced the Novice as the "entry level" license. Part of the
reason was the lack of 2 meter Novice privs. I know lots of local hams who
skipped Novice and went straight for Tech even before the 1987 written test
changes. After 1987, Novices were more the exception than the rule.

The two big questions now are:

- If/when S25.5 goes away, how long will it take FCC to dump Element 1?

- What other changes should be made to the license structure if/when that happens?

73 de Jim, N2EY

364. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 21:39:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB58888.3494B3B0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66564

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

>
>
> Actually there are three letter prefixes in use. They just don't happen to
> be assigned to the amateur radio service. I was a MARS operator for a short
> while. That's one of the services that gets assigned a three letter prefix.

Back when there were CB licenses, I had KAAR5167.
That's a 4 letter prefix. Being CB, maybe there is a connection
between 4 letter calls and 4 letter words..... :-)

365. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-04 23:16:11 UTC
From: SLee@houston-hunks.com
Message-ID: <48170454.316351341@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 66565
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 4 May 2003 13:12:56 -0700, Chris <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote:
> I don't think so Queenie. I looked him up and K3EKO lives in Port Vue,
> PA next to you. I'm not sure, but I think Chris is forging his headers
> and he is actually writing from Belgrade Lakes Maine and blaming it on
> Frankie the Qrmer.
>
> Chris (Forger extraordinaire)

I don't think so. It's really tough to forge certain headers (for example, you can't really forge a path header, although you can obfuscate it a bit) and Google includes the NNTP-Posting-Host header as the valid IP address of the person using Google.

That IP address consistently points to Adelphia and traceroutes back to Monroeville, PA.

Sorry, Chris: You're busted.

366. interesting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 00:35:19 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <s4bbbv843omm7qv6l8vak38em9ea7cjvvi@4ax.com>
Source record: 66567

```
--
NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
remove _spam in email to reply.
```

367. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 00:35:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b94bkh$5rh$0@208.206.142.77>
Source record: 66566

N2EY wrote:

>
> I also recall that way back in the early 1980s the Technician (WITH code test)
> had effectively replaced the Novice as the "entry level" license. Part of the
> reason was the lack of 2 meter Novice privs. I know lots of local hams who
> skipped Novice and went straight for Tech even before the 1987 written test
> changes. After 1987, Novices were more the exception than the rule.

AFAIC the end of the Novice license began when the Tech (with 5wpm code) was awarded all Novice HF privvileges. I'm not so sure that they shouldn't have done away with the Tech license and kept the Novice, not that it really makes any difference other than the name. At least the name Novice more accurately reflected the status of the holder of an entry level license.

Dick

368. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 00:44:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030504204411.18775.00000559@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66568

In article <bh5abvgvpn94snrqn5tlmugsk9fs97skea@4ax.com>, No Spam Please
<larrystranlator@anaddress.net> writes:

>>That about covers it.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Yup it sure does

Hey, "tranlator" (sic): Tranlate this -- No Spam Please is a big fat jerk!

73 de Larry, K3LT

*** Is a "tranlator" anything like an Interocitor?

369. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 01:06:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB5B906.F1703EA9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66569

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:

> (Not as many
> people to communicate with during the hours I am up..... damned third
> shifter here.)

Well, there's less competition to snagging some good DX depending on
what band is open to where..... :-)

370. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 01:15:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB5BB31.677124BC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66570

>
> > Another question, again more suited to the subject thread,
> > is WHY "save" the Novice Class?
>
> There's no clear reason to save it, because the Technician and Techncian Plus
> classes of license have been the choice of most new US radio amateurs since the
> 1980s.

In a sense, all coded hams hold novice licenses. Just that some also
have higher level licenses as well. As an Extra, I can operate any
novice frequency and mode, as well as other freqs and modes
not available to novices. Thus in a sense an extra licensee also has
an advanced, a general, a tech plus, a tech and a novice license.
But you only get to have one callsign!

And as I haven't done any code in something like twenty years, I could
perform about as well as a new novice..... Actually worse. :-(So I'm not gonna
do code in the extra subbands at first.

371. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 01:19:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB5BC2E.3050602@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66571

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>>
>>
>>I don't do public service because:
>
>
> I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.Oh, I also have
> a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> people constantly stroking my ego with praise.

Hmm... Was that facetious or what?

- Mike KB3EIA -

372. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 01:20:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB5BC5A.7DC57445@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66572

WA8ULX wrote:

>
> Of course thats the results, did anybody believe the DUMBING DOWN effort was
> going to attract new Hams, Get real.

To achieve true dumbing down, you'd have to declare that the 27MHz
CB band and its users are hams, with a grade of license one step lower
than "novice".

:-)

373. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 01:35:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030504213553.21638.00000398@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66573

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/4/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030504162727.18767.00000379@mb-m15.aol.com>

>>Why can't he accept the fact that the radio
>>world just happened to not need him as bad as he needed it?
>
>Almost everyone needs to feel needed, Steve.

I agree. And I think it's a shame he couldn't have just put his two cents in and joined Amateur Radio, code tested or not. He could have been an asset. As I have acknowledged before, his apparent knowledge is great...Too bad he can only share it when it suits a particular rant.

>I think it was Jon Bloom, KE3Z, who showed from old Callbook data that the
>number of new licenses did surge after 1991, only to slowly fade back to
>near-1990 levels.

...As it did with Novice Enhancement. I participated as an examiner for quite a few folks who jumped in after it started, but it ebbed just as quickly.

>The two big questions now are:
>
>- If/when S25.5 goes away, how long will it take FCC to dump Element 1?

I bet they issue a news release suspending further Element 1 requirements until the NPRM process can be completed and formally deleted.

>- What other changes should be made to the license structure if/when that
>happens?

I doubt they change anything.

73

Steve, K4YZ

374. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 02:32:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030504223228.02899.00000979@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66574

>To achieve true dumbing down, you'd have to declare that the 27MHz
>CB band and its users are hams, with a grade of license one step lower
>than "novice".

Might as well, theres not much difference anymore.

375. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 03:32:53 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <FXkta.4094$CI7.723@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66576

It ain't done in CW.

(good lord, am I opening this thread again ???)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
<<putting on the asbestos long johns and pulling the plug on the modem>>

:P)

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net...
> Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>
>
> How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
>
> I don't do public service because:
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

376. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 03:33:16 UTC
From: clutch@lycos.com
Message-ID: <vbbmoat296o85c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 66575

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:

>Now that would make it an effective communications mode! 100wpm! Whew!
>
>Since we obviously can't get away from the morse issue, I would actually
>support retesting after every 10 year chunk of time. If you haven't been
>active or taken the time to learn more than the minimum basic amount of
>learning to pass the tests. This re-testing would also include morse
>testing as well. If it is as important as some hold it here, then it is
>something that should have at least been maintained or improved upon within
>ten years, above original testing results. Definitely would weed out some
>of the ones that get the license and then do not do anything with it. Hell,
>drivers licenses are retested on a regular basis.
>
>
>--
>Ryan, KC8PMX
>FF/MFR

Gee guy. Do you really want to reduce the numbers of licensed
operators? Now as far as forgetting things, I am a Technician class
that recievied my license 2 1/2 years ago. I just bought a Ft-8900r
and wanted to make sure what freq's I am allowed to be. Darn if that
Gordon West book didn't look like something I had never seen before
even though it had been my constant companion a few years ago.

I'm going to take the Gordon West General class book to work for my
lunch periods since it was embarassing to me to see what I have
forgot. Might as well try to upgrade.

73, Wes, KC8SPR
--
Reply to:
Whiskey Echo Sierra Sierra AT Gee Tee EYE EYE dot COM
Lycos address is a spam trap.

377. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 03:35:07 UTC
From: clutch@lycos.com
Message-ID: <vbbmrprv7oe4a1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 66577

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>>
>> Drivers licenses are retested on regular basis? Where? No place I've been
>> in the last 40 years.
>>
>
>California, every 12 years or sooner if you have an accident or tickets.

The last time I came to renew in Michigan, I grabbed the 'what drivers
need to know' booklet to read up and the lady at the desk laughed. No
way you can't pass this test.

73,Wes,kc8spr

--
Reply to:
Whiskey Echo Sierra Sierra AT Gee Tee EYE EYE dot COM
Lycos address is a spam trap.

378. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 03:48:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB5DEF3.E8584CEF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66578

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> >I don't do public service because:
>
> I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
>

That's pretty much covers it here too.
"I don't want to be a wannabee."

379. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 06:04:45 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961i8$fj4dp$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66593

Yeah Larry.... I understand that with no problem. The question mainly is directed as to the point of should they be left up to "gentlemens' agreements" or should they be more formal declarations from the FCC?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20030504000701.08129.00000465@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <b8odng$btubt$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words,
> >should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for
> >each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working
> >with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?
> >
> >
> >If yes, why?
>
> Ryan:
>
> Yes, we should employ bandplans in the ARS. The best reason I can
> think of is to avoid the chaotic conditions on-the-air if we had a free-for-all
> system where anyone could do anything anywhere. One practical benefit
> of bandplans is that if you want to work someone on, say, one of the
> digital modes, you know basically where you're going to find that
> particular kind of activity on any given band just by referring to the
> bandplan.
>
> Without bandplans, all we'd have is high-power SSB 'phone everywhere,
> and everything else QRM'ed to oblivion.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

380. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 06:15:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961i9$fj4dp$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66594

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8ub2d$8ll$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> I just don't agree with the madness about scarfing up short or 'good
> contest' calls. As for you intentions, no problem. Its the rules now
and
> Im just expressing my opinion.
>

Thats cool. I see where you are going with it. Just wanted to add
another point to the conversation.

> As for the call of ASS and FUK....until recently those calls would NEVER
> HAVE BEEN ISSUED. It was policy to NOT issue those sort of calls. So
until
> now it wasn't a problem.

As I am sure that they "slip thru" now with the automation of systems being
used. In the "old days" they might have even did everything by hand.

>
> I know folks that asked for KKK in the suffix. Kinda assinine in my book.
> But it wern't mine... hi.

That would assinine as well in my book unless his parents hated him and gave
him the name of something like Kevin Kieth Kline or any other variation
thereof.... :)

>
> I have had several chances to change to a shorter call. I don't like the
> 'I' on the end. Its a problem in contesting. The 'I' gets dropped by
> qsb/qrm too easly on CW. But I don't think Ill change.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

The only one I would like to change to is one with a better "rhythmic" flow
to it. Some calls just sound cool even though it is merely a letters and
numbers.... Actually your call is kinda cool..... and I think I have come
up with some good "funny phonetics" for it..... (N)ot (T)echnically
(I)ncompetent sounds cool eh? Still can't figure out any good ones for
my suffix.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

381. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 06:31:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961ia$fj4dp$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66595

Larry,

The direction of what even caught my mind when I originally heard this discussion and decided to post it here for further discussion was I was looking at the district map and wondering myself about something. Say for instance, California which is it's own call district, and the "7" land which is quite a few states, and California ran out of calls, could they shift the lines to make part of California in the "7" land?? I highly doubt this would happen anyways, in regards to California running out of calls, it was more of one of those "what if's."

I see this being done alot with the phone area codes. (YES I KNOW PHONES ARE NOT AMATEUR RADIO!) Michigan used to have only 4 area codes (616, 517, 313, and 906) and now has 7 more area codes. Like I said, phones aren't ham radio, but there is similarity in regards to the districts.

(more below)

> Ryan:
>
> Call sign districts are simply geographically-based assignments of the
> call sign "number." The original intent was to identify the operator by
> geographical region within the U.S. and it's territories/possessions while
> operating. The Vanity Call Sign system scrapped this useful feature, and
> now the "district" numbers are essentially meaningless, since any ham
> in any district can request a call sign including a number from an
entirely
> different district. Personally, I would not have permitted this.
>
> Therefore, to answer your question, there is no need to do this. It would
> serve no practical purpose. Moreover, in an era when the FCC has had to
> resort to the extreme measures taken in Restructuring in order to
streamline
> the administrative burden of the ARS, this would only serve to add cost
and
> complexity it cannot afford and doesn't need. "Redistricting" the call
areas
> to reflect demographic shifts is of no value to the ARS, since all
licensees
> are already treated equally as radio amateurs. The ARRL already has a
> system in place to address demographic changes among the ham population;
> it creates new Sections to reflect increases in regonal ham populations.

Thanks Larry... like I had responded to I believe Mike was, that the code/no-code arguments seem to be getting to the point of like the dog chasing its tail and never actually catching it. Just going round and round

in a circle. Just wanted to see some other debates on some other topics
without the "wars" starting, but invariably that seems to happen anyways.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> Nice try; next topic, please. Keep going, though, you're on the right
track.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Dover, Delaware
>

382. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 06:44:24 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961ib$fj4dp$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66596

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86k7d96nsv.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

Mike> I don't do public service because:

* I don't have a good location.
I have yet to get my HF rig to work at home due to interference and
being stuck in a narrow valley between two high ridges. My wife
chose the apartment before we got married and she's not a ham.

Not all of the public service activities are things to do working from home.
Some actually involve leaving the residence. Unless you are house-bound,
there is alot to do out there.

* I don't have good equipment.
My VHF stuff is limited to running xastir on a 5W HT. A bit more
money and time, and I'll have a good APRS station that can run off
battery for 48hrs, but that's not now.

Alot of public service activities outside of NTS are locally based and can
be done with an HT. Does your local club or ARES/RACES group perform
communications for the various races/walks/runs?? An excellent chance to
learn and usually fun.

* I don't have any training.
I haven't yet spent the time or the money to take the ARRL courses
or to work with local volunteers on ARES and RACES operations.

Get involved. The ARRL course is expensive but there is alot of free
training via the EMI link at www.training.fema.gov site. IS-2 is required
for RACES, but there is alot of other courses there that are worthwile.
Fema will send you the materials to study for free and you can submit your
final exam answers online. Red Cross and your local ARES/RACES groups will
also have "some" training available too... Just takes getting involved.

Luckily for me, all three of those problems can be solved over the
course of a year or two, given enough stability in the rest of my
life. Maybe I'll have a different answer next year.

Good Luck!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

383. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because: I DO DO PS activities

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 06:55:50 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961id$fj4dp$10@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66597

Well.. my activities in and out of ham radio are:

Net participation (holding nets and participating)
Public service activities (various runs, bike-a-thons, walks etc.)
Teaching ham classes for the tech level license
Teaching FEMA IS courses coming up in the upcoming months.
Was PR/publicity manager for local club for 2 years
Will get into more of the NTS activities in the future I hope

Outside of ham radio?

Volunteer Firefighter (will be moving to full time position in the future...
hope to find a dept. that will allow me to do both!)
Achieving my Instructor certification for Red Cross CPR and First Aid
Participated in adopt-a-highway program
Participated in big brothers
Have done various tasks to assist with the poor. (serving/delivering food,
home repairs and maintenance issues etc.)
Work with the local Volunteer Action Center to fullfill needs where needed.

My family has always been involved with public service and employed in
public service in some capacities for the past 3 generations or so as best
as I can find out. Doing good gives me a good feeling and some of the types
of work performed gives one a really different persective on life.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net...
> Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>
>
> How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
>
> I don't do public service because:
>

384. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 06:56:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961ie$fj4dp$11@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66598

OOOOpppppssss.... I forgot to add, being named an Assistant EC/RO position
for a local county this month!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net...
> Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>
>
> How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
>
> I don't do public service because:
>

385. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 07:00:39 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961if$fj4dp$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66599

Well Larry,

What about outside of ham radio?? That was part of the original post.

There is alot to be done with public service activities in ham radio.
Consider being net control for an upcoming race/run/bike-a-thon etc??? Or
just plain participating? Great chance to meet and work with other hams in
your area. There is alot to do, where you don't have to be Superham, or
cop/firefighter/emt either. It is merely just a matter of getting
involved, participating and working TOGETHER to achieve a common goal.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
>
> That about covers it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

386. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 07:13:14 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961ig$fj4dp$13@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66600

Well thank you for stating the obvious Len, as that can be easily referenced
by looking at the applicable rules and regulations.....

Possibly there might be a benefit of changing the rules to make even more
questions necessary for each element. But wait a minute, I just realized
something, maybe they should lower the amount of questions for one reason
and one reason only. If you take a 10 question test, and the minimum
passing grade is 75%, then missing 3 questions would really "screw" a
person. If they are taking a 100 question test, missing 3 would still keep
them in the 90% ranges.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030502182730.18771.00000303@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <b8tl3u$dl0li$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305012316270.361@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> >> On Thu, 1 May 2003, Vshah101 wrote:
> >> > I don't see what you mean. The "license in a day class" teaches you
to
> >> > memorized the questions and answers, not the material.
> >> >
> >> > The Extra test looks like the same number of questions as Technician
> >license.
> >>
> >> It's not. The extra test has 50 questions while the others have only
35.
> >
> >Wow.... they should up the number to at least 100 questions per testing
> >level..... Every test I have taken in the fire service has had at least
a
> >minimum of 100 questions. The final exam for the firefighter 1 and 2
> >certification in Michigan has 200 questions and that is based on a pool
of
> >1,500 questions..... (try memorizing that many!!!!!)
>
> Present-day FCC regulations on written testing requirements
> specify a MINIMUM of 10 questions in any question pool for
> all written test elements. [ref: 97.523 since at least 1995]

>
> The FCC does not originate the question pool, representatives
> of Volunteer Examiner organizations do that. The VEC Question
> Pool Committee originate all questions and answers. The FCC
> merely approves or disproves VEC QPC pools. All question
> pools are public knowledge when approved for use by the FCC.
>
> There is NO maximum number of pool questions. 97.523
> clearly states all written test elements shall have "at least 10
> times the number of required [by the FCC regulations]."
>
> The VEC QPC could originate 11, 12, 15, 20 or any number
> greater number of required questions within the law now or
> 8 years ago.
>
> With today's easy electronic transfer of data and personal
> computers capable of storing vast quantities of data and then
> randomly selecting the required number of test questions,
> there is no problem to having a very large question pool.
>
> There would be some extra work required by the VEC QPC
> on pools larger than the 10-times number now done. That will
> not impact either examinees nor the VEs administering the
> written tests; the number of required written test questions
> remains the same, examinees would answer the same number
> of questions and VEs would score the same number of
> questions.
>
> Doubling or tripling the question pool quantity does two things:
> A larger pool quantity makes it more difficult to memorize and
> allegedly "cheat"; a larger quantity for random selection of the
> same required question quantity increases probability of
> uniqueness in each written test, again lessening alleged
> charges of "cheating by copying another's test."
>
> No changes in US amateur radio regulations are required to
> increase the quantity of question pool questions. There is
> little impact on any additional work by the FCC; new question
> pools are generated approximately once every two years.
> There is additional work imposed on the VEC QPC.

387. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 07:15:57 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961ii$fj4dp$14@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66451

True, but if most of the hams are people that are in bed by 9pm or 10pm, and that is when I am usually just starting my day, I am sure you can see the limitations there. Not complaining about it, just an observation. Till my schedule changes I will just have to make do.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EB5B906.F1703EA9@ix.netcom.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> > (Not as many
> > people to communicate with during the hours I am up..... damned third
> > shifter here.)
>
> Well, there's less competition to snagging some good DX depending on
> what band is open to where..... :-)
>

388. Re: Weather Guessing for Dummies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 07:16:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961ij$fj4dp$15@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66453

In Michigan, no rock needed. Just merely wait 5 minutes, the weather will change anyways! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030502041016.21229.00000454@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 5/1/03 6:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EB1AEA1.F725E675@earthlink.net>
>
> >During the times they were on duty, they could sometimes predict the
> >weather. During the monsoon season their predictions were much more
> >accurate.
>
> Did they use the same "weather rock" that some Navy weatherguessers used???
>
> Bright Rock = Sunny
>
> Dull Rock = Cloudy
>
> Hot Rock = Summer
>
> Cold Rock = Winter
>
> White Rock = Snowing
>
> Wet Rock = Raining
>
> Moving Rock = Earthquake
>
> Missing Rock = Hurricaine
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

389. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 07:18:55 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b961il$fj4dp$16@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66452

Forgot another ham activity. SKYWARN!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net...
> Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>
>
> How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
>
> I don't do public service because:
>

390. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 10:11:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305050211.6420fe1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66579

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030504150954.27996.00000832@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >We're both married,
>
> Well when was the happy occasion, where did you and Len spend your night of
> Bliss, by the way are you the Male or Female in this thing you 2 have?

You really were dropped on your head as an infant. Either that or horribly shaken.

391. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 10:16:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305050216.6fa9a082@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66580

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030504114754.21571.00000561@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >Thats what Im gearing up for right now DAn, I have a couple neighbors
> >I cant
> >stand
> >"-------------------
> >
> >To put it in perspective, you commented on "a large amount of RF."
>
> I didnt sat Ham Radio I didnt say it was going to be RF

Drive by shooting?

> >What else are you going to do to your neighbors that you don't like?
> >
> >
>
> All kids of wonderfull things

Great, now you're going to do something to their kids.

> >Are you good in the callbook?
>
> I dont know, never checked it.

Probably not. Goofs like you don't know how to fill out the form.

> >It would be easy enough to determine
> >who your neighbors are, you idiot.
>
> My neighbors know who I am, knock yourself have fun contacting them. They will
> probably tell you to mind your own Bussiness, and may even file harrassing
> charges against you. So go for it BIG BOY nothing holding you back but Air and
> Fear.

I have no doubt your neighbors already know who you are. You're the
guy on their TV every night saying, "10-4 Gud Buddy."

392. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 12:27:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505082718.18755.00000509@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66581

In article <20030503173631.18769.00000419@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030503105308.18759.00000578@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>> I actually GOT all that RTTY experience and GOT one patent.
>>
>>All in the past, Len, all in the past. That sort of RTTY is long obsolete
>>and the patent expired more than a decade ago.
>
> All those Teletype Corporation

(snip of Len living in the past)
>
> I don't really know if my single radio patent was renewed or not.

US patents are not renewable. I don't think they ever were renewable. You did
not even know that there are 3 kinds of US patents and that the term is no
longer 17 years.

(snip of more of Len living in the past)

>>You live in the past too much.
>
> Hardly.

Two examples in this post alone.

> Radio as a communications medium is only 107 years
> old.

That's old.

> You keep touting morse code all the time and morse code
> was first used in 1844, 159 years ago.

So 107 is not "old" but 159 is "old"?

Besides, the code and methods used in radiotelegraphy are different from those
used in wire telegraphy.
>
> You seem to be posting out of spite.

Not me. I'm not the one making fun of other people's names, ethnicities,
gender, military service, education or employment. You are.

> I did HF radio
> communications operations, maintenance, supervision for two
> full years in the 1950s, did microwave radio communications
> operations, maintenance, supervision for another year following
> that.

(snip of still more of Len living in the past)
Big station, many thousands of messages per month.

> Long-distance communications for commercial and government
> communications is now done via fiber-optic cable or satellite
> relay.

Satellites are old technology. Fiber is the way of the future. I recall some
posts where you had to be brought up-to-date on the capabilites of modern
fiber-optic communications.

> Fast, efficient, much more reliable.

Sure. But this isn't a fiber-optic or satellite newsgroup.

> Radio amateurs
> still stick to HF bands for the majority of their communications,
> the same as what others did a half century ago.

Even if true (you have not presented any evidence of communications-per-band to
back up your claim), so what?
>
Are you saying HF radio is obsolete? Sure sounds like it.

> Since the 1950s I've communicated by 100 WPM mechanical
> teleprinters,

(snip of still more of Len living in the past).

Did you do all those things on your own tiime, Len, paid for with your own
money and installed in your home and/or vehicle?

Or were they part of your JOB, paid for and supported by others?

> I didn't sit back and rest on morse code use glory in only
> amateur radio as you APPEAR to do, Jimmie.

So what's your complaint?

And why the diminutives? Do you think it makes you sound "professional"?
>
>>So? Do you think no one else here has a patent?
>
> Kellie has ONE patent for a bearing that does not need
> lubrication.

Who is "Kellie"? Do you mean W3RV?

> A Delphion search doesn't show any "Miccolis"
> patent. Cecil Moore

(W5DXP, ex-W6RCA)

> had several patents in electronics,

But not in radio.

> but Cecil got tired of all the PCTA

[expletive deleted]

> and went to another newsgroup.

Incorrect. Cecil has been a mainstay of the antenna newsgroup for years. He stated that he never posted seriously to rrap, and that with the restructuring of 2000 he was satisfied with the way things had changed. In fact, Cecil said he was resigning his No-Code International membership, because he thought a single 5 wpm code test was the right level of testing.

> I recall Jim Kelley

(AC6XG)

> claiming a patent
> on some golf-related thing but I never searched for that to
> examine it.
>
> Do YOU have a patent?

Do your own homework, Len.

I predict that if you did discover a patent or patents listing me as inventor or co-inventor, you would simply use it as another path of ridicule and insult. So I'm not going to help you.
>
> Have YOU published any paper in a professional association
> or academic institution publication?

Yes.

> If so, when and where?

I predict that if you did discover a paper or papers listing me as author or co-author, you would simply use it as another path of ridicule and insult. So I'm not going to help you.

Do your own homework, Len. You obviously have the time.
>
> The IEEE History Center

(snip of still more of Len living in the past).
>
> There's also the Radio Club of America, a membership
> organization open to all involved now or then in radio. It was
> formed in 1909 (5 year before ARRL) and still exists.

How many members? How much involvement in AMATEUR radio?

Sounds like you are telling me to shut up, Len. Sounds like you don't want me posting here anymore. You seem to be saying that free speech applies to you but not to others who disagree with you.

And again, you're mistaken.

393. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 13:24:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505092400.06049.00000712@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66582

>You really were dropped on your head as an infant. Either that or horribly
>shaken.

Does that mean you two have gotten a Divorce?

394. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 13:29:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505092957.06049.00000713@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66583

>I have no doubt your neighbors already know who you are.

Yes they do, Im the one they trust and look up to.

>You're the
>guy on their TV every night saying, "10-4 Gud Buddy."

I told you Brian, I have allready sold all my HAMcb Stuff, so it couldnt be me. But if my neighbors were getting TVI. Im sure they would contact me to see if could find out where the Dumb Down CBpluussers was. And most likely, it would be some DORK CBplusser like yourself.

395. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 14:01:54 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0305050601.64cc231e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> Sorry, Chris: You're busted.

So let's see... We know someone supposedly named Chris uses a server
that is supposedly on the Adelphia backbone and it supposedly
originates in Monroeville, PA. Does that tell us who Chris is?

No, didn't think so. So what's the point!?!

396. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 14:53:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EB67ADF.6020009@psu.edu>
Source record: 66585

Robert Casey wrote:
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
>>>I don't do public service because:
>>
>>I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
>>trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
>>regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
>>a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
>>be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
>>self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
>>people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
>>
>
>
> That's pretty much covers it here too.
> "I don't want to be a wannabee."
>

So let me get this straight.

People who do public service are wannabes?

People who help charities with their events (yes Virginia, there are other ps events beside working nets) are overweight oddballs and social misfits? I guess that must go for the other people who work at those events too.

And as for the ps nets and ARES/RACES and the like, it's a pity that some people get personality mixed up with process.

A couple of you folks sound like subjects in the book, "Bowling Alone"

- Mike KB3EIA -

397. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 14:56:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EB67B86.6080403@psu.edu>
Source record: 66586

paulfriedman@attbi.com wrote:
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
>
>>What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since
>
> you
>
>>have had your license?
>>Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....
>>
>
>
>
> My "favorite" worst experience:
> As a new ham a year and half ago, I called CQ on 75 meters -- after
> checking to make sure the frequency was clear, of course. First response
> was:
> Oh boy, must a newbie. Real hams don't CQ on 75. Go play on 11m
> Second response was:
> My God, you must be an old f**t. No one has called CQ on 75 in 30
> years.

Seriously? On Sunday, I had A nice chat with a Ham from Boston who
called CQ on 75 meters.

> Neither offered up a callsign, of course. That would be wrong.
>
> My real favorite experiences:
> My first QSO. After getting up enough nerve to respond to a CQ, I
> explained that this was my first contact. It seemed like 4 billion hams
> wanted to say hello and welcome me (and the person who "owned" the frequency
> was kind enough to let the party happen.)
>
> Having a QSO with a gentleman who goes back to the late spark days.
>
> All sorts of hams taking the time to help out a newbie (moi).
>
> Paul ab0si
>
>

398. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 15:19:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB680FC.2A9F9D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66587

I belong to my county ARES group. I'm happy to assist in time of emergency. I'm pleased to attend meetings when it doesn't conflict with my schedule. I'm willing to provide communications in a search for a lost person, after a storm or in the aftermath of a flood.

What I don't do is participate in communications for a marathon race, a parade or in parking cars for the county fair. While one or more of those might be considered a public service by some, I don't view them as having anything to do with "emergency service".

Dave K8MN

399. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 15:25:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB682A9.8C07E1AD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66588

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Morse code testing has long outlived its usefulness, is very old,
> and should be retired.

You're old and retired, Len. Have you outlived your usefulness?

> PCTAs cannot admit that. To them the
> code test must remain because they had to take the test long
> ago before they too got old and tired.

You probably should have tackled an amateur exam long ago--you know,
before you got too old and tired. Since the test is likely to go away
shortly, you might want to wait until you're older and more tired.

Dave K8MN

400. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 15:33:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB684BC.90B48777@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66589

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030503182717.18770.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >Flint"
> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >>> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
> >>lenover21@aol.com
> >>> (Len Over 21) writes:
> >>>
> >>> >In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >>> >Flint"
> >>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:

> Your lack of experience in ANY military communications area
> is noted there.

Allow me to point out your lack of experience in amateur radio, Leonard.
That hasn't stopped you from knowing how it should be regulated.

> >- Ability to send highly readable code using either straight key or bug.
>
> Please state the "bug" (automatic keyer mechanism) nomenclature
> you actually used in your military communications experience.

Please state your own experience with morse code use in any radio
service. Be advised that a "bug" is not an automatic keyer mechanism.
It is a semi-automatic key.

> Please state your experience under "difficult" military conditions.
>
> Please state the "long periods of time" you communicated while
> in the US military.

Please state your experience in communicating as a Novice amateur radio
operator.

> >It's like the difference between finishing in the lead pack of the Boston
> >Marathon and being able to jog a mile on a track in less than 12 minutes.
>
> No military anywhere in the world operates on principles of

> sport. The purpose of a military is "to close with and destroy
> the enemy."

Please state your military experience in closing with and destoying
anything other than a meal during your time in the U.S. Army.

> Take as long as you care to, make as long a posting as you
> normally do. The time you waste is your own...and that of all
> the readers here who have to wade through all your words of
> non-wisdom.

Feel free to take your own advice though the time you waste belongs to
others.

Dave K8MN

401. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 15:48:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB687AF.95AA7393@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66590

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030503020601.08218.00000542@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Powerful Marine Syndrome [PMS] Sufferer Steamy Stalker) writes:

>
> "Established Order" is a concept, a fantasy promulgated by ARRL
> to all the Faithful, a belief in self-righteousness despite ignorance
> of the much larger reality of the entire radio world.

Oh it's a fantasy all right--one promulgated and manufactured by you.

> There is NO "ballot," only a Belief System all about some fantasy
> of a self-contained amateur activity all alone that boasts of its
> mighty exploits as if it is the ultimate ruler of radio and technology
> involving radio.

It is peculiar that you are the only individual making such statements
here. What are the odds that we're all crazy and you are the sole
bastion of sanity?

> The Steamy Stalker has absolutely NO basis for any of his
> charges, but his lack of emotional stability and lack of ability to
> get along with others of opposing views prompts him to insult
> all who disagree with him.

But, Len--that's precisely what YOU do. Is this a result of your
emotional instability and lack of ability to get along with others of
opposing view?

> 3. I've digitized my First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial)
> Operator License first received in 1956, including the reverse
> side showing the radio and television stations worked at that
> year and duties, written in handwriting by the Chief Engineers
> at those stations...and sent those by e-mail SEVERAL TIMES
> to the Stalker. He refused to acknowledge them, claiming all
> were some kind of "lie" due to an unfortunate accident that
> attached the wrong image on the first sending.

After one "unfortunate accident", I'd certainly have trouble trusting
you.

> > "Pedantic Parson"..."Herr Oberst"...."Jackbooted thug"..."elitist
> >Morsemen"..."Dill Sergeant"...All various "nicknames" bestowed on licensed
> >Radio Amateurs who happen to disagree with Lennie.
>
> Only after those same individuals used similar nicknames, false

> accusations, and personal insults to me FIRST.

If that claim was true (and it isn't), it still wouldn't stand as an excuse.

> The Stalker's behavior is that of the schoolyard bully who thinks
> that he is can, by force or other means, do anything he wants
> but cannot take the same sort of commentary back. He cannot
> "play the game" by any rules other than his own.

This could have been taken from your biography, Leonard. You don't play well with others.

> The Stalker's sociopathic behavior is that of domination by any
> means. He cannot debate and lose gracefully, he must vent
> his self-righteous anger in public, lose control, and thereby
> cast a negative image on himself and that of US amateur radio.
> He needs both mental guidance and therapy.

So when you carry out what you've described in the above paragraph, you're actually casting a negative image on yourself and on the U.S. public as a whole? Naaaah, the negative image is yours alone.

Dave K8MN

402. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 15:52:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505115249.26620.00000524@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66591

>Subject: Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/5/2003 7:27 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030505082718.18755.00000509@mb-m06.aol.com>

>> Since the 1950s I've communicated by 100 WPM mechanical
>> teleprinters,
>
>(snip of still more of Len living in the past).
>
>Did you do all those things on your own tiime, Len, paid for with your own
>money and installed in your home and/or vehicle?
>
>Or were they part of your JOB, paid for and supported by others?

They had to be, Jim.

Lennie's one-and-only radio "license" clearly states he cannot operate a radio transmitter that does not have an FCC issued station license. So unless he's playing with Part 15 or Part 95 stuff, he's QRT.

(Garage door openers and TV remotes notwithstanding...)

>> I didn't sit back and rest on morse code use glory in only
>> amateur radio as you APPEAR to do, Jimmie.
>
>So what's your complaint?
>
>And why the diminutives? Do you think it makes you sound "professional"?

No....Lennie sits back and rests on his 1950s era radiotelephone operator license (now GROL) and his also 1950s era mmilitary service as "evidence" of experience in radiocommunication.

And "professional"...?!?! Jim, this twerp can't even send an e-mail without screwing it up (an "accident" by his own admission). This guy's no more an electronics "profesional" than my daughter is.

>Sounds like you are telling me to shut up, Len. Sounds like you don't want me
>posting here anymore. You seem to be saying that free speech applies to you
>but
>not to others who disagree with you.
>
>And again, you're mistaken.

Bingo. Rules only apply if they help or support a LennieRant, Jim, didn't you know that...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

403. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 15:54:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB68904.A0F2AAB8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66592

Len Over 21 wrote:

> You seem to be posting out of spite.

Thanks for the best laugh I've had in weeks, Leonard.

> Do YOU have a patent?

What is it with you and patents? It is almost as if you have some sort
of registration fetish.

Dave K8MN

404. N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 16:23:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505122321.26511.00000481@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66454

Fooling around with FAA database, found the following:

N2EY 1967 BEECH V35, GIORDANO GARY M, VALLEY AL

There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama! Maybe I
can find it and get my picture taken next to it!

Ya want one if I find it, Jim?

73

Steve, K4YZ

405. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 16:34:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305050834.14cd4195@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66455

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030504213553.21638.00000398@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/4/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030504162727.18767.00000379@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
> >>Why can't he accept the fact that the radio
> >>world just happened to not need him as bad as he needed it?
> >
> >Almost everyone needs to feel needed, Steve.
>
> I agree.

Well, there you have it.

> And I think it's a shame he couldn't have just put his two cents
> in and joined Amateur Radio, code tested or not.

Why is it a shame?

> He could have been an asset.

How?

> As I have acknowledged before, his apparent knowledge is great...
> Too bad he can
> only share it when it suits a particular rant.

What matters in real life is what actually gets done, not theoretical
blue-sky stuff. All of the newsgroup postings in the world don't put a
station on the air or make any contacts.

Is there such a shortage of technically knowledgeable and able people
in amateur radio that we should kow-tow to certain people and beg them
to become hams? I don't think so!

> >I think it was Jon Bloom, KE3Z, who showed from old Callbook data that the
> >number of new licenses did surge after 1991, only to slowly fade back to
> >near-1990 levels.
>
> ...As it did with Novice Enhancement. I participated as an examiner for
> quite a few folks who jumped in after it started, but it ebbed just as quickly.

The surge after 1991 was bigger and lasted longer. The effects are
hard to gauge for a number of reasons, such as the 1994 changes in
vanity callsign rules.

>
> >The two big questions now are:
> >
> >- If/when S25.5 goes away, how long will it take FCC to dump Element 1?
>
> I bet they issue a news release suspending further Element 1 requirements
> until the NPRM process can be completed and formally deleted.

I agree partly - I don't think they'll even bother with an NPRM. I predict the only delaying factor will be how long it takes The Congress to ratify the new treaty.

FCC can rightfully say that they addressed all of the current issues concerning code testing during the 2000 restructuring process, and that there is no reason to go through all of that all over again. FCC's "no regulatory purpose" wording makes it clear that they are holding onto Element 1 just to satisfy S25.5. They can rightfully say "We went through the NPRM process more than 3 years ago, nothing has really changed, done deal, game over".

In fact, the rewording of Part 97 that is required to eliminate Element 1 is quite minor, and consists mostly of deletions. I think I wrote up a summary of what would be needed some time back. FCC might save some paperwork and just do it all at once.

OTOH, FCC could do the NPRM/R&O thing all over again, stretching the process out for a year or more. Could be 2005 by the time action is taken if they go that route. Look how long the 160 meter and "Novice refarming" proposals have been sitting.

Of course there's always a tiny chance S25.5 could survive WRC-2003, but I'm not holding my breath for that one!

I think the delays in getting S25.5 on the agenda have worked to aid in its repeal. Had it come up for a vote some years back, the chances of its being renewed would have been far greater than today.

> >- What other changes should be made to the license structure if/when that
> >happens?
>
> I doubt they change anything.
>
They will only change things if we ask them to. Which we should.

73 de Jim, N2EY

406. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 17:12:58 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0305050912.37f395cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66456
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

And speaking of that Dougie, who made you the usenet cop anyway there shorty?

407. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 17:32:36 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3EB6A034.3A3ACB55@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 66457
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Chris wrote:
>
> And speaking of that Dougie, who made you the usenet cop anyway there shorty?

Dougie, N8WeenieWashingMaggot?

Is he here? Sorry to hear about it.

408. Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 18:31:37 UTC
From: valmont <radiola.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <28753N097@web2news.com>
Source record: 66459

NEWINGTON, CT, May 1, 2003--The FCC has requested the assistance of the ARRL Amateur Auxiliary/Official Observers in monitoring for illegal operation on the 10-meter amateur band. The request came in an April 28 letter from FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, who says incursions on the band by apparently unlicensed operators continue to be a major enforcement headache.

From: Lou Franklin <lou@cbcintl.com>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: Expanded 8-Band Channel Chart
Organization: CBC International
Reply-To: lou@cbcintl.com

FREE DOWNLOAD, 8-band expanded CB frequency chart shows 4 bands down, 3 up, + CB 40. Find where you are, 25.165 Ch.1 lowest band to 28.755 MHz Ch.40 highest band. Includes the skips too.

Download this (13Kb, 1-page PDF format/portrait layout) at:

www.cbcintl.com/docs/channels.pdf

We'll be adding more freebies as time permits. For links to those freebies we already have up, go to:

www.cbcintl.com/freebies.htm

Due to high demand, look for the xtal-mixing charts & block mixing diagrams covering about 95% of the most common AM and AM/SSB CB radios here. Lots of guys asking to "fill in the blanks" in order to replace a bad xtal or convert/expand these older rigs to new freqs.

Many thanks (again!) for all your great support these last 26 years!
73,
Lou
****
Who are we? Since 1976, we've been THE source for CB Radio technical information & high-performance CB accessories!

DIRECT link to our secure Web Order Form:
https://www.cbcintl.com/secure.htm
NOTE: Include the "s" in http; otherwise it's not secure!

Email: lou@cbcintl.com
Web: www.cbcintl.com

CBC INTERNATIONAL
P.O. Box 30655
Tucson AZ 85751 USA
Toll-Free TEL. & FAX: (888) 434-9227
Local TEL. & FAX: (520) 298-7980

--
Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

409. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 18:31:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <b96amm$im8$0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 66458

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/4/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030504162727.18767.00000379@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
> >>Why can't he accept the fact that the radio
> >>world just happened to not need him as bad as he needed it?
> >
> >Almost everyone needs to feel needed, Steve.
>
> I agree. And I think it's a shame he couldn't have just put his two cents
> in and joined Amateur Radio, code tested or not. He could have been an asset.

Yeah, but all he wanted to ever be is the first half of that descriptive!

410. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 20:48:11 UTC
From: Hambone the Magnifico <paintcanfullofpcb@amishonline.com>
Message-ID: <3eb6cdff@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66460

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net...
> Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
>
>
> How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
>
>
> I don't do public service because:

...Ham radio op's are egotistical Grade-AAA
ASSHOLES who have radios out the wazoo
but no clue whatsoever. They come out
only if they can get free food, then dissappear
when there's any work to do. Selfish beer-bellied
FUCKS who's antenna towers should be struck
by lightning or blown over when the next tornado
comes thru. All they ever do is say "ooola - ooola"
on HF to the guy 2 miles away when their running a
kilowatt and still want a "signal report" and cry if
their less than 40DB over S-9 on the meter.
Ask em to come out to a club function or volunteer
for even the most mundane communications exercize
is like gettin someone into the chair for a root-canal....

(...and all you reading this KNOW I am dead-on right too !!)

PFHBBBBBLTTT !!!!!!!!!

411. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 21:01:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b96k6juco1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66462

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EB5DEF3.E8584CEF@ix.netcom.com...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> > >I don't do public service because:
> >
> > I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> > trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be
a
> > regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> > a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> > be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> > self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> > people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
> >
>
> That's pretty much covers it here too.
> "I don't want to be a wannabee."
>

Excuse me 'gentlemen'...but how is providing emergency comm, checking into a net, being a net control, operating during wx watches being a 'wannabee'.

NOBODY I KNOW that does this sort of thing gives two hoots about a certificate or a letter...or a wannabee plaque.

You should both get a life. This attitude really pisses me off.

All that you get from ham radio and you put nothing back...No rule saying you need to do public service. And frankly we don't need your types anyway.

Have a crappy day.

Dan/W4NTI

412. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 21:02:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b96k6kuco2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66463

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EB67ADF.6020009@psu.edu...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> >
> >>>I don't do public service because:
> >>
> >>I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> >>trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be
a
> >>regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> >>a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> >>be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> >>self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> >>people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
> >>
> >
> >
> > That's pretty much covers it here too.
> > "I don't want to be a wannabee."
> >
>
> So let me get this straight.
>
> People who do public service are wannabes?
>
>
> People who help charities with their events (yes Virginia, there are
> other ps events beside working nets) are overweight oddballs and social
> misfits? I guess that must go for the other people who work at those
> events too.
>
> And as for the ps nets and ARES/RACES and the like, it's a pity that
> some people get personality mixed up with process.
>
>
> A couple of you folks sound like subjects in the book, "Bowling Alone"
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>

Man you got that right.

Dan/W4NTI

413. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 21:09:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB6D32B.5070409@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66461

Dave Heil wrote:
> I belong to my county ARES group. I'm happy to assist in time of
> emergency. I'm pleased to attend meetings when it doesn't conflict with
> my schedule. I'm willing to provide communications in a search for a
> lost person, after a storm or in the aftermath of a flood.
>
> What I don't do is participate in communications for a marathon race, a
> parade or in parking cars for the county fair. While one or more of
> those might be considered a public service by some, I don't view them as
> having anything to do with "emergency service".

Not emergency in the normal sense, where something happens and we
react. These are events where there can be an emergency like a lost
child or accident. But they are distinct from each other. And it gets
the word out that we exist.

- Mike KB3EIA

414. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because: I DO DO PS activities

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 21:20:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB6D5B4.6000209@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66464

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Well.. my activities in and out of ham radio are:
>
> Net participation (holding nets and participating)
> Public service activities (various runs, bike-a-thons, walks etc.)
> Teaching ham classes for the tech level license
> Teaching FEMA IS courses coming up in the upcoming months.
> Was PR/publicity manager for local club for 2 years
> Will get into more of the NTS activities in the future I hope
>
> Outside of ham radio?
>
> Volunteer Firefighter (will be moving to full time position in the future...
> hope to find a dept. that will allow me to do both!)
> Achieving my Instructor certification for Red Cross CPR and First Aid
> Participated in adopt-a-highway program
> Participated in big brothers
> Have done various tasks to assist with the poor. (serving/delivering food,
> home repairs and maintenance issues etc.)
> Work with the local Volunteer Action Center to fullfill needs where needed.
>
>
> My family has always been involved with public service and employed in
> public service in some capacities for the past 3 generations or so as best
> as I can find out. Doing good gives me a good feeling and some of the types
> of work performed gives one a really different persective on life.

Good work, Man! Doing good just for the doing good of it is about the highest form of civilization.

And another thing is if the conservative game plan is going to work, a lot of people are going to have to do public service. And oddly enough some of the most conservative people I know have a distinct hatred of public service.

- Mike KB3EIA -

415. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 21:42:48 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@qrmkingallbands.org>
Message-ID: <b96lsq$es3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66465
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305050601.64cc231e@posting.google.com...
> > Sorry, Chris: You're busted.
>
> So let's see... We know someone supposedly named Chris uses a server
> that is supposedly on the Adelphia backbone and it supposedly
> originates in Monroeville, PA. Does that tell us who Chris is?
>
> No, didn't think so. So what's the point!?!

He He He, busted!

Herb

416. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 22:13:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB6E1EF.CECA1810@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66466

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3EB5DEF3.E8584CEF@ix.netcom.com...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > >I don't do public service because:
> > >
> > > I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> > > trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be
> a
> > > regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> > > a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> > > be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> > > self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> > > people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
> > >
> >
> > That's pretty much covers it here too.
> > "I don't want to be a wannabee."
> >
>
> Excuse me 'gentlemen'...but how is providing emergency comm, checking into a
> net, being a net control, operating during wx watches being a 'wannabee'.
>
> NOBODY I KNOW that does this sort of thing gives two hoots about a
> certificate or a letter...or a wannabee plaque.
>
> You should both get a life. This attitude really pisses me off.
>
> All that you get from ham radio and you put nothing back...No rule saying
> you need to do public service. And frankly we don't need your types anyway.
>
> Have a crappy day.

In fairness to Larry's view, Dan, I've seen a number of the types he describes involved in amateur radio public service work both in Cincinnati and across the Ohio River in northern Kentucky. I've not encountered any of them in the West Virginia-Ohio-Pennsylvania tri-state area.

There are a number of ways to "give back" without being active in public service work.

Dave K8MN

417. Looking for 1977-79 callbook listing KA4GCB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 22:29:24 UTC
From: Mike <mparkes@spamnotmparkes.com>
Message-ID: <3572a0220b3c5161d04f084454ef6d7d@TeraNews>
Source record: 66467
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur

Does anyone have an old 77-79 callbook that might be able to see if my first licensed call is in there - KA4GCB? I am trying to figure out when I first got licensed (I believe it was around 77-79 - any help is appreciated!
Mike AB7RU

418. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 23:49:52 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3D67173A629AB7E7.7C6E7B86558F4AB9.EBB76BF8769656CD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 66468

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:FXkta.4094$Cl7.723@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> It ain't done in CW.
>
> (good lord, am I opening this thread again ???)
>

Yep, seems you are :). Hey, who says "it ain't done in CW??!! Nearly every
training net I've directed, and anyone I've ever trained for NCS on EmCom
nets has been trained to incorporate CW practices/policies into their
training. In some of the ARES training nets I've conducted, we had
check-ins via CW, APRS, any and every band that someone was licensed for and
cared to check in through! Nearly every net I have been fortunate enough to
have either an NCS or ANCS that is CW capable.

Kim W5TIT

>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
> <<putting on the asbestos long johns and pulling the plug on the modem>>
>
> :P)
>
>
>
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB2DE01.60208@adelphia.net...
> > Are there really only a couple people here who do public service? We
> > only got a few comments on Ryans thread.
> >
> >
> > How about we spice it up a little, and try finishing this sentence:
> >
> >
> > I don't do public service because:
> >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

>
>

419. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-05 23:54:08 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9219D8F06596659A.F7A9EC788BF760D8.5D307B32E28E7288@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 66469

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB680FC.2A9F9D4@earthlink.net...
> I belong to my county ARES group. I'm happy to assist in time of
> emergency. I'm pleased to attend meetings when it doesn't conflict with
> my schedule. I'm willing to provide communications in a search for a
> lost person, after a storm or in the aftermath of a flood.
>
> What I don't do is participate in communications for a marathon race, a
> parade or in parking cars for the county fair. While one or more of
> those might be considered a public service by some, I don't view them as
> having anything to do with "emergency service".
>
> Dave K8MN

Public Service events are the best/easiest/most convenient ways to learn and hone those very skills required under emergency conditions. Not to mention that public service events are, generally, a much more relaxed environment in which to learn and gain experience in communications and working with others.

Kim W5TIT

420. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 00:11:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EB6FD95.A12E3626@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66470

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/4/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030504162727.18767.00000379@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
> >>Why can't he accept the fact that the radio
> >>world just happened to not need him as bad as he needed it?
> >
> >Almost everyone needs to feel needed, Steve.
>
> I agree. And I think it's a shame he couldn't have just put his two cents
> in and joined Amateur Radio, code tested or not. He could have been an asset.

Instead of all 5 letters of that word, all he has achieved are the first three....

:-)

421. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 00:29:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505202930.18771.00000316@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 66471

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305040151440.253@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>For those who renewed, we know who they are as long as the "prior class"
>field shows the "P" or "N".

Right you are! Thanks for the info.

The point is, however, that if we just look at the number of "Technicians",
that number includes those with no prior class and those with a prior class of
Novice or Tech Plus.

>It's only those who got the CSCE after April 14, 2000
>that we don't know about....
>
Yup.

>The fact that the FCC allowed any of these post April 2000 techs to have
>PERMANENT op-authority in the "novice HF" bands was a bonehead move (*).
>They should have had that expire after 365 days just like the credit for
passing
>does. That way, these people would either upgrade or come in for an annual
>CW exam. :-)
>
>(*) - There's NO way for anyone to tell that these people are or are not
>operating within their privilege when on HF because no one can tell if they
>have the privilege short of knocking on their door and asking to see the
>CSCE.

That's true of anyone operating under CSCE authority, isn't it?

73 de Jim, N2EY

422. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 00:29:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505202931.18771.00000317@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 66472

In article <20030505122321.26511.00000481@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Fooling around with FAA database, found the following:
>
> N2EY 1967 BEECH V35, GIORDANO GARY M, VALLEY AL
>
> There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama! Maybe I
>can find it and get my picture taken next to it!

Holy shoot! Now that's cool!
>
> Ya want one if I find it, Jim?
>
Sure! I can put it next to the picture of me standing next to the sign at the WWV/WWVB transmitter site....

Now how's this for a coincidence:

When I was just a wee little lad, Dad had one of those line-controlled gas model airplanes that you could fly in a circle. .049 engine, etc. The model he had was...you guessed it.... a Beechcraft Bonanza.

73 es TNX de Jim, N2EY

423. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 00:37:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305051637.53c8afc1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66473

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB680FC.2A9F9D4@earthlink.net>...
> I belong to my county ARES group. I'm happy to assist in time of
> emergency. I'm pleased to attend meetings when it doesn't conflict with
> my schedule. I'm willing to provide communications in a search for a
> lost person, after a storm or in the aftermath of a flood.
>
> What I don't do is participate in communications for a marathon race, a
> parade or in parking cars for the county fair. While one or more of
> those might be considered a public service by some, I don't view them as
> having anything to do with "emergency service".

Parking lot patrols do fall into the overall category of ham public
service, ham emergency comms are a subset of ham public service
activities. It's the sum total of such activities which matters wrt to
hams meeting the charter of the service.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

424. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because: I DO DO PS activities

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 02:12:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030505221234.04525.00000375@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66474

In article <3EB6D5B4.6000209@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>And another thing is if the conservative game plan is going to work, a
>lot of people are going to have to do public service. And oddly enough
>some of the most conservative people I know have a distinct hatred of
>public service.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Us conservatives would probably be much more amenable to "public service"
if we weren't working so hard to pay the high taxes that support the Welfare
State which has been put in place in order to create dependency for the purpose
of keeping the liberal, Socialist, Democrat ideology permanently in power.
The simple fact is, the richer I get, the more generous I become -- with both
my money and my personal time. However, when I have to work twice as
hard just to carry my load and someone else's as well, then I have fewer
resources, personal or material, to devote to "public service."

73 de Larry, K3LT

425. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 02:12:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030505221234.04525.00000376@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66475

In article <b961i8$fj4dp$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Yeah Larry.... I understand that with no problem. The question mainly is
>directed as to the point of should they be left up to "gentlemens'
>agreements" or should they be more formal declarations from the FCC?

Ryan:

Right now, it's a combination of both. I believe that the FCC does have
a valid purpose for defining limitations on mode and power for specific
frequencies. The ARRL also suggests further refinements which are
adhered to by all amateurs in the spirit of the FCC rule requiring us to
operate within the bounds of "good amateur practice." The present system
works, and I can think of way more reasons to keep it, than to eliminate it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

426. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 02:12:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030505221235.04525.00000377@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66477

In article <3EB5BC2E.3050602@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
>> trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
>> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.Oh, I also have
>> a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
>> be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
>> self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
>> people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
>
> Hmm... Was that facetious or what?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

I'd say it was facetious, at the very least!

73 de Larry, K3LT

427. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 02:12:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030505221236.04525.00000378@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66478

In article <3EB67ADF.6020009@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
> So let me get this straight.
>
> People who do public service are wannabes?

No, Mike -- just the hams who use "public service" as a justification for reducing or eliminating code testing and other licensing requirements in order to create more hams for "public service."

> People who help charities with their events (yes Virginia, there are
>other ps events beside working nets) are overweight oddballs and social
>misfits? I guess that must go for the other people who work at those
>events too.

See above answer.

> And as for the ps nets and ARES/RACES and the like, it's a pity that
>some people get personality mixed up with process.

Yes, it is -- and the ones with the biggest personality problems are the ones who get into "public service" as No-Clue Technicians, and subsequently demand to be accepted as real, full-fledged hams, in spite of the fact that they only skill
they bring to the activity is the ability to push a button and talk.

> A couple of you folks sound like subjects in the book, "Bowling Alone"

Never heard of it. Hope it's nothing like "Bowling for Columbine."

73 de Larry, K3LT

428. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 02:12:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030505221237.04525.00000380@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66476

In article <b96k6juco1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Excuse me 'gentlemen'...but how is providing emergency comm, checking into a
>net, being a net control, operating during wx watches being a 'wannabee'.

Dan:

Because a lot of hams get involved in this sort of thing in the hope of being
close to the "action" usually participated in by the aforementioned groups,
in spite of the fact that they are not qualified to be policemen, firemen, or
paramedics themselves.

>NOBODY I KNOW that does this sort of thing gives two hoots about a
>certificate or a letter...or a wannabee plaque.

In that case, consider yourself lucky!

>You should both get a life. This attitude really pisses me off.

Dave and I already have lives, but thank you very much for your concern.
And remember, it's much better to be pissed off than pissed on.

>All that you get from ham radio and you put nothing back...No rule saying
>you need to do public service. And frankly we don't need your types anyway.
>
>Have a crappy day.

How charming!

73 de Larry, K3LT

429. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 02:12:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030505221237.04525.00000379@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66479

In article <b961if$fj4dp$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Well Larry,
>
>What about outside of ham radio?? That was part of the original post.
>
>There is alot to be done with public service activities in ham radio.
>Consider being net control for an upcoming race/run/bike-a-thon etc??? Or
>just plain participating? Great chance to meet and work with other hams in
>your area. There is alot to do, where you don't have to be Superham, or
>cop/firefighter/emt either. It is merely just a matter of getting
>involved, participating and working TOGETHER to achieve a common goal.

Ryan:

The type of activities you describe probably annoy me more than the Public Service Hero types. Some technically-disinclined, operationally-challenged, no-nothing-at-all-about-radio gets a No-Clue Technician ticket and an HT, drags it to a few club meetings, and then shows up at the March of Dimes Walk-A-Thon expecting to be given a leading role in the amateur communications being provided. Again, it's all done for the personal glory -- the approval, appreciation, the being seen as someone doing something that nobody else can do -- even when this isn't true. The worst part is that all of this kind of "public service" activity is usually applied as justification
to reducing/eliminating the code testing and other challenging licensing requirements -- which has the effect of watering down the overall capabilities of the whole of the amateur radio service.

The grandmother, who is the XYL of an active ham, who gets her No-Clue Tech ticket and then carries her HT to the Walk-A-Thon is NOT my fellow ham in any respect whatsoever. She is a pretender; a dumbed-down fake; a wannabe, if you will. She can be replaced by any other grandmother and a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie. She has no more interest in or commitment to the ARS than her pet cat. All she is doing is borrowing a frequency.

73 de Larry, K3LT

430. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 02:19:56 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0305051819.12f142af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66480
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

He He He, busted!
>
> Herb

No I was referring to NR5 Turd, the notorious weenie from Texas.
5 feet of cowshit packed in a ten pound bag. Big mouth behind a mike
but sort of a fag in person. Also considers himself the usenet FBI.

431. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 03:06:50 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505230650.08556.00000749@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66481

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>drags it to a few club meetings, and then shows up at the March of Dimes
>Walk-A-Thon

Often enough, these poeple show up at meetings, asking for Ham volunteers. It is not surprising that they show up at Ham meetings. Hams provide this "service" for free, something they would otherwise have to pay someone to do. In reality, the Hams that volunteer for these events are being taken advantage of.

>She can be replaced by any other grandmother and
>a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie.

True. Anyone can do these volunteer events. They could easily train someone, licensed or not, the same day to do it.

Also agree that Hams do these events to make Hams look like they are doing "public service".

>The worst part is that
>all of this kind of "public service" activity is usually applied as
>justification
>to reducing/eliminating the code testing and other challenging licensing
>requirements -- which has the effect of watering down the overall
>capabilities
>of the whole of the amateur radio service.

Wrong. It does not act as justification to eliminate code testing. It has NOTHING to do with code testing.

Its used by anyone, code or no-code, to make the hobby and themselves look like they do volunteer events.

432. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 03:13:09 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030505231309.08556.00000750@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66482

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>as No-Clue Technicians, and subsequently demand
>to be accepted as real, full-fledged hams, in spite of the fact that they
>only
>skill
>they bring to the activity is the ability to push a button and talk.

Do you feel that way about all Technician class license holders? Doesn't sound like supporting the hobby. You know some of them have BSEE degree and can design circuits. Hardly just pushing a button.

Some of those with a BSEE are also smart enough NOT to learn code when they want to be good at other aspects.

433. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 03:58:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB732C7.7CE6255@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66483

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB680FC.2A9F9D4@earthlink.net...
> > I belong to my county ARES group. I'm happy to assist in time of
> > emergency. I'm pleased to attend meetings when it doesn't conflict with
> > my schedule. I'm willing to provide communications in a search for a
> > lost person, after a storm or in the aftermath of a flood.
> >
> > What I don't do is participate in communications for a marathon race, a
> > parade or in parking cars for the county fair. While one or more of
> > those might be considered a public service by some, I don't view them as
> > having anything to do with "emergency service".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Public Service events are the best/easiest/most convenient ways to learn and
> hone those very skills required under emergency conditions. Not to mention
> that public service events are, generally, a much more relaxed environment
> in which to learn and gain experience in communications and working with
> others.

That's a good point. If others need to hone their skills, let them do
the marathons, parades and car parking and that can be their public
service. I'll be here with honed skills when there is an emergency.

Dave K8MN

434. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 04:11:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305052011.7da0101c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66484

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB6E1EF.CECA1810@earthlink.net>...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3EB5DEF3.E8584CEF@ix.netcom.com...
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > >I don't do public service because:
> > > >
> > > > I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> > > > trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be
> a
> > > > regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> > > > a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> > > > be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> > > > self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> > > > people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
> > > >
> > >
> > > That's pretty much covers it here too.
> > > "I don't want to be a wannabee."
> > >
> >
> > Excuse me 'gentlemen'...but how is providing emergency comm, checking into a
> > net, being a net control, operating during wx watches being a 'wannabee'.
> >
> > NOBODY I KNOW that does this sort of thing gives two hoots about a
> > certificate or a letter...or a wannabee plaque.
> >
> > You should both get a life. This attitude really pisses me off.
> >
> > All that you get from ham radio and you put nothing back...No rule saying
> > you need to do public service. And frankly we don't need your types anyway.
> >
> > Have a crappy day.
>
> In fairness to Larry's view, Dan, I've seen a number of the types he
> describes involved in amateur radio public service work both in
> Cincinnati and across the Ohio River in northern Kentucky. I've not
> encountered any of them in the West Virginia-Ohio-Pennsylvania tri-state
> area.
>
> There are a number of ways to "give back" without being active in public
```

> service work.
>
> Dave K8MN

Outside of handing out 12 second QSO's from backwater African countries, what other ways are there?

Working out of band Frenchmen?

435. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 04:20:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030506002019.08556.00000752@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66485

Mike Coslo writes:

>Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
>>> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.

A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general population.

I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations. I understand the cult like nature (in a good way) that Ham radio often is.

I recently attended an event with a random group of Hams. I have been with large groups of Hams, at Hamfests. I have noticed most of them are fat. But one can say that only these types of Hams attend Hamfests. For example, N2EY has said that Hams at Hamfests are not typical Hams, just those that attend Hamfests.

So, to find typical Hams, one can find a small group of Hams. Recently, I recently joined a small group of Hams in their activities. (I even operated HF phone). Although, it is a small group of Hams, remember It was a completely random group.

There were 16 adults and 4 children. Out of the adults, 12 were significantly fat. Four, including myself, were not. None of the children were fat. You can be sure that I ate a normal quantity of food throughout the whole event. However, I cannot say the same for any of the other adults.

Breakfast was 3 French toast with plenty of syrup and sugar, bacon, sausage. Through they day several bottles of beer, chips, cookies were consumed. Also burgers, sausage hot dogs with cheese, chili, chicken wings, clam chowder, shrimp, chili. This was all consumed in one day. There were an estimated three lunch times. Dinner was the same items, left over from lunch. There was some food left over. Instead of throwing them away, they cooked it and had a post dinner meal.

Some time during the same say, a couple of people and me went to get ice cream. Then we went driving. The driver was so weak, his fat arms could hardly turn the steering wheel. We stopped and walked around. The same driver person made two stops at stores, ate a candy bar, and some cookies. Then on the way back, in the car, complained that he was hungry. Also, note that this special trip were ADDITIONAL eating times to the ones I mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Contests require less physical activity, and this could be a reason for the weight gain. I noticed that snacking occurred during the contests. Other interests, such as radio direction finding use more physical activity. If more Hams were interested in this, there would be fewer overweight Hams.

The Hams were a very nice group of people, so I feel bad about it. When Hams over eat, it hurts them. Hopefully, this may change in the future.

The adults were of course showing the children how to operate, etc. The children were eating the same fatty foods the adults were eating. If one uses some common sense, one can see that these children will be fat when they become adults. This is the future of Ham radio.

436. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 04:21:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305052021.265bcd73@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66486

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030505092957.06049.00000713@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >I have no doubt your neighbors already know who you are.
>
> Yes they do, Im the one they trust and look up to.

Yet you conspire to screw them because you hate them.

> >You're the
> >guy on their TV every night saying, "10-4 Gud Buddy."
>
> I told you Brian, I have allready sold all my HAMcb Stuff, so it couldnt be me.

"Allready???"

You said you were on at least 6M. Which time were you lying? Then or
now?

> But if my neighbors were getting TVI. Im sure they would contact me to see if
> could find out where the Dumb Down CBpluussers was. And most likely, it would
> be some DORK CBplusser like yourself.

At least that's what you would want them to believe. Until officer
freindly cuffs you. Sayonara Broose.

437. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 04:22:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305052022.12b4b9df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66487

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030505092400.06049.00000712@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >You really were dropped on your head as an infant. Either that or horribly
> >shaken.
>
> Does that mean you two have gotten a Divorce?

Neither of us shook you as an infant.

438. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 04:23:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305052023.219368b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66488

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b924nc$kl3$1@208.207.71.152>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > > DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.
>
> Not for dealing with the likes of you. It's child's play.

If you want to play with children, hook up with Dave.

439. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 04:44:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030506004436.08556.00000753@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66489

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>> I agree. And I think it's a shame he couldn't have just put his two
>cents
>> in and joined Amateur Radio, code tested or not. He could have been an
>asset.
>

Joining costs almost nothing. It just takes a license in a day class. It SEEMS like there is alot of benefit for a small amount of effort (for the no-code license).

It could be that the narrow interests of contesting and antennas. Cult-like conventions, codewords, "contest" rules (which must be followed exactly), and Morse code pressure.

There ARE other things that can be done with amateur radio. The current group of Hams only seem to want to do things a certain way, and only bring new Hams that want to do things the same way.

As a result, some other people may not want to join amateur radio. I would not recommend any EE join the hobby, even if they were interested in rf. Only, if they were interested in antennas, would I recommend it.

Only by joining can one change the hobby for the better. Although, I would just get the privileges. Also, do not attend all meetings, find out the topic ahead of time, from the newsletter, and only attend the ones you like.

Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea. I can tell you that. You will be alot happier not trying to change the hobby.

440. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because: I DO DO PS activities

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 05:05:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b98m4m$fs8j1$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66601

>
> Good work, Man! Doing good just for the doing good of it is about the
> highest form of civilization.

And that is the biggest reason why to do it in the first place. It's not the award of a piece of paper or a plaque being the reason for getting involved. (both in ham radio and outside as well) It is the feeling you get by helping out to make your community a better place. (use any definition of community here)

>
> And another thing is if the conservative game plan is going to work, a
> lot of people are going to have to do public service. And oddly enough
> some of the most conservative people I know have a distinct hatred of
> public service.

You are partially right on this one.... there are some right wingers that do get involved but not as much as they should. But there are many that do not get involved. The overwhelming majority of right-wingers are people with money, as I have never yet met a rich left winger who wasn't a politician. The attitude of the right-wingers I have seen is the "I got mine" attitude. A real way to help give back would be helping to show how "they got theirs," but not actually giving the money to them. (Give a man a fish analogy here)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

441. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 05:27:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b97h41mav0@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 66490

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB6E1EF.CECA1810@earthlink.net>...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3EB5DEF3.E8584CEF@ix.netcom.com...
> > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > >I don't do public service because:
> > > > >
> > > > > I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> > > > > trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be
> > a
> > > > > regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> > > > > a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> > > > > be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> > > > > self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> > > > > people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > That's pretty much covers it here too.
> > > > "I don't want to be a wannabee."
> > > >
> > >
> > > Excuse me 'gentlemen'...but how is providing emergency comm, checking into a
> > > net, being a net control, operating during wx watches being a 'wannabee'.
> > >
> > > NOBODY I KNOW that does this sort of thing gives two hoots about a
> > > certificate or a letter...or a wannabee plaque.
> > >
> > > You should both get a life. This attitude really pisses me off.
> > >
> > > All that you get from ham radio and you put nothing back...No rule saying
> > > you need to do public service. And frankly we don't need your types anyway.
> > >
> > > Have a crappy day.
> >
> > In fairness to Larry's view, Dan, I've seen a number of the types he
> > describes involved in amateur radio public service work both in
> > Cincinnati and across the Ohio River in northern Kentucky. I've not
> > encountered any of them in the West Virginia-Ohio-Pennsylvania tri-state

> > area.
> >
> > There are a number of ways to "give back" without being active in public
> > service work.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Outside of handing out 12 second QSO's from backwater African
> countries, what other ways are there?
>
> Working out of band Frenchmen?

Hey Slim, you gonna give back all those QSO'S you allegedly made "with"
official permission as a /T5?

442. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 05:28:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b97h62mav1@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 66491

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b924nc$kl3$1@208.207.71.152>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.
> >
> > Not for dealing with the likes of you. It's child's play.
>
> If you want to play with children, hook up with Dave.

Dave won't do. You will.

443. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 05:31:03 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b97hanmav2@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 66492

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3EB5BC2E.3050602@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> >> trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
> >> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.Oh, I also have
> >> a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> >> be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> >> self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> >> people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
> >
> > Hmm... Was that facetious or what?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike:
>
> I'd say it was facetious, at the very least!

Maybe even downright trollish!

444. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 05:34:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030506013410.08518.00000600@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66493

>Neither of us shook you as an infant.
>

You still havent answered the Question

445. Re: PLC/BPL Interference Likely?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 09:48:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305060148.7995250f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66494

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030506013410.08518.00000600@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Neither of us shook you as an infant.
>
> You still havent answered the Question

So.

446. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 09:52:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305060152.1abd9592@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66495

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b97h41$mav$0@208.206.142.73>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB6E1EF.CECA1810@earthlink.net>...
> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:3EB5DEF3.E8584CEF@ix.netcom.com...
> > > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >I don't do public service because:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I am 5'11" tall, weigh only 180 lbs, and have normal cholesterol and
> > > > > > trygliceride levels. Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be
> a
> > > > > > regular participant in Amateur Public Service events. Oh, I also have
> > > > > > a full-time job and an active social life. I have no lifelong desire to
> > > > > > be a cop, fireman, or paramedic. I have a normal, healthy level of
> > > > > > self-esteem, and don't have any need to be doing things that have
> > > > > > people constantly stroking my ego with praise.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > That's pretty much covers it here too.
> > > > > "I don't want to be a wannabee."
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Excuse me 'gentlemen'...but how is providing emergency comm, checking into a
> > > > net, being a net control, operating during wx watches being a 'wannabee'.
> > > >
> > > > NOBODY I KNOW that does this sort of thing gives two hoots about a
> > > > certificate or a letter...or a wannabee plaque.
> > > >
> > > > You should both get a life. This attitude really pisses me off.
> > > >
> > > > All that you get from ham radio and you put nothing back...No rule saying
> > > > you need to do public service. And frankly we don't need your types anyway.
> > > >
> > > > Have a crappy day.
> > >
> > > In fairness to Larry's view, Dan, I've seen a number of the types he
> > > describes involved in amateur radio public service work both in
> > > Cincinnati and across the Ohio River in northern Kentucky. I've not
```

> > > encountered any of them in the West Virginia-Ohio-Pennsylvania tri-state
> > > area.
> > >
> > > There are a number of ways to "give back" without being active in public
> > > service work.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Outside of handing out 12 second QSO's from backwater African
> > countries, what other ways are there?
> >
> > Working out of band Frenchmen?
>
> Hey Slim, you gonna give back all those QSO'S you allegedly made "with"
> official permission as a /T5?

Hey DICK, how does one do that?

447. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 10:01:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305060201.7cdacf95@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66496

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b97h62mav1@208.206.142.73>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b924nc$kl3$1@208.207.71.152>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.
> > >
> > > Not for dealing with the likes of you. It's child's play.
> >
> > If you want to play with children, hook up with Dave.
>
> Dave won't do. You will.

Suit yourself. Now what?

448. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 12:05:42 UTC
From: Jumping Jim <jjim@jjimcbampsales.com>
Message-ID: <b988en$7c1$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66497

"valmont" <radiola.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in message
news:28753N097@web2news.com...
> ----------
>
> NEWINGTON, CT, May 1, 2003--The FCC has requested the assistance of the
> ARRL Amateur Auxiliary/Official Observers in monitoring for illegal
> operation on the 10-meter amateur band. The request came in an April 28
> letter from FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, who says incursions
> on the band by apparently unlicensed operators continue to be a major
> enforcement headache.
>
>

Not to start anything, but if the above has any truth in
it, then why did that well known truck stop on I-80 just
get in a huge shipment of 11m amps from overseas? Seems
like the supply of 11m amps is bottomless. Also saw amps
for MURS freqs. on sale too. It doesn't take a rocket
scientist to figure out another smoke & mirrors show is
going on, plus maybe a few well placed bribes.

J Jim

449. The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 13:47:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305060547.308a8290@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66499

http://www.msnbc.com/comics/daily.asp?sFile=td030420

73 de Jim, N2EY

450. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because: Hambone lies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 15:09:46 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB7D03A.4AC2E9A8@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66498

Hambone the Magnifico wrote:
>
> ...Ham radio op's are ... beer-bellied FUCKS

Now Hambone, you KNOW that's a lie.

Ham's are geeks and geeks seldom if ever engage in sex.

K3DWW

451. Re: Looking for 1977-79 callbook listing KA4GCB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 15:21:38 UTC
From: Mike <mparkes@nospamatt.net>
Message-ID: <glkfbvclovp7o4deai9tok2tetscd63pjr@4ax.com>
Source record: 66500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur

Keith,
Thanks for the info!

Mike

On Tue, 06 May 2003 07:05:21 GMT, Keith
<kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote:

>On Mon, 05 May 2003 22:29:24 GMT, Mike <mparkes@spamnotmparkes.com> wrote:
>
>>Does anyone have an old 77-79 callbook that might be able to see if my
>>first licensed call is in there - KA4GCB? I am trying to figure out
>>when I first got licensed (I believe it was around 77-79 - any help is
>>appreciated!
>>Mike AB7RU
>
> If you are a ARRL member ask them and they will look it up for you.
>Otherwise W5YI will doit for $5 unless you are lucky enough to get someone
>that still has one laying around.

452. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 16:31:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305060831.50ee62c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66602

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030503225903.18769.00000355@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <20030503182717.18770.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >Flint"
> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >>> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> >>> (Len Over 21) writes:
> >>>
> >>> >In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >>> >Flint"
> >>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >>> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
> >>> the recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
> >>>The required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio
> >>>code test.
> >>
> >>You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
> >>people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
> >>could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm.
> >
> >Goes way beyond even that, Dee. Some typical skills needed (and tested):
> >
> >- Ability to copy both plain language and code groups correctly at various
> >speeds with not more than a certain (very low) number of errors per hour.
>
> Please state the exact allowed "errors per hour"

OK, Len, here goes. Just one example - there are others. btw, the
"Armed Forces of the United States" includes the Navy, Coast Guard,
Air Force and Marine Corps, not just the Army.

Did you ever have a "Radioman" rating, Len?

The following is a direct quote from Curtis LaFon, N5HDQ. Mr. LaFon is
a retired US Navy Radioman. He posted it here back on January 9, 1998.

BEGIN QUOTE:

"U.S. Navy RM "A" School, San Diego, Ca .. 1957-58 ... 24 WPM for 1
hour
with no more than 3 errors was required to graduate .. that was 5
letter code
groups, on what we called a comminications mill .. a manual typewriter
with
special keys .. all caps and the 1 was with the rest of the figures ..
not lower
case L like on most typewriters back then."

END QUOTE

The entire posting can be viewed by clicking on this link:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=34B705B1.4950%40wf.quik.com&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain

24 wpm of 5 letter code groups is 120 letters per minute. 7200 letters
per hour, with just 3 errors permitted. That's ONE error per 2400
letters - an error rate of .0417% - over a one-hour period.

Compare this to the most-difficult code test now required by the FCC
for an amateur license. 5 minutes of plain-language text at 5 wpm. It
is possible to pass that test with an error rate of 80% (just get one
minute of solid copy out of the five).

24 wpm code groups for an hour with .0417% maximum error on a manual
typewriter

vs.

5 wpm plain language for 5 minutes with 80% maximum error using a
variety of copying methods.

Also, amateurs can pass the test by methods other than one solid
minute of copy, can go back and correct errors in their copy, can use
any reasonable method of writing down the message, and can get a
variety of adaptations in the test.

> >- Ability to send highly readable code using either straight key or bug.
>
> Please state the "bug" (automatic keyer mechanism) nomenclature
> you actually used in your military communications experience.

Irrelevant. Amateur radio operators are not tested on code sending
ability anymore (stopped about 20 years ago). Military radio operators
were.
>
> >- Ability to adjust, troubleshoot, operate and repair a wide variety of types
> >of radio equipment
>
> Incorrect.

No, correct. Morse skills alone would not get someone a Radioman
rating. Other knowledge and skills were needed.
>

> >It's like the difference between finishing in the lead pack of the Boston
> >Marathon and being able to jog a mile on a track in less than 12 minutes.
>
> No military anywhere in the world operates on principles of
> sport. The purpose of a military is "to close with and destroy
> the enemy."

Again, you miss the point, Len.

The reason for military aptitude tests for code skill potential was NOT because basic code skills are unusual. It was because their requirements went far beyond basic code skills. The most difficult code test ever required for a US amateur license was far below the skill level required of military radio operators. The code test now required for the General and Extra class amateur licenses is far, far, FAR below the skill level required of military radio operators.

The mention of running is an analogy. Obviously it went over your head, Len.

453. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 16:38:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305060838.45143cb4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66603

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86u1cb6hr3.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Jim" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:
>
> Jim> All depends on the issue. Take the issue of keeping your callsign
> Jim> when moving between districts. For hams who move a lot, it can be
> Jim> beneficial. For hams who like the idea of being able to tell
> Jim> where another ham is just by the callsign, it's not.
>
> Jack> Both sides can be happy here. Come to California and operate
> Jack> with "N2EY/6". You can keep your callsign and let hams know
> Jack> where you are.
>
> Jim> Two problems with that:
>
> Jim> First, adding the "/6" eliminates most of the advantage of the
> Jim> short call. Might as well get a 1x3 or 2x3 6-land call.
>
> I'm happy with my 2x3 2-land call, even as an Extra.

To each his own!

> If I truly cared
> about contesting to the point where I thought my callsign was holding
> me back, I'd go from using a key and my ears to a keyer and one of
> those handheld MFJ widgets, or maybe straight to a computer. But
> that, in my opinion, defeats the purpose. I've only operated in one
> contest, and that was last year's Field Day -- and I'll probably
> operate this year again with the same group of people because they're
> nice people.

I had a 2x3 call for ten years before I got this call. For seven of
those years I was an Extra.

While I'm no expert on contesting (or anything else), I have done
Field Day, November Sweepstakes, and a few other contests. Sending a
long callsign was a minor disadvantage, but there's also the fact that
the other op has to copy it and get it right. Six pieces of info vs.
four multiplied by several hundred contacts adds up.

All I use in contests is a Vibroplex bug (semiautomatic) and
pencil/paper log and dupe sheets.
>

> Jim> Second, it only works for those working stations who choose to
> Jim> add the designator.
>
> Change starts from within.

All progress requires change, but all change is not progress.

> The longest journey begins with a single step.

Nothing is ever difficult for the person who doesn't have to do the
work.

> Whatever metaphor floats your boat.

If it happens, it must be possible.

73 de Jim, N2EY

454. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 16:52:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305060852.6312288c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66604

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030506002019.08556.00000752@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> Mike Coslo writes:
>
> >Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
> >>> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.
>
> A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general population.

How do you know?
>
> I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations.

How many? How many of the 686,000+ US hams have you actually observed
for fatness?

> I recently attended an event with a random group of Hams.

How do you know it was a random group?

> I have been with
> large groups of Hams, at Hamfests. I have noticed most of them are fat. But
> one can say that only these types of Hams attend Hamfests. For example, N2EY
> has said that Hams at Hamfests are not typical Hams, just those that attend
> Hamfests.

It is true. To get a random sample of hams, the selection process must
be truly random. Looking at who shows up at club meetings or hamfests
is not a random selection process.
>
> So, to find typical Hams, one can find a small group of Hams.

Just the opposite. You need a large group.

> Recently, I
> recently joined a small group of Hams in their activities. (I even operated HF
> phone).

No, the control operator did the operating. You "participated".

> Although, it is a small group of Hams, remember It was a completely
> random group.

How could it be random?
>
> There were 16 adults and 4 children. Out of the adults, 12 were significantly
> fat. Four, including myself, were not. None of the children were fat. You can
> be sure that I ate a normal quantity of food throughout the whole event.

> However, I cannot say the same for any of the other adults.

Did you actually weigh anyone or compute anyone's BMI?
>
> Breakfast was 3 French toast with plenty of syrup and sugar, bacon, sausage.
> Through they day several bottles of beer, chips, cookies were consumed. Also
> burgers, sausage hot dogs with cheese, chili, chicken wings, clam chowder,
> shrimp, chili. This was all consumed in one day.

By whom?

20 people can eat a lot of food over the course of a day.

> There were an estimated three
> lunch times. Dinner was the same items, left over from lunch. There was some
> food left over. Instead of throwing them away, they cooked it and had a post
> dinner meal.

I gotta get me some of that....
>
> Some time during the same say, a couple of people and me went to get ice cream.
> Then we went driving. The driver was so weak, his fat arms could hardly turn
> the steering wheel. We stopped and walked around. The same driver person made
> two stops at stores, ate a candy bar, and some cookies. Then on the way back,
> in the car, complained that he was hungry. Also, note that this special trip
> were ADDITIONAL eating times to the ones I mentioned in the previous paragraph.

That's ONE person.
>
> Contests require less physical activity, and this could be a reason for the
> weight gain.

Nope.

> I noticed that snacking occurred during the contests. Other
> interests, such as radio direction finding use more physical activity. If more
> Hams were interested in this, there would be fewer overweight Hams.

There's no doubt that the hams you have encountered were overweight.
But how do you know that they are a representative sample of the
population?
>
> The Hams were a very nice group of people, so I feel bad about it. When Hams
> over eat, it hurts them. Hopefully, this may change in the future.
>
> The adults were of course showing the children how to operate, etc. The
> children were eating the same fatty foods the adults were eating. If one uses
> some common sense, one can see that these children will be fat when they become
> adults. This is the future of Ham radio.

It's not a radio problem, it's a problem of American culture. Food
here is inexpensive, plentiful, and delicious. Usually (and
unfortunately) the most inexpensive, plentiful and delicious food is

also the most fattening.

Add to this the fact that most Americans aren't required to have physically active lives, and the stage is set for the problems you see. Not just among radio amateurs but in the entire population.

73 de Jim, N2EY

455. Re: Looking for 1977-79 callbook listing KA4GCB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 19:15:06 UTC
From: Bill <jwgardiner@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <_QTta.492312$OV.476172@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 66606
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur

get on the FCC website...you can find out there...

"Mike" <mparkes@nospamatt.net> wrote in message
news:glkfbvclovp7o4deai9tok2tetscd63pjr@4ax.com...
> Keith,
> Thanks for the info!
>
> Mike
>
> On Tue, 06 May 2003 07:05:21 GMT, Keith
> <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
> >On Mon, 05 May 2003 22:29:24 GMT, Mike <mparkes@spamnotmparkes.com>
wrote:
> >
> >>Does anyone have an old 77-79 callbook that might be able to see if my
> >>first licensed call is in there - KA4GCB? I am trying to figure out
> >>when I first got licensed (I believe it was around 77-79 - any help is
> >>appreciated!
> >>Mike AB7RU
> >
> > If you are a ARRL member ask them and they will look it up for you.
> >Otherwise W5YI will doit for $5 unless you are lucky enough to get
someone
> >that still has one laying around.
>

456. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 20:18:20 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <gMUta.4597$GC6.3564@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66607

Thanks, Jim

Boy, you could mount a 40 foot tower to one of those things. That plus one
of those new-fangled 4 element stepper motor adjusted to any frequency from
13 to 30 MHz beams :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0305060547.308a8290@posting.google.com...
> http://www.msnbc.com/comics/daily.asp?sFile=td030420
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

457. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 21:08:06 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB82436.B17552EC@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66605

Jumping Jim wrote:
>
> "valmont" <radiola.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in message
> news:28753N097@web2news.com...
> > ----------
> >
> > NEWINGTON, CT, May 1, 2003--The FCC has requested the assistance of the
> > ARRL Amateur Auxiliary/Official Observers in monitoring for illegal
> > operation on the 10-meter amateur band. The request came in an April 28
> > letter from FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, who says incursions
> > on the band by apparently unlicensed operators continue to be a major
> > enforcement headache.
> >
> Not to start anything, but if the above has any truth in
> it, then why did that well known truck stop on I-80 just
> get in a huge shipment of 11m amps ....

Same reason the War on Drugs hasn't made a dent in drug imports despite $millions spent, lives ruined and really dangerous criminals released to make room for dopers. Given enough demand, there will always be a supply.

The only way to reduce either problem is to eliminate the demand. If I ran FCC I'd simply announce that there would be no more CB on HF after 1 Jan 2005; that all current CB freq's would be allocated to SSB for Tech's using <250W and other hams using legal limit.
My 2 cents
K3DWW

458. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 21:08:50 UTC
From: David Lafferty <dplaff@cox-internet.com>
Message-ID: <vbg92vijli7518@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 66608

> Same reason the War on Drugs hasn't made a dent in drug imports despite
> $millions spent, lives ruined and really dangerous criminals released to
> make room for dopers. Given enough demand, there will always be a
> supply.

I'll give you another .02. Specifically, what dangerous criminals have been released? Not arguing, just wanted to know what specific facts you have on this issue?

73,
David K5DEL

459. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 21:10:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030506171001.18767.00000408@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66609

In article <c2356669.0305060831.50ee62c8@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030503225903.18769.00000355@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030503182717.18770.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>> >Flint"
>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>> >
>> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >>news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> >>> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>> lenover21@aol.com
>> >>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>> >>>
>> >>> >In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
>D.
>> >>> >Flint"
>> >>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >>> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to
>find
>> >>> the recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they
>required.
>> >>>The required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur
>radio
>> >>>code test.
>> >>
>> >>You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
>> >>people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
>> >>could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm.
>> >
>> >Goes way beyond even that, Dee. Some typical skills needed (and tested):
>> >
>> >- Ability to copy both plain language and code groups correctly at various
>> >speeds with not more than a certain (very low) number of errors per hour.
>>
>> Please state the exact allowed "errors per hour"
>
>OK, Len, here goes. Just one example - there are others. btw, the

>"Armed Forces of the United States" includes the Navy, Coast Guard,
>Air Force and Marine Corps, not just the Army.
>
>Did you ever have a "Radioman" rating, Len?

Jimmie, open your morse-besotted mind to some facts instead
of wandering around like a spoiled child, waving your clenched
fists in anger at not being respected in a world of adults.

You've made so many errors, misdirections, accusations in
this post that you MUST be corrected in public. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

First of all the armed forces of the United States doesn't have
"ratings." It has MILITARY OCCUPATION SPECIALTIES,
commonly called "MOSs."

The US Army never had any MOS of "radioman." That is a
US Navy MOS nomenclature.

You've never been in any US military branch so you wouldn't
know. You apparently never went to the US Army website I
posted in this newsgroup TWICE to find out...or to try any
link on that site to find out other US military branch MOSs
and job descriptions.

All you want to do is ARGUE. You are wasting everyone's
time. You've already been told, given the resources, and
still you want to argue, argue, argue for no other reason than
to satisfy your childish tantrums.

Perhaps the closest Army MOS to a USN "Radioman" was
Field Radio Operator and Maintainer of the 1950s. Those soldiers
were required to graduate an Army morse code school and ALSO
be able to carry/mount transportable radios, set them up (including
antennas of many different sizes), take them down (for use else-
where), and perform elementary troubleshooting and repair if such
was required.

USN "Radiomen" operated radios rather fixed in position aboard
naval vessels or on shore stations, did not have to set them up
or take them down for use elsewhere...the ship moved to new
positions carrying both equipment and personnel together. Can
you grasp that concept? There are NO ships ON land. Trucks
and other vehicles on land do the transport on land for heavy
equipment while individual soldiers carried man-portable radios.
Both today and a half century ago, the majority of all US Army
radios are/were "manpack," meaning they were/are carried by
individual soldiers on foot. Can you grasp THAT concept?

Both today and a half century ago, US Army soldiers are LAND
warfighters FIRST, the military occupation specialty being
secondary to that primary task. All US Army soldiers receive
basic infantryman training and continue to practice and updating

infantryman skills throughout their career. One of the major differences between soldiers and sailors is that soldiers are in territory on land in very close proximity to an enemy relative to sailors on shipboard. [another concept which may not be grasped...Jimmie's problem since he never served in any branch of the US military]

>The following is a direct quote from Curtis LaFon, N5HDQ. Mr. LaFon is
>a retired US Navy Radioman. He posted it here back on January 9, 1998.

Belay that, swabbie-wannabe.

This is the year 2003. It is NOT five years and three months ago.

TRY, oh really TRY to stay current with the existing flow.

You are totally wasting everyone's time quoting message exchanges from over 5 years ago. Those exchanges are OVER, done with, cannot be resurrected from the dead past in hopes that you will win some of those you lost.

The US Navy NO LONGER USES any on-off manual telegraphy for radio communications. It hasn't done so for many years.

The US Army NO LONGER USES any on-off manual telegraphy for radio communications. It hasn't done so for many years.

The US Air Force NO LONGER USES any on-off manual telegraphy for radio communications. It quit doing that ahead of all the other US military branches.

The US Coast Guard MIGHT use some manual telegraphy on the great lakes. USCG QUIT monitoring the maritime international distress frequency of 500 KHz some years ago. USCG is the smallest branch of the military and isn't strictly military during periods of peacetime.

>24 wpm of 5 letter code groups is 120 letters per minute. 7200 letters
>per hour, with just 3 errors permitted. That's ONE error per 2400
>letters - an error rate of .0417% - over a one-hour period.

BFD. ANY error may be fatal in a five-letter-group encrypted message. I don't think you grasp that concept at all.

In amateur hobby/recreation communications one can handle errors and garble in cleartext quite easily. Such an error has no tactical or strategic importance compared to sensitive military communications.

One of the reasons the US Navy began using teleprinters for encrypted communications in 1939 was the ERROR rate in manual morse code telegraphy. Not only that, teleprinters could "stand watch" (a nautical term in the military) 24/7 on an important frequency. Teleprinters need only their paper

rolls and tape replenished...they don't need sleep, food, or any necessary human being needs away from the comm gear.

But...but...this message thread is all about the NOVICE CLASS amateur radio license, isn't it? Amateur radio is NOT military or even close to military communications. The Novice Class license is no longer being granted. It will disappear when the last novice class renewal time is up. Gone.

So, why are you in such a big dither about MILITARY radio, Jimmie? You've never served, haven't indicated you've ever seen any military radio communications in progress, don't seem to know squat about military comm.

You are in such a state of concern for only one reason: To try to "get back" at someone who has challenged your radio expertise in the past and continues to do so. You carry on in childish rants about "accuracy" when all you want to do is make message points and personal triumphs in the newsgroup.

You don't seem to care about the future, newcomers in ham radio not yet licensed, or anything but those who Believe as You do. You just can't shake that Belief in morse code as needed in amateur radio.

>No, correct. Morse skills alone would not get someone a Radioman
>rating. Other knowledge and skills were needed.

Yes, first one had to join the US Navy and go through Boot Camp.

Beyond that what do YOU know?

You don't know. You've never served in any US military branch, wartime or peacetime. You've never taken that Oath. You've never put your life on the line anytime, anywhere for your country.

Your only connection to military radio is OLD data, surplus radio equipment, electronics from the PAST.

>The reason for military aptitude tests for code skill potential was
>NOT because basic code skills are unusual. It was because their
>requirements went far beyond basic code skills.

Ah, yes, the authoritative voice of the military again...not just from someone who never served, but someone who never instituted any battery of military recruit aptitude skills, someone who never had to argue that for any military review board.

You've gotten terribly confused with what you are trying to argue.

The message thread Subject header says "Novice Class license."

"Novice class license" only exist in AMATEUR RADIO. Amateur radio is NOT military, never was. Amateur radio is a hobby, a

recreational pursuit.

You've lost everything on arguments either for or against saving any Novice Class license.

You are all hung up and petty about some military requirement of the past, desperately seeking to avenge some perceived past hurts from messaging of 5 years ago.

You've lost it.

Quit wasting everyone's time with your petty desires.

460. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 22:33:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <jLWta.515707$Zo.112004@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 66610

An obvious idiot who like a parrot with his continued squalking demands a cracker ..... well here is my cracker ...

God Bless and I hope you can find more positive things to do with you time on earth than troll on old worn out arguments.

Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh
"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:UAEta.57538$4P1.5301413@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> The State of Connecticut will require each person testing for a drivers
> license to show that they can operate a whip in case they need drive a horse
> and buggy some day.
> In other news FCC enforcer Riley Hollingsworth wrote several Amateur
> Operators noting that they were operating Morse Code using a very wide
> bandwidth and they should consider operating with spark gap transmitters for
> better fidelity. In response the ARRL asked for a NPRM to outlaw anyone not
> using 100+ year old technology on the ham bands.
>
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
> Death to horse and buggy technology in ham radio test!
> Eliminate the Morse Code test now!

461. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 23:01:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b99ertutd1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66612

Hey Dee.....you can't argue with a turnip. Neither 'Vshah101', or 'Len over 21' are licensed. I guess the real issue is why bother with someone that ain't been there and done that.

There minds are already made up. All they are doing is keeping the arguements going. Apparantly neither have a life.

You obviously do, and so do the rest of us. If it don't meet their approval....so what?

See ya in the sweeps next time.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:LIXta.4932$3f7.3859452@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030506004436.08556.00000753@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > >> I agree. And I think it's a shame he couldn't have just put his
> two
> > >cents
> > >> in and joined Amateur Radio, code tested or not. He could have been
an
> > >asset.
> > >
> >
> > Joining costs almost nothing. It just takes a license in a day class. It
> SEEMS
> > like there is alot of benefit for a small amount of effort (for the
> no-code
> > license).
> >
> > It could be that the narrow interests of contesting and antennas.
> Cult-like
> > conventions, codewords, "contest" rules (which must be followed
exactly),
> and
> > Morse code pressure.
>
> You keep stating this nonsensical rubbish. Please identify the amateur
club
> by name and location that fits this description. This certainly does not
> describe any club that I've ever belonged to.

>
> There are absolutely NO codewords in amateur (ham) radio. All specialized
> terms are clearly defined in the amateur radio reference books. Every
> activity has its specialized vocabulary. There is nothing unique about
> amateur (ham) radio in this regard.
>
> >
> > There ARE other things that can be done with amateur radio. The current
> group
> > of Hams only seem to want to do things a certain way, and only bring new
> Hams
> > that want to do things the same way.
>
> Please state these "other things". I'd bet there are several people in
our
> local club that do them.
>
> >
> > As a result, some other people may not want to join amateur radio. I
would
> not
> > recommend any EE join the hobby, even if they were interested in rf.
Only,
> if
> > they were interested in antennas, would I recommend it.
>
> And just what should a EE expect pray tell? You keep making these
> statements but do a very poor job of explaining what it is you think the
> hobby should be.
>
>
> >
> > Only by joining can one change the hobby for the better. Although, I
> would
> > just get the privileges. Also, do not attend all meetings, find out the
> topic
> > ahead of time, from the newsletter, and only attend the ones you like.
> >
> > Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea. I can tell you
that.
> You
> > will be alot happier not trying to change the hobby.
>
> This is a prescription for failure not only in the amateur (ham) radio
hobby
> but for life as well.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

462. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 23:39:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LIXta.4932$3f7.3859452@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66611

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030506004436.08556.00000753@mb-m04.aol.com...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >> I agree. And I think it's a shame he couldn't have just put his
two
> >cents
> >> in and joined Amateur Radio, code tested or not. He could have been an
> >asset.
> >>
>
> Joining costs almost nothing. It just takes a license in a day class. It
SEEMS
> like there is alot of benefit for a small amount of effort (for the
no-code
> license).
>
> It could be that the narrow interests of contesting and antennas.
Cult-like
> conventions, codewords, "contest" rules (which must be followed exactly),
and
> Morse code pressure.

You keep stating this nonsensical rubbish. Please identify the amateur club by name and location that fits this description. This certainly does not describe any club that I've ever belonged to.

There are absolutely NO codewords in amateur (ham) radio. All specialized terms are clearly defined in the amateur radio reference books. Every activity has its specialized vocabulary. There is nothing unique about amateur (ham) radio in this regard.

>
> There ARE other things that can be done with amateur radio. The current
group
> of Hams only seem to want to do things a certain way, and only bring new
Hams
> that want to do things the same way.

Please state these "other things". I'd bet there are several people in our local club that do them.

>
> As a result, some other people may not want to join amateur radio. I would
not
> recommend any EE join the hobby, even if they were interested in rf. Only,

if
> they were interested in antennas, would I recommend it.

And just what should a EE expect pray tell? You keep making these statements but do a very poor job of explaining what it is you think the hobby should be.

>
> Only by joining can one change the hobby for the better. Although, I would
> just get the privileges. Also, do not attend all meetings, find out the topic
> ahead of time, from the newsletter, and only attend the ones you like.
>
> Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea. I can tell you that. You
> will be alot happier not trying to change the hobby.

This is a prescription for failure not only in the amateur (ham) radio hobby but for life as well.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

463. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because: Hambone lies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-06 23:44:32 UTC
From: Hambone the Magnifico <paintcanfullofpcb@amishonline.com>
Message-ID: <3eb848d2@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66613

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB7D03A.4AC2E9A8@crosslink.net...
> Hambone the Magnifico wrote:
> >
> > ...Ham radio op's are ... beer-bellied FUCKS
>
> Now Hambone, you KNOW that's a lie.
>
> Ham's are geeks and geeks seldom if ever engage in sex.
>
> K3DWW

Folks....I think he's got a point there!

Shame I ain't going to Dayton else I'd
buy you a beer and a burger Vito. If your
at Charlotte or Shelby however, look for
the dapper dude in the hat and vest what looks
like C. Dundee. That's will be me :) :)

464. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 00:29:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030506202942.18759.00000679@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66614

In article <b99ertutd1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan Turnip"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Hey Dee.....you can't argue with a turnip.

I know we can't, Dan...we've tried to argue with you for years...:-)

>Neither 'Vshah101', or 'Len over 21' are licensed.

Sorry, Mr. Turnip, I'm licensed and been licensed longer than you
have. One of those licenses isn't in AMATEUR radio. :-)

>I guess the real issue is why bother with someone that
>ain't been there and done that.

Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.

FCC doesn't require any commissioner or staff to have
amateur licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio. :-)

>There minds are already made up.

Translation: We won't switch to your fantasy island thinking.

>All they are doing is keeping the arguements going.

"Arguements?" :-)

So...you feel that everyone MUST think as you do?

Why is that? Are you the supreme judge of something?

>Apparantly neither have a life.

I don't know about Vipul Shah, but I not only have a nice life but
have made a whole career as a professional in electronics and
radio. I'm married to a wonderful woman who was my high
school sweetheart. We own two houses, debt free, in Washington
and California. Both my wife and I have comfortable incomes even
though we are both retired.

>You obviously do, and so do the rest of us.

All morsemen have wonderful lives in their own minds, bound
and determined to keep up a living museum of the air on
archaic radiotelegraphy.

I wish you all well.

Now, why in the world do you and other morsemen need laws to cram morse code ability down all amateur radio newcomers' throats?

What's wrong with "live and let live?"

>If it don't meet their approval....so what?

Good question. Apparently morsemen are so narrowly tunnel-vision focussed on morse code ability...or so enchanted with themselves and their mighty accomplishments in archaic radio...that they cannot see their self-righteous eliteism through keeping outdated law will only hurt them in the long run.

Mighty morsemen are not only maintaining this Archaic Radio-telegraphy Society but are also living in a Fantasyland, one where everything stopped advancing when they were first licensed. They cannot understand progress, only their own stunted abilities bound up in a unique, singular skill that is no longer needed in the rest of the radio world or all society.

There is NO arguing with mighty morsemen of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society. They are locked in, captives of the Belief System of the Church of St. Hiram.

But some of us are optimistically trying to free mighty morse-men from their own morse-besotted Beliefs. Maybe it is too ideal an optimism. We keep on trying while the mighty morse-men are just trying everyone else's patience. :-)

465. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 01:58:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB8684F.1060805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66615

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3EB67ADF.6020009@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

<some snippage>

>> A couple of you folks sound like subjects in the book, "Bowling Alone"
>
>
> Never heard of it. Hope it's nothing like "Bowling for Columbine."

Not at all. It is a book written by Robert Putnam, based on how
Americans are becoming less and less socially connected with each other.
It is based on many interviews. The title comes from the author noting
that while more people bowl than ever before, most do it by themselves
and not in leagues. We're becoming insular.

- Mike KB3EIA -

466. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:05:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB86A01.7050401@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66616

Vshah101 wrote:
> Mike Coslo writes:
>
>
>>Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
>>
>>>>>regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.
>>>
>
> A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general population.

Mike Doesn't write this. Larry writes this. I don't write disparaging
things about the obese.

How about this guys and gals, Vipul and Larry have something in common!
I think this was prophesied by Nostradamus as a sign of the
end-time..... 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

467. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:59:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heh3fp6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66617

On Sun, 04 May 2003 17:39:20 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:

>Back when there were CB licenses, I had KAAR5167.
>That's a 4 letter prefix. Being CB, maybe there is a connection
>between 4 letter calls and 4 letter words..... :-)

"In the Beginning" CB calls were issued by the FCC District
Office and were of the format nnWnnnn where the first "nn" was the
FCC District number and the "nnnn" was a sequential number for
each district.

"Later On" when the Gettysburg License Center was opened, CB
licenses were issued from there and call signs were 3+4 format
such as KBA1234. KAA calls were reserved for GMRS. When they ran
out of 3+4 calls, the 4+4 format came in. I don't even remember
what my ex-wife's CB call was.....

But that's CB - not ham radio.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

468. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:59:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hehh4f7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66618

On 06 May 2003 02:12:36 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>to be accepted as real, full-fledged hams, in spite of the fact
>that they only skill they bring to the activity is the ability to
>push a button and talk.

When I have three ops at a console passing status messages in
the inter-hospital net, the above-cited skill is exactly what I
would want them to have. The only other skills that I would
want in an operator is the ability to type a packet message
(two-finger typing is OK) and the ability to keep their wits
about them.

In our ARES/RACES operation, "No-Code Techs" with the
above-cited skills are far better than the old farts of any age
who rant and rave about the lack of taking a CW test. Then
again, we've weeded out the latter by giving them -real- work
to do during an exercise, and watching them scurry back into
the woodwork.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

Passed the 20 wpm test, gave "real"
code tests for decades, and still
feels that code testing for an amateur
license is irrelevant.

469. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:59:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hehhb28.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66619

On 06 May 2003 02:12:37 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>Because a lot of hams get involved in this sort of thing in the
>hope of being close to the "action" usually participated in by
>the aforementioned groups, in spite of the fact that they are not
>qualified to be policemen, firemen, or paramedics themselves.

Tell that to the five ops that we had riding fire apparatus in
a test of simplex radio suitability for tactical comms via RACES.
It was all work and no play.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

470. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:59:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hehhfk9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66620

On 06 May 2003 02:12:37 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>The grandmother, who is the XYL of an active ham, who gets her No-Clue
>Tech ticket and then carries her HT to the Walk-A-Thon is NOT my fellow
>ham in any respect whatsoever.

You are so right. She's a far better ham that you will ever be
with your attitude.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

471. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:59:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hehilxb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66622

On 06 May 2003 04:20:19 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the
>general population.

Where did you get your public health degree from?

>I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations.
>I understand the cult like nature (in a good way) that Ham radio
>often is.

Where did you get your psychology degree from?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

472. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:59:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hehidza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66623

On 06 May 2003 03:06:50 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>Often enough, these poeple show up at meetings, asking for Ham
>volunteers. It is not surprising that they show up at Ham
>meetings. Hams provide this "service" for free, something they
>would otherwise have to pay someone to do. In reality, the Hams
>that volunteer for these events are being taken advantage of.

And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
the expertise to make the statement above?

>True. Anyone can do these volunteer events. They could easily
>train someone, licensed or not, the same day to do it.

And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
the expertise to make the statement above?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

473. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 02:59:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hehle9c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66621

On 05 May 2003 16:23:21 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> Fooling around with FAA database, found the following:
>
> N2EY 1967 BEECH V35, GIORDANO GARY M, VALLEY AL
>
> There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama!

It's not an FCC call sign - it's an FAA registration number.

FCC Rules s. 87.107(a)(3) provides that the FAA registration number minus the "N" can be used when it follows the type of aircraft INSTEAD of an FCC-issued call sign, . The proper radio identification of the above aircraft would be "Beech 2 Echo Yankee".

I got this from the FCC Call Sign Desk in the 1980s when California DMV asked for an opinion as to whether an amateur call-sign-lookalike aircraft "tail number" was an FCC call sign or not. Apparently an aircraft owner wanted to use his 1x2 N-number on a personalized license plate - under California vehicle law, if it looks like a ham call, it can only be issued as a ham plate and only if the license holder thereof is one of the registered owners of the vehicle.

>Maybe I can find it and get my picture taken next to it!
>
> Ya want one if I find it, Jim?

Where would he park it?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

474. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 03:38:54 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030506233854.19604.00000600@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66624

From: N2EY

>> A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general
>population.
>
>How do you know?

It stood out when I was attending Hamfests. By the way, the Hams I saw on ATV that day often (but not always) were overweight also. And, Hams are often antisocial (but in a good way, I guess).

>> I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations.
>
>How many? How many of the 686,000+ US hams have you actually observed
>for fatness?

You can apply this argument to anything. By this logic, nothing is known.

>> I recently attended an event with a random group of Hams.
>
>How do you know it was a random group?

I did not know any of these Hams before. There were no photos of the people in the ad. No indication of their weight was given by the text.

Also, I know it was random because they invited Hams to attend. I happened to be on the mailing list. It is random from my perspective who actually attended this event. There were a few new people, like me, that did not attend before.

It was a general activity Ham gathering. (I did PSK31, SSB, ATV, some satellite, some HF phone).

>To get a random sample of hams, the selection process must
>be truly random.

The selection process was completely random here. I chose to attend because they had many radio modes I could operate.

>Looking at who shows up at club meetings or hamfests
>is not a random selection process.

Almost any Ham would attend a Hamfest. I don't know of any reason why more overweight people would chose to attend Hamfests.

>> So, to find typical Hams, one can find a small group of Hams.
>
>Just the opposite. You need a large group.

Hamfests are a large group. Also, surveys have been done. Its also common sense observation.

>You can
>> be sure that I ate a normal quantity of food throughout the whole event.
>> However, I cannot say the same for any of the other adults.
>
>Did you actually weigh anyone or compute anyone's BMI?

I did not have to weigh anyone. The 12 that I counted were so overweight, there was no doubt that they were overweight. They did eat a large quantity of <high fat> food, including French toast, bacon, sausage, hamburger, fatty cold cuts, and cheese.

>This was all consumed in one day.
>By whom?

It was not hard to miss that EACH one of them ate a huge quantity of high fat foods. In fact, they ate more than I saw them eat. I know they ate the shrimp when I was out on my trip.

>20 people can eat a lot of food over the course of a day.

This proves it.

>I gotta get me some of that.

There was plenty of food left over. Some beer were shared with others that joined the event for a few minutes. Yes, the free food is one good part of some Ham events. I try to make use of events that have food served. You can do the same - its fun!

It was a fun experience at a very low cost. I got to operate many modes, enjoyed touring the town, and had good food and good company. Will I attend next year? Sure! I plan on it, if I am not busy.

>> Contests require less physical activity, and this could be a reason for the
>> weight gain.
>
>Nope.

I noticed that there were 30+ cyclists near the event. None of them were fat. The events one participate in do seem to affect people's weight.

Contesting requires you to sit in one place for a period of time. The lack of activity does not help one's weight.

If more people participated in radio direction finding, less would be overweight. Radio direction finding requires one to move around to find a signal. Also, its a more fun activity <to me> than contesting.

>It's not a radio problem, it's a problem of American culture.

True, any event, like this, seems to bring such foods. For example, certain people that get together for sporting events often have these types of foods there.

They just went unbelievably overboard.

475. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 03:49:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030506234931.19604.00000601@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66625

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

> Please identify the amateur club
>by name and location that fits this description.

The four closest clubs to me, the event I recently attended (not a close by group), any Hamfest i've been to. The several states i've heard Hams on while travelling.

A Ham may not realize they are different.

>Please state these "other things". I'd bet there are several people in our
>local club that do them.

Hams do not like: experimenting with circuits, troubleshooting, tuning, radio direction finding.

Hams love: contesting, antennas, HF,CW, collecting cards, ragchewing.

476. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:05:24 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507000524.19604.00000602@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66626

From: "Dan/W4NTI"

>Neither 'Vshah101', or 'Len over
>21' are licensed.

I have a Technician class license.

>Apparantly neither have a life.
>
>You obviously do, and so do the rest of us.

Hams are often anti-social. I have noticed this at Hamfests. The event I recently attended also supports this. Hamfests cover a large group of people, <almost> all Hams, and a significant indication of what represents the social aspect of Ham radio.

Also, note that people often were curious about the Ham station. They saw a bunch of antennas and cars slowed down. Some people did get out of their cars and visit the station. However, seeing a bunch of overwiegh people doing these activities was not the greatest advertisement of Ham radio.

Hams have fun within their group. One can define radio as a life, but this would be changing the definition to fit the minority. The defintion fits what the majority of people do, and some common sense on what is acceptable behavior.

-Chanting Wuoff Hong, for example, is not.
-Waiting three hours (with no events in between) to do any activity, is not.
-Operating radio all the time, instead of as one of the events, is not.
-Operating radio, at hours when no normal person would, is not.

Seems like a club for the anti-social.

477. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:06:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB8862E.93CAE71A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66627

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message

> > There are a number of ways to "give back" without being active in public
> > service work.

> Outside of handing out 12 second QSO's from backwater African
> countries, what other ways are there?

Why not sit and ponder the matter for a few days and let us know if you
come up with anything?

> Working out of band Frenchmen?

I am not responsible for enforcing amateur radio regs in France. As has
been suggested numerous times, you need to take your case to the French
PTT and the REF.

Dave K8MN

478. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:13:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB887F3.4070305@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66628

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>
>>drags it to a few club meetings, and then shows up at the March of Dimes
>>Walk-A-Thon
>
>
> Often enough, these poeple show up at meetings, asking for Ham volunteers. It
> is not surprising that they show up at Ham meetings. Hams provide this
> "service" for free, something they would otherwise have to pay someone to do.
> In reality, the Hams that volunteer for these events are being taken advantage
> of.

It's volunteerism. It's volunteerism. Its volunteerism. Sheesh.

At any of these events, there are dozens of volunteers. How about dome
disparaging remarks about the organizers? Why are the hams the ones
taken advantadge of?

>>She can be replaced by any other grandmother and
>>a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie.
>
> True. Anyone can do these volunteer events. They could easily train someone,
> licensed or not, the same day to do it.

Both of ya just don't get it. It isn't what you do when everything is
going fine. It's what you do when there is a problem. You have to keep
your cool and do your job. People get hurt and get lost.

> Also agree that Hams do these events to make Hams look like they are doing
> "public service".

HAR! I also wear clothing to make it look like I wear clothing!

>>The worst part is that
>>all of this kind of "public service" activity is usually applied as
>>justification
>>to reducing/eliminating the code testing and other challenging licensing
>>requirements -- which has the effect of watering down the overall
>>capabilities
>>of the whole of the amateur radio service.
>
>
> Wrong. It does not act as justification to eliminate code testing. It has
> NOTHING to do with code testing.

>
> Its used by anyone, code or no-code, to make the hobby and themselves look like
> they do volunteer events.

Vipul, I do these because I like to do them, not because I want to look like I'm doing anything. It's more real than just giving money to a charity, it's getting right down at street level with something that the organizers appreciate, as well as the people who they are working for.

- Mike KB3EIA -

479. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:14:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB888AF.B36357A8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66630

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo writes:
>
> >Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
> >>> regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.
>
> A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general population.

This sounds more surreal with each posting. On what do you base your in
depth research?

> I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations. I understand
> the cult like nature (in a good way) that Ham radio often is.

There is no cult-like "nature" in amateur radio.

>
> I recently attended an event with a random group of Hams. I have been with
> large groups of Hams, at Hamfests. I have noticed most of them are fat. But
> one can say that only these types of Hams attend Hamfests. For example, N2EY
> has said that Hams at Hamfests are not typical Hams, just those that attend
> Hamfests.

N2EY's statement makes sense to me.

> So, to find typical Hams, one can find a small group of Hams. Recently, I
> recently joined a small group of Hams in their activities. (I even operated HF
> phone). Although, it is a small group of Hams, remember It was a completely
> random group.
>
> There were 16 adults and 4 children. Out of the adults, 12 were significantly
> fat. Four, including myself, were not. None of the children were fat. You can
> be sure that I ate a normal quantity of food throughout the whole event.
> However, I cannot say the same for any of the other adults.
>
> Breakfast was 3 French toast with plenty of syrup and sugar, bacon, sausage.
> Through they day several bottles of beer, chips, cookies were consumed. Also
> burgers, sausage hot dogs with cheese, chili, chicken wings, clam chowder,
> shrimp, chili. This was all consumed in one day. There were an estimated three
> lunch times. Dinner was the same items, left over from lunch. There was some
> food left over. Instead of throwing them away, they cooked it and had a post
> dinner meal.
>
> Some time during the same say, a couple of people and me went to get ice cream.
> Then we went driving. The driver was so weak, his fat arms could hardly turn

> the steering wheel. We stopped and walked around. The same driver person made
> two stops at stores, ate a candy bar, and some cookies. Then on the way back,
> in the car, complained that he was hungry. Also, note that this special trip
> were ADDITIONAL eating times to the ones I mentioned in the previous paragraph.

I recently attended a meeting of about 30 hams. Of those in attendance,
all were shorter than me. About half were under about 5'7". Only two
were above 6 feet. I was the tallest at 6'3". Using your research
method, we can safely assume that most hams are short.

You've got yourself some great junk science, Vipul.

> Contests require less physical activity, and this could be a reason for the
> weight gain. I noticed that snacking occurred during the contests.

Most serious contesters eat very little during the course of a contest.

> Other
> interests, such as radio direction finding use more physical activity.

Direction finding uses very little energy. The running in Fox hunting
on foot uses a lot of energy. Some Fox hunts uses mobile rigs mounted
in automobiles. Very little energy used there.

What does your theory prove?

> If more
> Hams were interested in this, there would be fewer overweight Hams.

Many hams watch television. One actually burns less calories watching
TV than in sleeping. Go figure!

Dave K8MN

480. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:15:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB8886F.3060206@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66629

Phil Kane wrote:
> On 06 May 2003 03:06:50 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
>
>
>>Often enough, these poeple show up at meetings, asking for Ham
>>volunteers. It is not surprising that they show up at Ham
>>meetings. Hams provide this "service" for free, something they
>>would otherwise have to pay someone to do. In reality, the Hams
>>that volunteer for these events are being taken advantage of.
>
>
> And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
> the expertise to make the statement above?

I'll bet he'd feel a lot better about himself if he tried it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

481. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:17:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB8895F.DC6B7A12@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66631

Brian wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b924nc$kl3$1@208.207.71.152>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.
> >
> > Not for dealing with the likes of you. It's child's play.
>
> If you want to play with children, hook up with Dave.

Would you mind repeating your recent comment about Dick's one line
comments? That classic is sure to be on my hit parade for some time to
come as it has long been one of your regular routines here.

Dave K8MN

482. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:21:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB889D9.4030806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66632

Phil Kane wrote:
> On 06 May 2003 02:12:36 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
>>to be accepted as real, full-fledged hams, in spite of the fact
>>that they only skill they bring to the activity is the ability to
>>push a button and talk.
>
>
> When I have three ops at a console passing status messages in
> the inter-hospital net, the above-cited skill is exactly what I
> would want them to have. The only other skills that I would
> want in an operator is the ability to type a packet message
> (two-finger typing is OK) and the ability to keep their wits
> about them.

Bingo!

> In our ARES/RACES operation, "No-Code Techs" with the
> above-cited skills are far better than the old farts of any age
> who rant and rave about the lack of taking a CW test. Then
> again, we've weeded out the latter by giving them -real- work
> to do during an exercise, and watching them scurry back into
> the woodwork.

HAR! Yes, you use the method I used to use when a Hockey parent would bitch and moan about something. I'd thank them kindly for their concern, noting how we need more people to express their concerns. Then I'd give them a job to do. About 90 percent went away and never complained again. The others actually did help.

- Mike KB3EIA -

483. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:21:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB88A49.7BE37B48@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66634

Vshah101 wrote:

> It could be that the narrow interests of contesting and antennas. Cult-like
> conventions, codewords, "contest" rules (which must be followed exactly), and
> Morse code pressure.

> As a result, some other people may not want to join amateur radio. I would not
> recommend any EE join the hobby, even if they were interested in rf. Only, if
> they were interested in antennas, would I recommend it.
>
> Only by joining can one change the hobby for the better. Although, I would
> just get the privileges. Also, do not attend all meetings, find out the topic
> ahead of time, from the newsletter, and only attend the ones you like.
>
> Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea. I can tell you that. You
> will be alot happier not trying to change the hobby.

My own heartfelt opinion after reading your latest offering, Vipul, is
that you are not from this galaxy.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

484. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:23:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB88A62.9080004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66633

Dave Heil wrote:
> Brian wrote:
>
>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>
>
>>>There are a number of ways to "give back" without being active in public
>>>service work.
>>
>
>
>>Outside of handing out 12 second QSO's from backwater African
>>countries, what other ways are there?
>
>
> Why not sit and ponder the matter for a few days and let us know if you
> come up with anything?
>
>
>>Working out of band Frenchmen?
>
>
> I am not responsible for enforcing amateur radio regs in France. As has
> been suggested numerous times, you need to take your case to the French
> PTT and the REF.

I wonder if out of band F****hmen do public service?

- Mike KB3EIA -

485. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:26:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB88B55.EE6777B0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66636

N2EY wrote:
>
> http://www.msnbc.com/comics/daily.asp?sFile=td030420

It certainly offers promises a way to deal with the kids running those four wheelers up and down my drive on the weekends. It sometimes sounds as if we're in the grandstands for chain saw racing.

Dave K8MN

486. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:27:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507002743.18770.00000470@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66635

In article <b99ertutd1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan Turnip"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Hey Dee.....you can't argue with a turnip.

I know we can't, Dan...we've tried to argue with you for years...:-)

>Neither 'Vshah101', or 'Len over 21' are licensed.

Sorry, Mr. Turnip, I'm licensed and been licensed longer than you
have. One of those licenses isn't in AMATEUR radio. :-)

>I guess the real issue is why bother with someone that
>ain't been there and done that.

Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.

FCC doesn't require any commissioner or staff to have
amateur licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio. :-)

>There minds are already made up.

Translation: We won't switch to your fantasy island thinking.

>All they are doing is keeping the arguements going.

"Arguements?" :-)

So...you feel that everyone MUST think as you do?

Why is that? Are you the supreme judge of something?

>Apparantly neither have a life.

I don't know about Vipul Shah, but I not only have a nice life but
have made a whole career as a professional in electronics and
radio. I'm married to a wonderful woman who was my high
school sweetheart. We own two houses, debt free, in Washington
and California. Both my wife and I have comfortable incomes even
though we are both retired.

>You obviously do, and so do the rest of us.

All morsemen have wonderful lives in their own minds, bound
and determined to keep up a living museum of the air on
archaic radiotelegraphy.

I wish you all well.

Now, why in the world do you and other morsemen need laws to cram morse code ability down all amateur radio newcomers' throats?

What's wrong with "live and let live?"

>If it don't meet their approval....so what?

Good question. Apparently morsemen are so narrowly tunnel-vision focussed on morse code ability...or so enchanted with themselves and their mighty accomplishments in archaic radio...that they cannot see their self-righteous eliteism through keeping outdated law will only hurt them in the long run.

Mighty morsemen are not only maintaining this Archaic Radio-telegraphy Society but are also living in a Fantasyland, one where everything stopped advancing when they were first licensed. They cannot understand progress, only their own stunted abilities bound up in a unique, singular skill that is no longer needed in the rest of the radio world or all society.

There is NO arguing with mighty morsemen of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society. They are locked in, captives of the Belief System of the Church of St. Hiram.

But some of us are optimistically trying to free mighty morse-men from their own morse-besotted Beliefs. Maybe it is too ideal an optimism. We keep on trying while the mighty morse-men are just trying everyone else's patience. :-)

487. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:45:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB88FCE.46FAF8BA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66637

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0305060831.50ee62c8@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030503225903.18769.00000355@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20030503182717.18770.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >> >Flint"
> >> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >>news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >> >>> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
> >> lenover21@aol.com
> >> >>> (Len Over 21) writes:

> >OK, Len, here goes. Just one example - there are others. btw, the
> >"Armed Forces of the United States" includes the Navy, Coast Guard,
> >Air Force and Marine Corps, not just the Army.
> >
> >Did you ever have a "Radioman" rating, Len?
>
> Jimmie, open your morse-besotted mind to some facts instead
> of wandering around like a spoiled child, waving your clenched
> fists in anger at not being respected in a world of adults.
>
> You've made so many errors, misdirections, accusations in
> this post that you MUST be corrected in public. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> First of all the armed forces of the United States doesn't have
> "ratings." It has MILITARY OCCUPATION SPECIALTIES,
> commonly called "MOSs."

I'm almost certain that you are incorrect on this one, Leonard. The
Navy uses "ratings". The Air Force used the term "AFSC". The term
"MILITARY OCCUPATION SPECIALTIES" was not used in the Air Force.

[much of a long, long, long post snipped.]

> So, why are you in such a big dither about MILITARY radio,
> Jimmie? You've never served, haven't indicated you've ever seen
> any military radio communications in progress, don't seem to
> know squat about military comm.

Well, he knew the Navy uses ratings...

> You are in such a state of concern for only one reason: To try
> to "get back" at someone who has challenged your radio
> expertise in the past and continues to do so. You carry on in
> childish rants about "accuracy" when all you want to do is make
> message points and personal triumphs in the newsgroup.

Uh, isn't that what you're all about?

> You don't seem to care about the future, newcomers in ham
> radio not yet licensed, or anything but those who Believe as You
> do. You just can't shake that Belief in morse code as needed
> in amateur radio.

Where has that been indicated in this post or any other by Jim?

> >No, correct. Morse skills alone would not get someone a Radioman
> >rating. Other knowledge and skills were needed.
>
> Yes, first one had to join the US Navy and go through Boot Camp.
>
> Beyond that what do YOU know?

Ever hear of the Navy "A" and "B" schools?

> You don't know. You've never served in any US military branch,
> wartime or peacetime. You've never taken that Oath. You've
> never put your life on the line anytime, anywhere for your
> country.

You look just like George Patton up on that soapbox, all wrapped in
patriotic bunting, "Lennie".

Dave K8MN

488. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:54:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB89218.3454D84A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66638

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> > Please identify the amateur club
> >by name and location that fits this description.
>
> The four closest clubs to me, the event I recently attended (not a close by
> group), any Hamfest i've been to. The several states i've heard Hams on while
> travelling.
>
> A Ham may not realize they are different.
>
> >Please state these "other things". I'd bet there are several people in our
> >local club that do them.
>
> Hams do not like: experimenting with circuits, troubleshooting, tuning, radio
> direction finding.
>
> Hams love: contesting, antennas, HF,CW, collecting cards, ragchewing.

This guy gets my vote for troll of the year.

Dave K8MN

489. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 04:58:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB892E8.9010080E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66639

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> >>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >
> >
> >>>There are a number of ways to "give back" without being active in public
> >>>service work.
> >>
> >
> >
> >>Outside of handing out 12 second QSO's from backwater African
> >>countries, what other ways are there?
> >
> >
> > Why not sit and ponder the matter for a few days and let us know if you
> > come up with anything?
> >
> >
> >>Working out of band Frenchmen?
> >
> >
> > I am not responsible for enforcing amateur radio regs in France. As has
> > been suggested numerous times, you need to take your case to the French
> > PTT and the REF.
>
> I wonder if out of band F****hmen do public service?

See, Mike? All of these problems with the French didn't begin just
recently.

Dave K8MN

490. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 05:03:34 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9aohc$h4an8$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66644

Okay.... then next question for ya, for the sake of argument. Who says that the ARRL's suggestions meet within the bounds of "good amateur practice" then?

I am not suggesting elimination, just a clearly defined bandplan for each band where even modes are clearly spelled out for each band. Upon using search engines, there have been some discrepancies I have found. Things such as calling frequencies etc, as well as exact breakdowns of different modes within the specific band edges have shown to be different. And I believe the FCC should be mandating that as long as they are still issuing licenses, not Newington.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> Right now, it's a combination of both. I believe that the FCC does have
> a valid purpose for defining limitations on mode and power for specific
> frequencies. The ARRL also suggests further refinements which are
> adhered to by all amateurs in the spirit of the FCC rule requiring us to
> operate within the bounds of "good amateur practice." The present system
> works, and I can think of way more reasons to keep it, than to eliminate
it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

491. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 05:08:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB8954A.92335192@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66640

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <b99ertutd1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan Turnip"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

> >I guess the real issue is why bother with someone that
> >ain't been there and done that.
>
> Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.

They probably weren't aware that they should consult with you.

> FCC doesn't require any commissioner or staff to have
> amateur licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio. :-)

That's right. They're paid to regulate. It is part of the job.

> >Apparantly neither have a life.
>
> I don't know about Vipul Shah, but I not only have a nice life but
> have made a whole career as a professional in electronics and
> radio. I'm married to a wonderful woman who was my high
> school sweetheart. We own two houses, debt free, in Washington
> and California. Both my wife and I have comfortable incomes even
> though we are both retired.
>
> >You obviously do, and so do the rest of us.
>
> All morsemen have wonderful lives in their own minds, bound
> and determined to keep up a living museum of the air on
> archaic radiotelegraphy.

If you can have a nice life in your mind, we can have nice lives in our
minds.

> I wish you all well.

You don't sound very sincere.

> Now, why in the world do you and other morsemen need laws to
> cram morse code ability down all amateur radio newcomers'
> throats?

Why in the world do you think you can force anyone to share your beliefs
about morse testing or a minimum age for participation in amateur radio?

> What's wrong with "live and let live?"

Go live.

> Mighty morsemen are not only maintaining this Archaic Radio-
> telegraphy Society but are also living in a Fantasyland, one
> where everything stopped advancing when they were first
> licensed. They cannot understand progress, only their own
> stunted abilities bound up in a unique, singular skill that is no
> longer needed in the rest of the radio world or all society.

Amateur radio has changed quite a bit since I first became a ham forty
years back. The singular skill to which you refer is used daily by
thousands on the amateur bands. I don't live in a fantasy land and I
understand progress. How's your progess on getting up to five wpm?

> There is NO arguing with mighty morsemen of the Archaic
> Radiotelegraphy Society. They are locked in, captives of the
> Belief System of the Church of St. Hiram.

You mean there are those here who disagree with you and that honks you
off.

> But some of us are optimistically trying to free mighty morse-
> men from their own morse-besotted Beliefs. Maybe it is too
> ideal an optimism. We keep on trying while the mighty morse-
> men are just trying everyone else's patience. :-)

Izzat in your role as self-appointed "advocate" for something or other?

Dave K8MN

492. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 05:47:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9aohd$h4an8$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66645

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030505221237.04525.00000379@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <b961if$fj4dp$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Well Larry,
> >
> >What about outside of ham radio?? That was part of the original post.
> >
> >There is alot to be done with public service activities in ham radio.
> >Consider being net control for an upcoming race/run/bike-a-thon etc???
Or
> >just plain participating? Great chance to meet and work with other hams
in
> >your area. There is alot to do, where you don't have to be Superham, or
> >cop/firefighter/emt either. It is merely just a matter of getting
> >involved, participating and working TOGETHER to achieve a common goal.
>
> Ryan:
>
> The type of activities you describe probably annoy me more than the Public
> Service Hero types. Some technically-disinclined,
operationally-challenged,
> no-nothing-at-all-about-radio gets a No-Clue Technician ticket and an HT,
> drags it to a few club meetings, and then shows up at the March of Dimes
> Walk-A-Thon expecting to be given a leading role in the amateur
> communications being provided. Again, it's all done for the personal
> glory -- the approval, appreciation, the being seen as someone doing
something
> that nobody else can do -- even when this isn't true. The worst part is
that
> all of this kind of "public service" activity is usually applied as
> justification
> to reducing/eliminating the code testing and other challenging licensing
> requirements -- which has the effect of watering down the overall
capabilities
> of the whole of the amateur radio service.

Wow.... I definitely am sorry that you have been exposed to these alleged
types of situations to create these mere opinions. I can only speak of
local experience, but I have yet to find someone that fits into that
category as described above. Furthermore I have never seen someone working
these events, promoting the whole code issue simulataneously.
Locally speaking, the people I know that are getting involved are getting

involved, for the right reasons; to help out their community, and do not do it for some type of tangible award. The award is a personal feeling of doing something good. If doing something good is against your ethics apparently from this post, then one could extract that you condone doing bad things then. (In regards to locally speaking, there is a wide cross-section of people with different license classes and dates they got the licenses. The most unselfish people with the desire to help out with no personal gain other than a feeling of doing good are the PCTA general thru extra class licensee's that were licensed in the 70's and before, and the newly licensed. The ones in the middle are the only ones that *may* be what you were describing.)

> The grandmother, who is the XYL of an active ham, who gets her No-Clue
> Tech ticket and then carries her HT to the Walk-A-Thon is NOT my fellow
> ham in any respect whatsoever. She is a pretender; a dumbed-down fake;
> a wannabe, if you will. She can be replaced by any other grandmother and
> a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie. She has no more interest in or
> commitment to the ARS than her pet cat. All she is doing is borrowing a
> frequency.

Wow... it is almost astonishing to see the level of bitterness and broad-sweeping generalities. I hope you learn to deal with this bitterness in a positive way before it consumes you. It is is attitudes like this that bring the amateur service "one step closer to extinction."

Try to have a better day,

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

493. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 05:57:40 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9aohf$h4an8$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66646

Since Larry can make broad-sweeping generalities, here I go with one.
Tpyically a majority of hams I have ever met are the introverted,
stay-at-home types that only get out once in a while and only become
extroverted in any sense when behind a microphone, keyer or keyboard.
Although there may be a quantity of ham's that are physically active, most
aren't.

How about encouraging more "bicycle mobiles" out there?? Hell, when I go
riding, I throw an HT in a pocket just in case of an emergency. Once it
actually came in handy, as I ran across someone who got stung by a bee on
the local rail-trail, and was having a severe allergic reaction. Being able
to bring up the autopatch, and getting emergency help there rather quickly
probably their day a little better than if they had to wait alot longer to
get help. True that this could have been done with a cellphone but I still
rather carry the HT.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Contests require less physical activity, and this could be a reason for
the
> weight gain. I noticed that snacking occurred during the contests. Other
> interests, such as radio direction finding use more physical activity. If
more
> Hams were interested in this, there would be fewer overweight Hams.
>
> The Hams were a very nice group of people, so I feel bad about it. When
Hams
> over eat, it hurts them. Hopefully, this may change in the future.
>
> The adults were of course showing the children how to operate, etc. The
> children were eating the same fatty foods the adults were eating. If one
uses
> some common sense, one can see that these children will be fat when they
become
> adults. This is the future of Ham radio.
>

494. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 06:03:30 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9aohh$h4an8$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66647

Bingo Jim,

This was a strong topic of discussion recently at a local continuing education credits session I went to as a requirement of my medical licensure. The typical lifestyle 50-75 years ago involved a hell of alot more work on a day-to-day basis, be it doing chores or having to work multiple jobs and that is not the same now. Technology is partially to blame.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> It's not a radio problem, it's a problem of American culture. Food
> here is inexpensive, plentiful, and delicious. Usually (and
> unfortunately) the most inexpensive, plentiful and delicious food is
> also the most fattening.
>
> Add to this the fact that most Americans aren't required to have
> physically active lives, and the stage is set for the problems you
> see. Not just among radio amateurs but in the entire population.
>
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

495. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 06:10:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <zr1ua.4689$Vp1.903@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66641

Yes, Keith, please pass along your call sign.

If you suggest digital means, I'll agree with you. If you suggest AM, FM, or SSB, I will disagree. I have put 40 words per minute perfect copy on a typewriter (and no need to think I couldn't put it into a computer). No big deal, except when you get to difficult spellings of street names or surnames or whatever ... well, you get the idea. Digital is the way to go. If not that, cw is better than voice. Believe it or not.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2AQ

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:UAEta.57538$4P1.5301413@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> The State of Connecticut will require each person testing for a drivers
> license to show that they can operate a whip in case they need drive a
horse
> and buggy some day.
> In other news FCC enforcer Riley Hollingsworth wrote several Amateur
> Operators noting that they were operating Morse Code using a very wide
> bandwidth and they should consider operating with spark gap transmitters
for
> better fidelity. In response the ARRL asked for a NPRM to outlaw anyone
not
> using 100+ year old technology on the ham bands.
>
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
> Death to horse and buggy technology in ham radio test!
> Eliminate the Morse Code test now!

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

496. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 08:25:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507042527.18755.00000659@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66642

In article <20030503173632.18769.00000420@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030503105308.18759.00000578@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:

>>> You've just not had that much
>>> experience anywhere with the newer networks, won't do the
>>> math to do an honest comparison.
>>
>>How do you know? You claim an awful lot about my experience and knowledge.
>
> All us readers can see is that you are deliberately vague about
> what you've done, where you've worked, or all the claimed
> expirience. Very vague.

Incorrect. All that YOU can see is what I've written here. Some other readers know a lot more about my work experience.

It's quite clear that no matter what work experience I have, you would find a way to ridicule and insult the work, my empoyers, and me. We've all seen you do it many times. You even make fun of other veterans' military service. So why should anyone give you details?
>
>>> Don't try that "MSEE snow
>>> job" again about "knowing better."
>>
>>Your degree is from what accredited institution? What date is on your
>>diploma?
>
> It was from an accredited institution in the Southern California
> area.
>
> The date is from the last millenium.
>
> I've told you as much as you've told everyone else about where
> you work or your work experience. :-)

Different subject. I posted my education - you won't post yours.
>
>>>You haven't shown anything
>>> of newer techniques, only new snow.
>>
>>You haven't shown anyhting other than references to the OLD work of others.
>

> Oh? The year 1998 is "old?" :-)

1974 is OLD.
>
>>> You seem bent on acquiring many more pounds of flesh.
>>
>>What does that mean?
>
> Poor baby. Doesn't know common American idioms. Tsk.

I only know it from "Merchant of Venice". That's an old, old OLD play by one
Bill Shakespeare.
>
> It means you HAVE to "get even" in a discussion, no matter
> how or where. You MUST win. :-)

Sounds just like you, Len.

Do you want me to stop posting? Do you think that you should have the right to
post here, but that nobody should disagree with you or point out your mistakes?

Sure seems like it, from the way you behave.

497. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 10:34:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305070234.77229087@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66643

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB8895F.DC6B7A12@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b924nc$kl3$1@208.207.71.152>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.
> > >
> > > Not for dealing with the likes of you. It's child's play.
> >
> > If you want to play with children, hook up with Dave.
>
> Would you mind repeating your recent comment about Dick's one line
> comments? That classic is sure to be on my hit parade for some time to
> come as it has long been one of your regular routines here.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, how nice of you to comment. You may have missed it, but DICK
and I are actually having a dialogue, which is different that him
Tail-Ending one of your or anyone elses comments. Maybe if you
weren't so thick you would have noticed.

498. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 11:45:42 UTC
From: Spectrum <Rush@sisolixter.org>
Message-ID: <b9asd2mpv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66648

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote the following
troll:

>
> Where did you get your public health degree from?
>
>
> Where did you get your psychology degree from?
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

**** TROLL ALERT ****

Troll-o-Meter
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
Troll Reading

499. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 11:49:07 UTC
From: Spectrum <Rush@sisolixter.org>
Message-ID: <b9asd3mpv1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66649

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hehh4f7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 06 May 2003 02:12:36 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >to be accepted as real, full-fledged hams, in spite of the fact
> >that they only skill they bring to the activity is the ability to
> >push a button and talk.
>
> When I have three ops at a console passing status messages in
> the inter-hospital net, the above-cited skill is exactly what I
> would want them to have. The only other skills that I would
> want in an operator is the ability to type a packet message
> (two-finger typing is OK) and the ability to keep their wits
> about them.
>
> In our ARES/RACES operation, "No-Code Techs" with the
> above-cited skills are far better than the old farts of any age
> who rant and rave about the lack of taking a CW test. Then
> again, we've weeded out the latter by giving them -real- work
> to do during an exercise, and watching them scurry back into
> the woodwork.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
> Passed the 20 wpm test, gave "real"
> code tests for decades, and still
> feels that code testing for an amateur
> license is irrelevant.
>
>
>

Where did you earn your code degree?

73 de Rush

500. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 11:50:32 UTC
From: Spectrum <Rush@sisolixter.org>
Message-ID: <b9asd5mpv2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66650

**** TROLL ALERT *****

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hehhfk9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 06 May 2003 02:12:37 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >The grandmother, who is the XYL of an active ham, who gets her No-Clue
> >Tech ticket and then carries her HT to the Walk-A-Thon is NOT my fellow
> >ham in any respect whatsoever.
>
> You are so right. She's a far better ham that you will ever be
> with your attitude.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

501. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 11:57:09 UTC
From: Spectrum <Rush@sisolixter.org>
Message-ID: <b9asdbmpv3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66651

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.heh3fp6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 04 May 2003 17:39:20 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >Back when there were CB licenses, I had KAAR5167.
> >That's a 4 letter prefix. Being CB, maybe there is a connection
> >between 4 letter calls and 4 letter words..... :-)
>
> "In the Beginning" CB calls were issued by the FCC District
> Office and were of the format nnWnnnn where the first "nn" was the
> FCC District number and the "nnnn" was a sequential number for
> each district.
>

No, that is incorrect. CB calls were issued by the
FCC Division office and were in format nWxnnnn where
the first "n" was the FCC division number and the "Wxnnnn"
was the spec op random number for each division.

> "Later On" when the Gettysburg License Center was opened, CB
> licenses were issued from there and call signs were 3+4 format
> such as KBA1234. KAA calls were reserved for GMRS. When they ran
> out of 3+4 calls, the 4+4 format came in. I don't even remember
> what my ex-wife's CB call was.....

BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
signs per an agreement with the ITU.

>
> But that's CB - not ham radio.

Yes, correct. At least yo got one out of three correct.

>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

502. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 12:25:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507082514.18828.00000799@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66652

In article <20030503173634.18769.00000421@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>According to the book, "Morse Code, The Essential Language" one can
>achieve
>>>>5wpm in 30 hours of study if an effective study method is chosen. Of
>course
>>>>some people learn much quicker. My older daughter learned it in a week
>>>>spending not more than an hour or so per day. It took me longer but so
>>>>what.
>>>
>>> According to the Armed Forces of the United States, morse
>>> code cognition is of such a limited aptitude in the "average"
>>> person that they kept a morse code aptitude test in the bank
>>> of recruit tests for two decades...1940s on through to at least
>>> 1960.
>>
>>Where is this stated explicitly?
>
> In the US Army it is contained in an "AR" (Army Regulation) which has
> long been out of date and eliminated from any current regulations. I
> saw it and discussed it with Captain William Boss, then the Officer
> in Charge of the ADA Transmitter station (and then a licensed US
> radio amateur). The morse code aptitude test was discussed in an
> informal discussion between two US Army commissioned officers
> at the Far East Command Headquarters in Pershing Heights area
> of Tokyo about 1954 after my general query to one of them (while on
> official duties requiring my visit to FEC Hq).

So all we have is your memory of a discussion of an alleged Army regulation of
a half-century ago. We have the name of one officer, who is unavailable to
comment today.

The Army is not the entire "Armed Forces of the United States", btw.

It has been clearly shown in another post that the level of Morse skill
required of Morse-skilled US military radio operators was far, far, FAR above
that required to pass the current amateur test.
>>
>>The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
>>the
>>recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required. The
>>required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur radio
>>code test.

One too few "far's" in the above ;-)
>
(N2EY)
> should state his own personal experiences on US
> military recruit testing as well as his US military experience
> in communications of any sort.

WHY?
>
(N2EY)
> has NO such experience, hasn't seen an AR, didn't
> even fall under the Uniform Code of Military Justice at any time..

Why do you ask a question if you know the answer?

And what difference does my military experience or lack therof have on the
simple fact that:

The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
the recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
The
required military skill level was far, far, FAR above the 5 wpm amateur radio
code test.

>>> In US amateur radio, Novice Class examinations have always
>>> required morse code testing. At the same time, the Novice
>>> Class license numbers have steadily decreased for years.
>>
>>In US amateur radio, Technician Plus Class examinations have always
>>required morse code testing. At the same time, the Technician Plus
>>Class license numbers have steadily increased from the introduction of that
>>license class until its being closed to new licenses in April of 2000.
>
> Do not try to misdirect on "Technician Plus" testing. The "debate"
> was on the NOVICE CLASS.

Not misdirection at all. Just proof that your line of 'reasoning' is flawed.
FCC closed off the Technician Plus class from new licensees even though it was
growing steadily.
>
> If you must misdirect, try the pre-restructuring no-code Technician
> Class.

Why?

> That will show you quite a different picture.

Not at all. The Technician class was also growing. Still is, in part due to the
renewal of all Technician Plus licenses as Technician.

>>> The decrease in license numbers was so much and for so
>>> long that it was obvious to all who bothered to examine that
>>> Class. The FCC dropped the Novice Class from any new
>>> license grants following the recent restructuring.
>>
>>The FCC also dropped the Technician Plus and Advanced Class from any new
>>license grants in the same restructuring.
>
> Irrelevant again.

Not irrelevant at all. Technician Plus class was growing, yet it was closed to
new applicants, just like the Novice.
>
>>> Another question, again more suited to the subject thread,
>>> is WHY "save" the Novice Class?
>>
>>There's no clear reason to save it, because the Technician and Techncian
>>Plus classes of license have been the choice of most new US radio amateurs
>>since the 1980s.
>
> Where is that stated explicitly? ARRL statements?

Nope. In the license totals since the late 1970s.
>
> ARRL statements for several years prior to 1991 did not
> think so...they were pushing the NOVICE Class as the
> "entry" license. They continued to do that for several
> years following.

Where is that stated explicitly?
>
>>> The only US amateur radio license class that kept growth in
>>> US amateur radio license totals was the no-code-test
>>> Technician Class.
>>
>>Incorrect.
>
> Sorry. VERY CORRECT.

Sorry. Incorrect.

> Two hundred thousand NEW
> no-code Technician Class licenses between 1991 and
> mid-2000 make you very wrong.

How do you know that all of those Technicians were not code-tested?

More important, how do you know that none of those who obtained a Technician
license in that period would have done so if a code test was involved?

What does your crystal ball say?
>
>>The above 'alternate history' statement assumes that none of those who
>>obtained
>>Technician Class licenses after February 1991 would have done so if that
>>license had not lost its code test. That is clearly incorrect.
>
> Supposition fantasy.

Only by you.

> You cannot possibly know the motivations
> of two hundred thousand no-code Technican Class licensees.

Neither can you, Len. Yet you ASSUME none of them would have gotten amateur
radio licenses if a code test were involved.
>
>>It stands to reason that if code testing were an 'unnecessary, arbitrary,
>>and
>>distasteful (to many) barriers to entry', those who were interested, but
>>dissuaded by those unnecessary barriers would "jump in." when the 'barriers'
>>were eliminated. Except that's not what happened, in either absolute number
>>of
>>hams or percentage growth. Growth in total hams was almost exactly the same
>>during the '90s, compared to the '80s, and the percentage growth actually
>>dropped.
>
> No, you are too far into supposition fantasy.

How? Was there no growth in the number of US hams from 1980 to 1990?

How do you explain the FACT that US amatuer radio grew as much in the '80s
(when all licenses required a code test and there were no code test waivers) as
it did in the '90s (with waivers and a class of license without a code test)?

> Two hundred thousand licensees wrong.

Not me. See above question. Explain.
>
> That PCTA argument has become a trite, worn-out cliche' of no
> logical value.

Then explain the FACT that US amatuer radio grew as much in the '80s (when all
licenses required a code test and there were no code test waivers) as it did in
the '90s (with waivers and a class of license without a code test).
>
> That old horse has been beaten to death so many times over that
> no skeleton is left to bleach in the sun.

Then explain the FACT that US amatuer radio grew as much in the '80s (when all
licenses required a code test and there were no code test waivers) as it did in
the '90s (with waivers and a class of license without a code test).
>
> The ACTUAL growth has been discussed over and over again in here

> prior to the restructuring data. You've been shown the numbers.
> You want to discount the evidence, turn a blind eye to it, all to
> support your obstinate need for winning an argument at any cost.

Not at all. You are the one who cannot admit a mistake. You keep insisting that if there were no license class without a code test, US amateur license totals would have decreased. Yet the decade of the '80s proves you wrong.
>
>>Since the closing of the Technician Plus to new licenses in April 2000, FCC
>>has
>>been renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician, causing the latter
>>class to grow and the former to shrink.
>
> Where is this explicitly stated?

Part 97.
>
> Did you download the entire FCC database of amateur radio licensees
> for several years and do your own sorting and totalizing? Or did you
> take someone else's statements as truth?

I just read Part 97.
>
> Why do you accept some statements as truth and others as false?

The credibility of the source.

> The answer seems clear. A double standard.

Nope. It's the credibility of the source that matters. You don't have much.

> Statements from
> pro-code supporters are "truth" while statements from no-code
> advocates are "false."

Incorrect. See any discussion I have had with K2UNK, W5NET, KC8PMX or a number of others for the past 5+ years.

The fact is that YOUR statements are suspect due to your long history of unadmitted mistakes and faulty reasoning.

503. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 12:40:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB8FECB.8671B76A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66653

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EB8895F.DC6B7A12@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b924nc$kl3$1@208.207.71.152>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > DICK, you're just going to have to come up with some better material.
> > > >
> > > > Not for dealing with the likes of you. It's child's play.
> > >
> > > If you want to play with children, hook up with Dave.
> >
> > Would you mind repeating your recent comment about Dick's one line
> > comments? That classic is sure to be on my hit parade for some time to
> > come as it has long been one of your regular routines here.

> Dave, how nice of you to comment. You may have missed it, but DICK
> and I are actually having a dialogue, which is different that him
> Tail-Ending one of your or anyone elses comments. Maybe if you
> weren't so thick you would have noticed.

I notice quite a lot, Brian. I notice, for example, that you sidestep
the fact that you frequently do that of which you accuse Dick of doing.
When you repost the one liner routine, would you mind digging up your
old double standard line and tossing it in for grins.

Dave K8MN

504. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 13:03:16 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93745C1D13D36elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66654

"Spectrum" <Rush@sisolixter.org> wrote in news:b9asdbmpv3@pita.alt.net:

>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.heh3fp6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On Sun, 04 May 2003 17:39:20 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>> >Back when there were CB licenses, I had KAAR5167.
>> >That's a 4 letter prefix. Being CB, maybe there is a connection
>> >between 4 letter calls and 4 letter words..... :-)
>>
>> "In the Beginning" CB calls were issued by the FCC District
>> Office and were of the format nnWnnnn where the first "nn" was the
>> FCC District number and the "nnnn" was a sequential number for
>> each district.
>>
>
> No, that is incorrect. CB calls were issued by the
> FCC Division office and were in format nWxnnnn where
> the first "n" was the FCC division number and the "Wxnnnn"
> was the spec op random number for each division.
>

????
>
>> "Later On" when the Gettysburg License Center was opened, CB
>> licenses were issued from there and call signs were 3+4 format
>> such as KBA1234. KAA calls were reserved for GMRS. When they ran
>> out of 3+4 calls, the 4+4 format came in. I don't even remember
>> what my ex-wife's CB call was.....
>
>
> BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
> issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
> signs per an agreement with the ITU.
>

CB is not recognised by the ITU as a service

>
>>
>> But that's CB - not ham radio.
>
> Yes, correct. At least yo got one out of three correct.
>

>>
>> --
>> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>

505. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 13:17:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EB90760.8020507@psu.edu>
Source record: 66657

```
Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030505221237.04525.00000379@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>>In article <b961if$fj4dp$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>><kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Well Larry,
>>>
>>>What about outside of ham radio?? That was part of the original post.
>>>
>>>There is alot to be done with public service activities in ham radio.
>>>Consider being net control for an upcoming race/run/bike-a-thon etc???
>>
> Or
>
>>>just plain participating? Great chance to meet and work with other hams
>>
> in
>
>>>your area. There is alot to do, where you don't have to be Superham, or
>>>cop/firefighter/emt either. It is merely just a matter of getting
>>>involved, participating and working TOGETHER to achieve a common goal.
>>
>>Ryan:
>>
>>The type of activities you describe probably annoy me more than the Public
>>Service Hero types. Some technically-disinclined,
>
> operationally-challenged,
>
>>no-nothing-at-all-about-radio gets a No-Clue Technician ticket and an HT,
>>drags it to a few club meetings, and then shows up at the March of Dimes
>>Walk-A-Thon expecting to be given a leading role in the amateur
>>communications being provided. Again, it's all done for the personal
>>glory -- the approval, appreciation, the being seen as someone doing
>
> something
>
>>that nobody else can do -- even when this isn't true. The worst part is
>
> that
>
```

>>all of this kind of "public service" activity is usually applied as
>>justification
>>to reducing/eliminating the code testing and other challenging licensing
>>requirements -- which has the effect of watering down the overall
>
> capabilities
>
>>of the whole of the amateur radio service.
>
>
> Wow.... I definitely am sorry that you have been exposed to these alleged
> types of situations to create these mere opinions. I can only speak of
> local experience, but I have yet to find someone that fits into that
> category as described above. Furthermore I have never seen someone working
> these events, promoting the whole code issue simulataneously.
> Locally speaking, the people I know that are getting involved are getting
> involved, for the right reasons; to help out their community, and do not do
> it for some type of tangible award. The award is a personal feeling of
> doing something good. If doing something good is against your ethics
> apparently from this post, then one could extract that you condone doing bad
> things then. (In regards to locally speaking, there is a wide cross-section
> of people with different license classes and dates they got the licenses.
> The most unselfish people with the desire to help out with no personal gain
> other than a feeling of doing good are the PCTA general thru extra class
> licensee's that were licensed in the 70's and before, and the newly
> licensed. The ones in the middle are the only ones that *may* be what you
> were describing.)
>
>
>
>>The grandmother, who is the XYL of an active ham, who gets her No-Clue
>>Tech ticket and then carries her HT to the Walk-A-Thon is NOT my fellow
>>ham in any respect whatsoever. She is a pretender; a dumbed-down fake;
>>a wannabe, if you will. She can be replaced by any other grandmother and
>>a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie. She has no more interest in or
>>commitment to the ARS than her pet cat. All she is doing is borrowing a
>>frequency.
>>
>
>
> Wow... it is almost astonishing to see the level of bitterness and
> broad-sweeping generalities. I hope you learn to deal with this bitterness
> in a positive way before it consumes you. It is is attitudes like this that
> bring the amateur service "one step closer to extinction."

It IS fascinating to see these generalities. The bitterness is
something else again. Bitterness is one of those things that can become
addictive to some people.

But as for generalities, of the people who do the charity event PS for
our club, there are only one or two who are not highly technically

inclined. They are just regular tech types. And there are no grandmas to be seen - though we'd welcome them. I'm highly technically inclined, and I do every event. So I don't know where he gets his data.

- Mike KB3EIA -

506. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 14:05:47 UTC
From: David Lafferty <dplaff@cox-internet.com>
Message-ID: <vbi4lvrqflel5b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 66658

However, searches of
> the following sites will no doubt yield the information you seek.

I doubt it. I was wondering what specific information you had. I've heard these "statics" quoted before, but no one so far has produced the statics to back up their statements. I thought maybe you'd be the first.

K5DEL

507. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 14:32:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507103256.25198.00001132@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66659

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/5/2003 10:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030505231309.08556.00000750@mb-m04.aol.com>

>Do you feel that way about all Technician class license holders? Doesn't
>sound
>like supporting the hobby.

At least Larry's comments are in an AMATEUR Radio nwsgroup, Vippy...NOT
some mealy-mouthed anti-Amateur rant in a >>CB<< radio newsgroup.

>You know some of them have BSEE degree and can
>design circuits. Hardly just pushing a button.

How many, Vippy? Source?

>Some of those with a BSEE are also smart enough NOT to learn code when they
>want to be good at other aspects.

You still have yet to explain how NOT learning something can make someone
better at something else.

Steve, K4YZ

508. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 14:49:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507104940.25198.00001133@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66660

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/5/2003 10:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030505230650.08556.00000749@mb-m04.aol.com>

>In reality, the Hams that volunteer for these events are being taken
>advantage
>of.

Seducing your fourteen year old neice, that can't know better, is "taking advantage" of someone, Vippy.

Offering to DO public service, expecially for an organization as worthy as March-of-Dimes is NOT "being taken advantage of." I know...I had to depend on funds from them and Shriners and a couple other organizations for several years....

>>She can be replaced by any other grandmother and
>>a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie.
>
>True. Anyone can do these volunteer events. They could easily train someone,
>licensed or not, the same day to do it.

Uh huh...There's not a GMRS repeater within 75 miles of Chattanooga, and the terrain will not support MURS/FRS communications over a few hundred yards.

Try again. Try smarter.

>Also agree that Hams do these events to make Hams look like they are doing
>"public service".

If they ARE doing the event, Your Screwiness, they ARE doing public service!

>>The worst part is that
>>all of this kind of "public service" activity is usually applied as
>>justification
>>to reducing/eliminating the code testing and other challenging licensing
>>requirements -- which has the effect of watering down the overall
>>capabilities
>>of the whole of the amateur radio service.
>
>Wrong. It does not act as justification to eliminate code testing. It has
>NOTHING to do with code testing.

OH?

Several folks in this VERY FORUM used the excuse that if code testing were dropped, there would be more Amateurs to draw from to do public service functions.

>Its used by anyone, code or no-code, to make the hobby and themselves look
>like
>they do volunteer events.

If someone is doing a communications event without compensation, and they VOLUNTEERED to do it, they ARE "doing" a VOLUNTEER EVENT.

I used to think you were just a kid with little Amateur Radio experience and poor English comprehension. (Or at least the American version of it...)

But I am now convinced this is an INTENTIONAL effort to look stupid, and your only reason to be here is to incite and antagonize.

Imagine that...Yet another alleged "engineering professional" with an acidic mouth and few facts trolling in this NG.

Sheeeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

509. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 15:05:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507110507.25198.00001134@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66661

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/6/2003 10:38 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030506233854.19604.00000600@mb-m20.aol.com>

>And, Hams are often
>antisocial (but in a good way, I guess).

Yeah...anti-social...That's why they organize all these hamfests...so they can go out in public and NOT socialize with people. I guess Dayton Hamvention is just tens-of-thousands of guys standing around, eating and ignoring each other...?!?!?

>You can apply this argument to anything. By this logic, nothing is known.

In your case, Vippy, this would be correct..."nothing is known".

>Also, I know it was random because they invited Hams to attend. I happened to
>be on the mailing list. It is random from my perspective who actually
>attended
>this event.

If Amateurs were the only ones invited, it was not "random".

>There were a few new people, like me, that did not attend before.

Probably so...but how do YOU know? Did you go up to them and ask? Or did you go and NOT socialize?

>It was a general activity Ham gathering. (I did PSK31, SSB, ATV, some
>satellite, some HF phone).

WHOOOOOOOA VIPPY!

You yourself have stated, in this VERY forum, that Hamfests were controlled by "only coders" who had NO interest in doing anything BUT Morse Code related activities. With the possible exception of the satellites which DO have some Morse Code traffic on them, where is the evidence of "only coders" in YOUR example???

>The selection process was completely random here. I chose to attend because
>they had many radio modes I could operate.

But you stated Hamfests were "only coder" events? Were you mistaken before, and now recanting your earlier assertion, or were you lying before ? ? ?

>Hamfests are a large group. Also, surveys have been done. Its also common
>sense

>observation.

You keep refering to "surveys", Vippy, but you have yet to make a SINGLE referecen to some valid study taht was done by ANYONE.

So, WHERE are these "surveys" and WHO did them?

>>This was all consumed in one day.
>>By whom?
>
>It was not hard to miss that EACH one of them ate a huge quantity of high fat
>foods. In fact, they ate more than I saw them eat. I know they ate the shrimp
>when I was out on my trip.

There's your problem, Vippy...You spend entirely too much time at the concession stand and too LITTLE time in the hamfest events! If you hang around food, you're going to see people eating it!

>>20 people can eat a lot of food over the course of a day.
>
>This proves it.

Proves WHAT? That over the course of a day people eat...?!?!

There's a revelation! Glad we cleared THAT up ! ! ! !

>Yes, the free food is one good part of some Ham events.

WHAT "free food"...?!?! The only "free food" I ever saw was at LOCAL club meetings, NOT "hamfests", and then only becasue everyone brought their own covered plate.

>I try to make use of events that have food served. You can do the
>same - its fun!

How can THAT be? You spend sooooooooooo much time belittling people who eat, Vippy!

>Contesting requires you to sit in one place for a period of time.

So does riding in the Space Shuttle.

>They just went unbelievably overboard.

Kinda like some of your assertions in this forum, Vippy?

Steve, K4YZ

510. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 15:56:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB92CD4.7060604@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66662

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Since Larry can make broad-sweeping generalities, here I go with one.
> Tpyically a majority of hams I have ever met are the introverted,
> stay-at-home types that only get out once in a while and only become
> extroverted in any sense when behind a microphone, keyer or keyboard.
> Although there may be a quantity of ham's that are physically active, most
> aren't.

It is a generalization, but not based on bitterness or emotion.

There are plenty of people who are not social butterflies. If the shy one is technically inclined, the ARS can be the ticket out of his/her shell. What a great thing!

On average, Hams are probably somewhat less active than other groups due to the fact that there are quite a few elderly hams (no problem, the ARS is a great hobby for older people)

As for the young and middle aged hams, there might be a few more of us active ones than first appear. You bicycle, Jim is a runner, and I play Ice Hockey. Those are just the ones I know about

> How about encouraging more "bicycle mobiles" out there?? Hell, when I go
> riding, I throw an HT in a pocket just in case of an emergency. Once it
> actually came in handy, as I ran across someone who got stung by a bee on
> the local rail-trail, and was having a severe allergic reaction. Being able
> to bring up the autopatch, and getting emergency help there rather quickly
> probably their day a little better than if they had to wait alot longer to
> get help. True that this could have been done with a cellphone but I still
> rather carry the HT.

At least you'll have a better chance of coverage with the HT! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

511. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 16:05:34 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB92ECE.1818DF99@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66655

David Lafferty wrote:
>
> I'll give you another .02. Specifically, what dangerous criminals have been
> released? Not arguing, just wanted to know what specific facts you have on
> this issue?
>
This came up in a college LE course I took a few years ago. The prof disliked manditory sentancing because it forced release of more dangerous criminals and had many ancidotal examples. I do not have my notes from class and doubt I could find them now.

There have been many major news stories about violent criminals released (often under court order) to correct overcrowding who commited serious violent crimes including rape/murder. At the same time other news articles attributed the overcrowding to manditory drug sentances. Faced with a court order that requires release of, say, 10 prisoners, prison authorities perforce release criminals doing indeterminate sentances rather than those doing manditory sentances regardless of their crimes.

This isn't anything I'm interested in, nor pertinent to this NG, so no specific facts such as names of criminals or victims, what prison they were relaesed from, etc come immediately to mind. However, searches of the following sites will no doubt yield the information you seek.
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/>
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/rpr94.pdf>

73, K3DWW

512. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 16:15:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB93149.3010902@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66663

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/5/2003 10:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030505230650.08556.00000749@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>
>>In reality, the Hams that volunteer for these events are being taken
>>advantage
>>of.
>
>
> Seducing your fourteen year old neice, that can't know better, is "taking
> advantage" of someone, Vippy.

> Offering to DO public service, expecially for an organization as worthy as
> March-of-Dimes is NOT "being taken advantage of." I know...I had to depend on
> funds from them and Shriners and a couple other organizations for several
> years....
>
>
>>>She can be replaced by any other grandmother and
>>>a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie.
>>
>>True. Anyone can do these volunteer events. They could easily train someone,
>>licensed or not, the same day to do it.
>
>
> Uh huh...There's not a GMRS repeater within 75 miles of Chattanooga, and
> the terrain will not support MURS/FRS communications over a few hundred yards.
>
> Try again. Try smarter.

Now that has me thinking. Some years ago, before I was a Ham, our club did one of those "tough guy" competitions in Penns Creek, east of where I live. This was in a mountainous area, with a meandering creek cutting through it. There were no GMRS repeaters or anything else nearby. In fact, it was darn near wilderness.

The fellow who ran the ham end of the event put up a battery powered repeater on top of one of the mountains to cover the event. This involved some heavy duty 4-wheeling and map studying, and knowledge, as well as determination.

Lets see someone be trained in one day to do that!

- Mike KB3EIA -

513. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 16:19:23 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB9320B.2426285D@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66656

Keith wrote:
>
> Yes, using 100+ year old technology and forcing people to pass a test on it
> so they can press a microphone to talk below 30 MHz is certainly absurd and
> stupid. ...

It is neither absurd no stupid - it is selfish. Forcing people to pass such a test makes perfect sense if your goal is to keep others from sharing what is, after all, public property.

73, K3DWW

514. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 17:51:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507135140.08218.00000764@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66664

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/5/2003 11:44 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030506004436.08556.00000753@mb-m04.aol.com>

>Joining costs almost nothing. It just takes a license in a day class. It
>SEEMS
>like there is alot of benefit for a small amount of effort (for the no-code
>license).

"SEEMS"...?!?!

>It could be that the narrow interests of contesting and antennas. Cult-like
>conventions, codewords, "contest" rules (which must be followed exactly), and
>Morse code pressure.

Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
Communications Commission.

>There ARE other things that can be done with amateur radio. The current group
>of Hams only seem to want to do things a certain way, and only bring new Hams
>that want to do things the same way.

That's Lennie talking.

NONE od Amateur Radio is still done "The Way I Did It" for any except the
newest of Amateurs in this forum, Vippy.

>As a result, some other people may not want to join amateur radio. I would
>not
>recommend any EE join the hobby, even if they were interested in rf. Only, if
>they were interested in antennas, would I recommend it.

That's becasue you are narrow minded and selfish. You didn't get what YOU
want of it, so you're going to try and ruin it for everyone else, tehreby
imposing YOUR "opinion" on anyone you can. It's your own form of extracted
revenge.

>Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea.

That's only because you are hopelessly narrowminded. And you are
disappointed that there are not a bevy of "preety fems" to be had here.

>I can tell you that. You
>will be alot happier not trying to change the hobby.

Then you wasted your time. I have had a LOT of fun, both doing "old"
things AND "new" things.

Steve, K4YZ

515. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 17:55:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heisdkd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66665

On Wed, 7 May 2003 07:57:09 -0400, Spectrum wrote:

>> "In the Beginning" CB calls were issued by the FCC District
>> Office and were of the format nnWnnnn where the first "nn" was the
>> FCC District number and the "nnnn" was a sequential number for
>> each district.
>>
>
> No, that is incorrect.

Mister/Ms Spectrum, whomever you are, know before whom you stand...

But then again, you DO know who I am. Sorry, buddy, your are
not succeeding in pulling my chain...but for the sake of those
few here who would tend to give any credence to your misstatements,
I will deal with them.

>CB calls were issued by the
>FCC Division office and were in format nWxnnnn where
>the first "n" was the FCC division number and the "Wxnnnn"
>was the spec op random number for each division.

What "Division" office? What "spec op random number"?

At the FCC, all "Divisions" were and still are the next
organizational level below the Bureau at FCC HQ in Washington.
The field offices across the country which dealt with the
public were always called District offices, and reported to a
HQ entity called the Field Offices Division, later called the
Enforcement Division, and now report to a Regional Office. All
these were under the Field Engineering and Monitoring Bureau,
later called the Field Engineering Bureau, then the Field
Operations Bureau, then the Compliance and Information Bureau,
and now are part of the Enforcement Bureau structure. Look it
up on the FCC web site.

And that's only the history going back to the early 1950s.

A careful reading of my quoted posting will show the correct
format for the field-issued licenses (1959-1963 IIRC). The
"nnnn" numbers were NOT random - there was a ledger at each
office in which they were recorded sequentially.

>> "Later On" when the Gettysburg License Center was opened, CB
>> licenses were issued from there and call signs were 3+4 format
>> such as KBA1234. KAA calls were reserved for GMRS. When they ran
>> out of 3+4 calls, the 4+4 format came in. I don't even remember

>> what my ex-wife's CB call was.....
>
>
> BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
>issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
>signs per an agreement with the ITU.

Your statement makes no sense. What "random intended call
signs"? The CB call signs issued by Gettysburg in the 3x4 or
4x4 formats were always computer-issued sequentially, not random.

Get your act together before you speak or post further on this
subject, my friend.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
District Director (retired)
FCC San Francisco District Office

516. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 17:55:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heisyxe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66666

On Wed, 7 May 2003 07:49:07 -0400, Spectrum wrote:

>> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>>
>> Passed the 20 wpm test, gave "real"
>> code tests for decades, and still
>> feels that code testing for an amateur
>> license is irrelevant.
>>
> Where did you earn your code degree?
>
> 73 de Rush

H. Knox University. 40 Meters Division.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

517. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 17:56:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507135644.08218.00000766@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66667

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/6/2003 7:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030506202942.18759.00000679@mb-m04.aol.com>

>Sorry, Mr. Turnip, I'm licensed and been licensed longer than you
> have. One of those licenses isn't in AMATEUR radio.

You're right. You are NOT licensed in Amatuer Radio. At present (07 May 03) you do not possess an FCC Station license, ergo you may NOT legally radiate any RF except under Part 15 and 95.

For the purposes of this forum, you are UNLICENSED.

>Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.

You're right...you are as amteurish as they come and it's high time to get rid of you.

So...pack your bags and get lost, Your Putziness, and do us ALL a favor.

Steve, K4YZ

518. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 18:07:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507140717.08218.00000767@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66668

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 5/6/2003 6:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b99ertutd1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>

>Hey Dee.....you can't argue with a turnip. Neither 'Vshah101', or 'Len over
>21' are licensed.

One correction, Dan...To his credit, "VShah101" is KB1HMW.

He DID, however, try to conceal this fact for weeks until I did a bit of detective work of my own and "outted" him. He tried to avoid it at first, but then owned up to it.

Despite repeatedly stating he "supports" Amateur Radio, he's made numerous denigrating rants in "rec.radio.cb", and, to the best of my knowledge, has never even signed a post here with his callsign.

Also, he makes all these grandiose assertions about Amateur Radio (cult, etc), and how "anti-social" Amateur Radio supposedly is, yet he's never once "enlightened" us with his on-the-air activities.

>I guess the real issue is why bother with someone that
>ain't been there and done that.

He's at least been to a VE session, however I get the feeling that that was his LAST Amateur Radio related function he was really at. He makes some vague claims to participating in some "club meetings", but then also makes wierd assertions as to what allegedly ahppens at these meetings...Yet NO ONE has ANY idea as to what "clubs" they are supposed to be, because even people who live in his neighborhood don't know what the heck he's talking about.

>There minds are already made up. All they are doing is keeping the
>arguements going. Apparantly neither have a life.

Lennie is an argumentitive, socially diminutive putz. Vipul is too young and too inexperienced to know the difference.

73

Steve, K4YZ

519. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 18:17:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507141744.08218.00000770@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66669

>Subject: Re: N2EY Is Flying High!
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/6/2003 9:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hehle9c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>> There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama!
>
> It's not an FCC call sign - it's an FAA registration number.

I use the N-number on the radio. It doubles as a callsign.

>FCC Rules s. 87.107(a)(3) provides that the FAA registration number
> minus the "N" can be used when it follows the type of aircraft
> INSTEAD of an FCC-issued call sign, . The proper radio
> identification of the above aircraft would be "Beech 2 Echo
> Yankee"

As long as that operation occurs within airspace under the jurisdiction of
the United States government. Otherwise the entire CALLSIGN must be used
except where international agreements recognize an airline identifier and
flightnumber (ie: Speedbird 1369).

>I got this from the FCC Call Sign Desk in the 1980s when
> California DMV asked for an opinion as to whether an amateur
> call-sign-lookalike aircraft "tail number" was an FCC call sign
> or not. Apparently an aircraft owner wanted to use his 1x2
> N-number on a personalized license plate - under California
> vehicle law, if it looks like a ham call, it can only be issued
> as a ham plate and only if the license holder thereof is one of
> the registered owners of the vehicle.

Interesting story.

>>Maybe I can find it and get my picture taken next to it!
>>
>> Ya want one if I find it, Jim?
>
> Where would he park it?

Uhhhhh...an airport, Phil...????

Steve, K4YZ

520. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 18:25:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507142518.18827.00000614@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66670

In article <20030506171001.18767.00000408@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 06 May 2003 21:10:01 GMT
>
>In article <c2356669.0305060831.50ee62c8@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030503225903.18769.00000355@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20030503182717.18770.00000393@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >In article <FUTsa.3176$3f7.2497958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>> >Flint"
>>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>> >
>>> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> >>news:20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com...
>>> >>> In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>>> lenover21@aol.com
>>> >>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>> >>>
>>> >>> >In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
>>D.
>>> >>> >Flint"
>>> >>> ><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>> >>>
>>> >>> The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to
>>find
>>> >>> the recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they
>>required.
>>> >>>The required military skill level was far, far above the 5 wpm amateur
>>radio
>>> >>>code test.
>>> >>
>>> >>You have hit the nail on the head exactly. The military was looking for
>>> >>people who could copy random code groups at 20wpm or more not people who
>>> >>could copy plain text at a mere 5wpm.
>>> >
>>> >Goes way beyond even that, Dee. Some typical skills needed (and tested):

>>> >
>>> >- Ability to copy both plain language and code groups correctly at
>various
>>> >speeds with not more than a certain (very low) number of errors per hour.
>>>
>>> Please state the exact allowed "errors per hour"
>>
>>OK, Len, here goes. Just one example - there are others. btw, the
>>"Armed Forces of the United States" includes the Navy, Coast Guard,
>>Air Force and Marine Corps, not just the Army.
>>
>>Did you ever have a "Radioman" rating, Len?
>
> Jimmie, open your morse-besotted mind to some facts instead
> of wandering around like a spoiled child, waving your clenched
> fists in anger at not being respected in a world of adults.

I guess the answer to that question is "no".
>
> You've made so many errors, misdirections, accusations in
> this post that you MUST be corrected in public. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Where? All I did was ask a question.
>
> First of all the armed forces of the United States doesn't have
> "ratings." It has MILITARY OCCUPATION SPECIALTIES,
> commonly called "MOSs."
>
> The US Army never had any MOS of "radioman." That is a
> US Navy MOS nomenclature.

You're getting all worked up over some minor semantics. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> You've never been in any US military branch so you wouldn't
> know. You apparently never went to the US Army website I
> posted in this newsgroup TWICE to find out...or to try any
> link on that site to find out other US military branch MOSs
> and job descriptions.

Misdirection. Irrelevant.

You asked for information about error rates and I provided some, and a link to
the post. Now you're all upset about something.
>
> All you want to do is ARGUE.

I prefer the terms "debate" or "discuss".

The point I am making is very simple, but you keep avoiding it: The level of
Morse skill required for an amateur license is far, far, FAR below that
required of military radio operators. Which is why the military used aptitude
tests. One does not have to have served in the military to know the truth of

that statement.

You cannot refute it, so you attack the messenger - me.

> You are wasting everyone's time.

How? You don't have to read my posts. You don't have to respond, either. But you do, and your responses are lengthy and very hostile. For example, I don't make fun of your name - why do you make fun of mine? Why do you address me as "boy", even after it was pointed out to you that the term is a racial slur in some situations?

> You've already been told, given the resources, and
> still you want to argue, argue, argue for no other reason than
> to satisfy your childish tantrums.

What tantrums? I'm not the one calling people names because they disagree with me.
>
> Perhaps the closest Army MOS to a USN "Radioman" was
> Field Radio Operator and Maintainer of the 1950s. Those soldiers
> were required to graduate an Army morse code school and ALSO
> be able to carry/mount transportable radios, set them up (including
> antennas of many different sizes), take them down (for use else-
> where), and perform elementary troubleshooting and repair if such
> was required.

You just proved my point.
>
> USN "Radiomen" operated radios rather fixed in position aboard
> naval vessels or on shore stations, did not have to set them up
> or take them down for use elsewhere...the ship moved to new
> positions carrying both equipment and personnel together.

When were you in the Navy, Len?

> Can
> you grasp that concept? There are NO ships ON land. Trucks
> and other vehicles on land do the transport on land for heavy
> equipment while individual soldiers carried man-portable radios.
> Both today and a half century ago, the majority of all US Army
> radios are/were "manpack," meaning they were/are carried by
> individual soldiers on foot. Can you grasp THAT concept?

What's your point?
>
> Both today and a half century ago, US Army soldiers are LAND
> warfighters FIRST, the military occupation specialty being
> secondary to that primary task. All US Army soldiers receive
> basic infantryman training and continue to practice and updating
> infantryman skills throughout their career. One of the major
> differences between soldiers and sailors is that soldiers are in
> territory on land in very close proximity to an enemy relative to

> sailors on shipboard. [another concept which may not be
> grasped...Jimmie's problem since he never served in any
> branch of the US military]

Do you think that there are no other "Armed Services of the United States"
besides the Army?
>
>>The following is a direct quote from Curtis LaFon, N5HDQ. Mr. LaFon is
>>a retired US Navy Radioman. He posted it here back on January 9, 1998.
>
> Belay that, swabbie-wannabe.
>
> This is the year 2003. It is NOT five years and three months ago.

So what? You asked for the information, and I provided it.
>
> TRY, oh really TRY to stay current with the existing flow.
>
> You are totally wasting everyone's time quoting message
> exchanges from over 5 years ago.

How? You don't have to read my posts. You don't have to respond, either. But
you do, and your responses are lengthy and very hostile.

The posting I quoted gives the info you requested. From someone who was there,
met the qualifications, did the job. The fact that the posting is five years
old does not make it any less true.

> Those exchanges are OVER,
> done with, cannot be resurrected from the dead past in hopes
> that you will win some of those you lost.

I don't recall "losing" anything. The fact is that at least the Navy's code
skill requirements (back when the Navy actually used Morse code) were much
higher than any amateur radio test.
>
> The US Navy NO LONGER USES any on-off manual telegraphy
> for radio communications. It hasn't done so for many years.
>
> The US Army NO LONGER USES any on-off manual telegraphy
> for radio communications. It hasn't done so for many years.
>
> The US Air Force NO LONGER USES any on-off manual
> telegraphy for radio communications. It quit doing that ahead of
> all the other US military branches.

So? The discussion is about what the standards were when they did use it.
>
> The US Coast Guard MIGHT use some manual telegraphy on the
> great lakes. USCG QUIT monitoring the maritime international
> distress frequency of 500 KHz some years ago. USCG is the
> smallest branch of the military and isn't strictly military during

> periods of peacetime.
>
You don't seem to have much respect for the Coast Guard. I recall a posting of yours where you made fun of the accomplishments of a Coast Guard radio operator in Hawaii. Perhaps I will repost some of your choice words about his military service.

>>24 wpm of 5 letter code groups is 120 letters per minute. 7200 letters
>>per hour, with just 3 errors permitted. That's ONE error per 2400
>>letters - an error rate of .0417% - over a one-hour period.
>
> BFD. ANY error may be fatal in a five-letter-group encrypted
> message. I don't think you grasp that concept at all.

Sure I do.

Can you point to an incident where an error in a five-letter-group encrypted message was fatal?
>
> In amateur hobby/recreation communications one can handle
> errors and garble in cleartext quite easily. Such an error has
> no tactical or strategic importance compared to sensitive
> military communications.

The point is still the same: The level of Morse skill required for an amateur license is far, far, FAR below that required of military radio operators. Which is why the military used aptitude tests. One does not have to have served in the military to know the truth of that statement.
>
> One of the reasons the US Navy began using teleprinters for
> encrypted communications in 1939 was the ERROR rate in
> manual morse code telegraphy.

How do you know that?

K0HB, who was in the navy as a radioman, says the reason the Navy stopped using Morse on the radio was speed, not errors. I recall him saying that a modern war could not be fought effectively at 25 wpm. He was there, met the qualifications, did the job.

> Not only that, teleprinters
> could "stand watch" (a nautical term in the military) 24/7 on
> an important frequency. Teleprinters need only their paper
> rolls and tape replenished...they don't need sleep, food, or any
> necessary human being needs away from the comm gear.

Only on the receiving end.

So what's your point? That hams should use teleprinters?
>
> But...but...this message thread is all about the NOVICE CLASS
> amateur radio license, isn't it?

Nope.

> Amateur radio is NOT military or
> even close to military communications.

So why did you mention military aptitude tests for Morse skill in the first place?

> The Novice Class
> license is no longer being granted.

Incorrect. No new Novice licenses are being granted. Existing ones continue in effect.

> It will disappear when the
> last novice class renewal time is up.

WRONG.

Novice class licenses can be renewed. Only the Technician Plus license will disappear through renewals.

> Gone.
>
> So, why are you in such a big dither about MILITARY radio,
> Jimmie?

I'm not. Just pointing out some facts. Like the fact that the level of Morse skill required for an amateur license is far, far, FAR below that required of military radio operators. Which is why the military used aptitude tests. One does not have to have served in the military to know the truth of that statement.

> You've never served, haven't indicated you've ever seen
> any military radio communications in progress, don't seem to
> know squat about military comm.

Yet I do know some things about it.

Why are you in such a big dither about AMATEUR radio, Len? You've never had an amateur license, never even tried to get a license, never set up your own amateur station, and don't seem to know squat about the actual use of Morse code in amateur radio.
>
> You are in such a state of concern for only one reason: To try
> to "get back" at someone who has challenged your radio
> expertise in the past and continues to do so. You carry on in
> childish rants about "accuracy" when all you want to do is make
> message points and personal triumphs in the newsgroup.

That sounds like you, Len. Not me.
>
> You don't seem to care about the future, newcomers in ham
> radio not yet licensed, or anything but those who Believe as You
> do.

How do you figure that?

> You just can't shake that Belief in morse code as needed
> in amateur radio.

It's just an opinion. Why are you so upset about it? You can't seem to handle
strong opposition to your views.
>
>>No, correct. Morse skills alone would not get someone a Radioman
>>rating. Other knowledge and skills were needed.
>
> Yes, first one had to join the US Navy and go through Boot Camp.
>
> Beyond that what do YOU know?

Quite a bit, actually. Doesn't make me an expert.
>
> You don't know. You've never served in any US military branch,
> wartime or peacetime. You've never taken that Oath.

So? Does that make the facts I posted incorrect?

Does that mean Mr. LaFon was wrong?

Does my lack of military experience somehow prove that there should not be a
code test or a Novice class license?

>>The reason for military aptitude tests for code skill potential was
>>NOT because basic code skills are unusual. It was because their
>>requirements went far beyond basic code skills.
>
> Ah, yes, the authoritative voice of the military again...not just from
> someone who never served, but someone who never instituted
> any battery of military recruit aptitude skills, someone who never
> had to argue that for any military review board.

Did you ever institute a battery of military recruit aptitude skills, Len?

Did you ever argue them for a military review board?
>
> You've gotten terribly confused with what you are trying to argue.
>
> The message thread Subject header says "Novice Class license."
>
> "Novice class license" only exist in AMATEUR RADIO. Amateur
> radio is NOT military, never was.

Then why did you bring up the subject of military aptitude tests, Len?

This whole military rant of yours is something you started, not me.

> Amateur radio is a hobby, a
> recreational pursuit.
>
> You've lost everything on arguments either for or against saving

> any Novice Class license.

I haven't lost a thing, Len. You seem to lose your temper a lot, though.
>
> You are all hung up and petty about some military requirement
> of the past, desperately seeking to avenge some perceived past
> hurts from messaging of 5 years ago.
>
> You've lost it.
>
Not me.

> Quit wasting everyone's time with your petty desires.

Len, you post here more often and at greater length than anyone else. Sounds
like pot/kettle to me.
>
>

521. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 18:29:59 UTC
From: Spectrum <Rush@sisolixter.org>
Message-ID: <b9bjb9$4la$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66671

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.heisyxe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 7 May 2003 07:49:07 -0400, Spectrum wrote:
>
> >> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> >>
> >> Passed the 20 wpm test, gave "real"
> >> code tests for decades, and still
> >> feels that code testing for an amateur
> >> license is irrelevant.
> >>
> > Where did you earn your code degree?
> >
> > 73 de Rush
>
> H. Knox University. 40 Meters Division.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
Ok, that explains it then. You went to an
unaccredited school.

73 de Spectrum

522. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 18:41:45 UTC
From: Spectrum <Rush@sisolixter.org>
Message-ID: <b9bk1d$5tm$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66672

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.heisdkd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 7 May 2003 07:57:09 -0400, Spectrum wrote:
>
> >> "In the Beginning" CB calls were issued by the FCC District
> >> Office and were of the format nnWnnnn where the first "nn" was the
> >> FCC District number and the "nnnn" was a sequential number for
> >> each district.
> >>
> > > No, that is incorrect.
>
> Mister/Ms Spectrum, whomever you are, know before whom you stand...

Yes, smoke & mirrors. You tap dance & spin but never
answer the original question.

>
> But then again, you DO know who I am. Sorry, buddy, your are
> not succeeding in pulling my chain...but for the sake of those
> few here who would tend to give any credence to your misstatements,
> I will deal with them.

Ok, I'll bite. Who are you?

>
> >CB calls were issued by the
> >FCC Division office and were in format nWxnnnn where
> >the first "n" was the FCC division number and the "Wxnnnn"
> >was the spec op random number for each division.
>
> What "Division" office? What "spec op random number"?

The middle division office. But you already knew
that and are deliberately not commenting on the
"spec op random numbr."

>
> At the FCC, all "Divisions" were and still are the next
> organizational level below the Bureau at FCC HQ in Washington.
> The field offices across the country which dealt with the
> public were always called District offices, and reported to a
> HQ entity called the Field Offices Division, later called the
> Enforcement Division, and now report to a Regional Office. All
> these were under the Field Engineering and Monitoring Bureau,
> later called the Field Engineering Bureau, then the Field

> Operations Bureau, then the Compliance and Information Bureau,
> and now are part of the Enforcement Bureau structure. Look it
> up on the FCC web site.

That was prior to the chapter 15d reorganization. I thought
you claimed to know all about it, now you act like it is news
to you. As you say, go look it up on the FCC web site.

>
> And that's only the history going back to the early 1950s.
>
> A careful reading of my quoted posting will show the correct
> format for the field-issued licenses (1959-1963 IIRC). The
> "nnnn" numbers were NOT random - there was a ledger at each
> office in which they were recorded sequentially.

They were random intermittentlly for several years until my
good friend Hap Halifung came in and reorganized that
division. Come on, you know all this already! "nnnn" numbers
did not fite the 95.308c1e format.

>
> >> "Later On" when the Gettysburg License Center was opened, CB
> >> licenses were issued from there and call signs were 3+4 format
> >> such as KBA1234. KAA calls were reserved for GMRS. When they ran
> >> out of 3+4 calls, the 4+4 format came in. I don't even remember
> >> what my ex-wife's CB call was.....
> >
> >
> > BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
> >issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
> >signs per an agreement with the ITU.
>
> Your statement makes no sense. What "random intended call
> signs"? The CB call signs issued by Gettysburg in the 3x4 or
> 4x4 formats were always computer-issued sequentially, not random.

You are not making any sense!
>
> Get your act together before you speak or post further on this
> subject, my friend.
>

Oh Pulleeeeeeese! Oldest cop out on Usenet!

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> District Director (retired)
> FCC San Francisco District Office

Titles, offices, education, etc. So? Am I supposed to
be impressed? Is anyone impressed? I mean hell,
I earned my second Ph. D. in theoretical physics, but

why should I bother listing that here?

>
>
>
>

523. Spread Spectrum Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:01:23 UTC
From: Spectrum <Rush@sisolixter.org>
Message-ID: <b9bl65$83n$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66673

Does anybody know of any nets meeting on a
regular basis to discuss Spread Spectrum?

I'm completing a reaserch paper on Spread
Spectrum. Several of my students have been
bugging me to check into technical discussion
nets. Also nets that discuss quantum theory.

73 de Spectrum

524. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:03:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507150340.08218.00000773@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66674

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/6/2003 4:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030506171001.18767.00000408@mb-m15.aol.com>

>>Did you ever have a "Radioman" rating, Len?
>
> Jimmie, open your morse-besotted mind to some facts instead
> of wandering around like a spoiled child, waving your clenched
> fists in anger at not being respected in a world of adults.

Yet again...

Jim Miccolis addresses Lennie by his given name, and Lennie tries to dig
in with diminutives again.

Just one more example why N2EY gets more respect in any 10 seconds of his
life than Lennie ever hoped for in his 70+ years...

Maybe that's why Lennie has to lie and denigrate others so aggressively?
He's still angry that he's not looked up to so fondly?

>You've made so many errors, misdirections, accusations in
> this post that you MUST be corrected in public. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Jim's not had "...so many errors" in this forum, Your Putziness. Nor has
he been caught lying or misrepresenting himself in any way, shape or form.

YOU, on the otherhand...Well...follow along and see....

>First of all the armed forces of the United States doesn't have
> "ratings." It has MILITARY OCCUPATION SPECIALTIES,
> commonly called "MOSs.

Stupid. Really stupid.

The Army and the Marine Corps have MOS's. The Navy has NEC's (also
parroted by the USCG), and the Air Force acronym escapes me at the moment.

The Navy refers to it's enlisted specialties as "Ratings". This is public
knowledge and official USN policy.

>The US Army never had any MOS of "radioman." That is a
> US Navy MOS nomenclature.

The Navy does not have MOS's. And as of several years ago, it no longer
has the radioman rating, either.

>You've never been in any US military branch so you wouldn't
> know.

You allegedly WERE in teh Armed Forces at one time, and you are
demonstrating a significant degree of ignorance right now, Lennie. So what's
your point about his lack of military service?

>You apparently never went to the US Army website I
> posted in this newsgroup TWICE to find out...or to try any
> link on that site to find out other US military branch MOSs
> and job descriptions.

The only othr branch of service that refers to "job descriptions" as MOS's
is the United States Marine Corps.

> All you want to do is ARGUE.

In as much as he's presenting facts and you are not, I'd say you are the
one who's arguing. Foolishly at that.

>You are wasting everyone's time.

Hmmmmm.....YOU are making false assertions and relating non-factual
information...Who's wasting who's time, Lennie?

>You've already been told, given the resources, and
> still you want to argue, argue, argue for no other reason than
> to satisfy your childish tantrums.

Jim's not raised tantrum one. On the OTHERHAND we have you...

>USN "Radiomen" operated radios ...(SNIP)

What's the point?

>There are NO ships ON land...(SNIP)...Can you grasp THAT concept?

Why the tantrum, Lennie?

You STILL have not answered Jim's question.

>Both today and a half century ago, US Army soldiers are LAND
> warfighters FIRST, the military occupation specialty being
> secondary to that primary task.

You STILL have not answered Jim's question.

>All US Army soldiers receive basic infantryman training...(SNIP)

Not germane. You STILL ahev not answered Jim's question

>Jimmie's problem since he never served in any
> branch of the US military]

Nor has he ever been obligated to do so by law.

You STILL have not answered Jim's question.

None of these items were ever contested nor even broached. THIS was an attempt by you, Your Putziness, to avoid the question put to you.

Kinda like a tantrum...You're trying to distract mommy's attention from the fact taht you got caught with your hands in the cookie jar...

>>The following is a direct quote from Curtis LaFon, N5HDQ. Mr. LaFon is
>>a retired US Navy Radioman. He posted it here back on January 9, 1998.
>
> Belay that, swabbie-wannabe.

Hmmmm....Lennie trying to avoid facing the "Virtual Firing Squad" of facts vs his fiction.

>This is the year 2003. It is NOT five years and three months ago.

The we can rest assured that we've heard the last of your Army career and anything having to do with your alleged "professional" career since all of it predates the "five years and three months" threshold...?!?!

>TRY, oh really TRY to stay current with the existing flow.

Try yourself.

>You are totally wasting everyone's time quoting message
> exchanges from over 5 years ago. Those exchanges are OVER,
> done with, cannot be resurrected from the dead past in hopes
> that you will win some of those you lost.

The comments he cited were from a person with first-person knowledge of facts that contradcit your rants, Lennie. Sorry you got your nose rubbed in it..

>The US Navy NO LONGER USES any on-off manual telegraphy
> for radio communications. It hasn't done so for many years.

And you know this how?

>The US Army NO LONGER USES any on-off manual telegraphy
> for radio communications. It hasn't done so for many years.

And you know this how?

>The US Air Force NO LONGER USES any on-off manual
> telegraphy for radio communications. It quit doing that ahead of
> all the other US military branches.

And you know this how?

>>24 wpm of 5 letter code groups is 120 letters per minute. 7200 letters
>>per hour, with just 3 errors permitted. That's ONE error per 2400
>>letters - an error rate of .0417% - over a one-hour period.
>
> BFD. ANY error may be fatal in a five-letter-group encrypted
> message. I don't think you grasp that concept at all.

"BFD"...?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

Yes, there's a lack of concept grasping here, but the problem is NOT Jim Micollis' ! ! !

>One of the reasons the US Navy began using teleprinters for
> encrypted communications in 1939...(SNIP)

WHOA YOUR SCUMBAGGINESS ! ! !

1939 is waaaaaaaaay off your 5Y3M threshold!

>But...but...this message thread is all about the NOVICE CLASS
> amateur radio license, isn't it? Amateur radio is NOT military or
> even close to military communications. The Novice Class
> license is no longer being granted. It will disappear when the
> last novice class renewal time is up. Gone.

Assuming that the "last Novice" keeps renewing his/her ticket and is of relatively young years, that may be a very long time.

Certainly more time that YOU have, Lennie!

>So, why are you in such a big dither about MILITARY radio,
> Jimmie?

BBBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

I love it when His Scumminess goes into his Pot/Kettle/Black mode.

>You've never served, haven't indicated you've ever seen
> any military radio communications in progress, don't seem to
> know squat about military comm.

Coming from a punk who DID serve yet doesn't know the difference between the occupational rating systems of the branches of the Armed Forces he claims so much expertise in, I'd say that was pretty darned funny!

>You are in such a state of concern for only one reason: To try
> to "get back" at someone who has challenged your radio
> expertise in the past and continues to do so.

Who's challenging him?

YOU certainly haven't. There's nothing challenging about anything you've said here, Lennie, except to try and keep from laughing at your arrogance and your IGNORANCE!

>You carry on in
> childish rants about "accuracy" when all you want to do is make
> message points and personal triumphs in the newsgroup.

This post alone has shown that Jim is right. You cannot keep simple things right. Why should we expect ANYTHING you do to be correct?

>Yes, first one had to join the US Navy and go through Boot Camp.
>

> Beyond that what do YOU know?

So far, more than you, obviously.

>You don't know. You've never served in any US military branch,
> wartime or peacetime. You've never taken that Oath. You've
> never put your life on the line anytime, anywhere for your
> country.

You took the oath and put on the uniform, Lennie...but keeping from
stumbling into a ben-jo ditch while weaving a drunken path back to the barracks
in a rear area is NOT "putting your life on the line" for ANYthing, Lennie.

>Your only connection to military radio is OLD data, surplus radio
> equipment, electronics from the PAST.

Like ADA in 1953, Your Laziness?

>You've gotten terribly confused with what you are trying to argue.

Pot/kettle/black.

>"Novice class license" only exist in AMATEUR RADIO. Amateur
> radio is NOT military, never was. Amateur radio is a hobby, a
> recreational pursuit.

Amateur Radio MAY be a hobby...pursued for recreational purposes. It has
other applications.

>You've lost it.
>
> Quit wasting everyone's time with your petty desires.

As opposed to YOUR petty desires, Lennie?

Sheeeeeeesh. What an IDIOT!

Steve, K4YZ

525. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:07:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507150754.08145.00000913@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66675

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/7/2003 8:03 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Xns93745C1D13D36elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>> BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
>> issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
>> signs per an agreement with the ITU.
>>
>
>CB is not recognised by the ITU as a service

Sure it is, Alun. "Land Mobile". Regradless of what "service" name we
give it in the United States, that's the category it falls under.

73

Steve, K4YZ

526. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:45:30 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9374A04FB7068elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66676

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030507150754.08145.00000913@mb-m03.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/7/2003 8:03 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <Xns93745C1D13D36elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>>> BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
>>> issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
>>> signs per an agreement with the ITU.
>>>
>>
>>CB is not recognised by the ITU as a service
>
> Sure it is, Alun. "Land Mobile". Regradless of what "service"
> name we
> give it in the United States, that's the category it falls under.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>

True insofar as it goes, but I meant it's not recognised as a separate
service. Unlike, say ... amateur radio, for example.

527. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:58:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155854.18821.00000519@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66682

In article <20030507042527.18755.00000659@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030503173632.18769.00000420@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030503105308.18759.00000578@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>
>>>> You've just not had that much
>>>> experience anywhere with the newer networks, won't do the
>>>> math to do an honest comparison.
>>>
>>>How do you know? You claim an awful lot about my experience and knowledge.
>>
>> All us readers can see is that you are deliberately vague about
>> what you've done, where you've worked, or all the claimed
>> expirience. Very vague.
>
>Incorrect. All that YOU can see is what I've written here. Some other readers
>know a lot more about my work experience.

That's nice. No go off in PRIVATE e-correspondence and give each
other high-fives for keeping secrets and chuckling among yourselves.

>> I've told you as much as you've told everyone else about where
>> you work or your work experience. :-)
>
>Different subject. I posted my education - you won't post yours.

I did. In public.

Steamy Stalker bitched, moaned, cried about it for years in
here, wailing over and over about a "CV."

That's all in Google.

>>>>You haven't shown anything
>>>> of newer techniques, only new snow.
>>>
>>>You haven't shown anyhting other than references to the OLD work of others.
>>
>> Oh? The year 1998 is "old?" :-)
>
>1974 is OLD.

Yoshida's article in QEX wasn't 29 years ago.

The Dome two-phase network packaged and produced by B&W
is MUCH, MUCH OLDER. :-)

>> Poor baby. Doesn't know common American idioms. Tsk.
>
>I only know it from "Merchant of Venice". That's an old, old OLD play by one
>Bill Shakespeare.

Irrelevant. You just don't know common, everyday American
idioms. Not my fault. Get out more.

>Do you want me to stop posting? Do you think that you should have the right to
>post here, but that nobody should disagree with you or point out your
>mistakes?

Poor baby. Negative criticism offends you that much?

Are you "going to take the ball and go home" because something
about the game offends you?

You don't own the ball, Reverend Jimmie. [may not have a pair]

You have difficulty standing up to the heat in here. I'd suggest
"taking off"...going away to cooler climates where you can try to
snow others about everything.

At least get familiar with common idioms in American speech.

Do you live in little Davie's galaxy too?

528. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:58:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155856.18821.00000521@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66678

In article <3EB88B55.EE6777B0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>It certainly offers promises a way to deal with the kids running those
>four wheelers up and down my drive on the weekends. It sometimes sounds
>as if we're in the grandstands for chain saw racing.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Little Davie is NOW all in a dither over the AGE
of those engaged in a recreational pursuit. :-)

Remember, there are "thousands engaged" in such activity
"every day" all across the USA.

Why do you want to prohibit "kids" from enjoying a hobby, sport,
or recreational activity?

529. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:58:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155856.18821.00000520@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66683

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hehle9c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>> Fooling around with FAA database, found the following:
>>
>> N2EY 1967 BEECH V35, GIORDANO GARY M, VALLEY AL
>>
>> There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama!
>
> It's not an FCC call sign - it's an FAA registration number.
>
> FCC Rules s. 87.107(a)(3) provides that the FAA registration number
> minus the "N" can be used when it follows the type of aircraft
> INSTEAD of an FCC-issued call sign, . The proper radio
> identification of the above aircraft would be "Beech 2 Echo
> Yankee".

That's not how the FAA does it in air traffic control, Phil.

For over 30 years the FAA ATC folks have used the FAA "tail
number" (FAA registry) on the radio. Their "proper radio ID" in
this case would be November Two Echo Yankee. They may
or may not preface that ID with the aircraft type.

In repeated back-and-forth on the radio the FAA ATC may use
only the latter part of the FAA registry, the numbers and any
suffix to that tail number. In that example it would be just
Echo Yankee or Two Echo Yankee.

Any scanner user can vouch for that. No pilot's license required
to "know it." Radios tuned to BUR and VNY in this neck of the
woods can confirm it any day of the week. Listening to LAX,
especially approach and departure control frequencies, reveals
that commercial air carriers don't even use the tail numbers in
radio ID, just their corporate identification and flight number.

Military aircraft flying civil airways under FAA air traffic control
will use their military flight designations, not the military aircraft's
tail number.

A visit to any TRACON will confirm all of that if no scanner handy.

>>Maybe I can find it and get my picture taken next to it!
>>
>> Ya want one if I find it, Jim?
>
> Where would he park it?

In this newsgroup and Google, his second home.

530. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:58:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155857.18821.00000522@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66685

In article <3EB8954A.92335192@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.
>
>They probably weren't aware that they should consult with you.

They are very much aware, little Davie. It is required by LAW.
The FCC listens to ALL United States citizens.

They aren't required to listen to extraterrestrials living in another
galaxy.

>> FCC doesn't require any commissioner or staff to have
>> amateur licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio. :-)
>
>That's right. They're paid to regulate. It is part of the job.

REQUIRED BY LAW...but law does not yet require "gladness."

ONLY for US civil radio.

>If you can have a nice life in your mind, we can have nice lives in our
>minds.

My wife and I have very nice lives. My only problem seems to be
the stubborn, vain, self-righteous, self-appointed-code-police who
demand that all in a hobby/recreational radio activity test for
morse code. Those "SVSS" types insist that all amateurs must
do as they did long ago.

>> I wish you all well.
>
>You don't sound very sincere.

I am far more sincere in that than little Davie.

>Why in the world do you think you can force anyone to share your beliefs
>about morse testing or a minimum age for participation in amateur radio?

I don't expect to change the opinions of das Oberst (little Davie),
Reverend Jimmie, Steamy Stalker, the bear-hunting Katapult
King Kellie, big DICK, or the lost bus driver. They consider
themselves arrogant and smug in their stubborn, vain, self-righteous,
self-appointed-code-police ("SVSS") attitudes. They demand all
others do as they did long ago.

OTHER readers are considered optimistically to be capable of
rational thought and actually capable of deciding for themselves
on the proper course of action in changing laws. Perhaps that is
TOO optimistic considering that the opposition has been spoon-
fed the Proper Way to Think from the Church of St. Hiram in
Newington.

>> What's wrong with "live and let live?"
>
>Go live.

I do. Why don't you?

>Amateur radio has changed quite a bit since I first became a ham forty
>years back.

Oh, my, another "CV!"

I've been a professional in radio since FIFTY years ago.

Never had to use morse code in all those FIFTY years. No need.

>The singular skill to which you refer is used daily by
>thousands on the amateur bands.

Whoopie. Many more thousands ride horses just in Los Angeles
County every day...not for transportation, but for pleasure.

The state of California does NOT require horsemanship skills to
operate any motor vehicle. There are about 35.6 million residents
in the state of California and Californians have the most vehicles
in any state of the union.

There is NO need to test for morsemanship for an amateur radio
license just to satisfy the selfish desires of ALREADY licensed
amateurs.

US radio amateurs have no law enforcement powers from their
amateur radio license grants, yet they demand CONTROL over
who shall get into amateur radio and HOW they do so. That's
a perverse "control-freak" condition.

>I don't live in a fantasy land and I understand progress.

Little Davie lives in another galaxy according to another post in a
different thread.

>How's your progess on getting up to five wpm?

Zero. Passing some irrelevant test is not necessary to discuss
the need to maintain that irrelevant test in law.

The specious control-freak's idea that one must "pass a test first
in order to talk about it" is like requiring all to commit a felony
crime in order to talk about laws for same.

>You mean there are those here who disagree with you and that honks you
>off.

The "SVSS" honk me off. They are control-freaks. They are
perverse in thinking.

They have NO authority yet they assume such.

The "SVSS" are the Saddam Husseins and Osama bil Ladens of
a hobby, a recreational pursuit...demanding to control and judge
a non-professional activity.

>> But some of us are optimistically trying to free mighty morse-
>> men from their own morse-besotted Beliefs. Maybe it is too
>> ideal an optimism. We keep on trying while the mighty morse-
>> men are just trying everyone else's patience. :-)
>
>Izzat in your role as self-appointed "advocate" for something or other?

That's in all rational, thinking observers' perception more or less.

If that upsets you, go honk your own horn. You certainly do that
often enough in here.

531. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:58:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155858.18821.00000523@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66677

In article <3EB89218.3454D84A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>This guy gets my vote for troll of the year.

Jealous? Little Davie has had that title for at least four past years.

Back under your bridge, little Davie.

532. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:58:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155859.18821.00000525@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66679

In article <3EB88A49.7BE37B48@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>My own heartfelt opinion after reading your latest offering, Vipul, is
>that you are not from this galaxy.

Where is your galaxy, colonel?

You should join the rest of us in ours and on our planet Earth.
It may be out on a spiral arm of our galaxy, but that makes it
kind of nice in our galactic suburbs.

533. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:58:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155859.18821.00000524@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66684

In article <3EB88FCE.46FAF8BA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I'm almost certain that you are incorrect on this one, Leonard. The
>Navy uses "ratings". The Air Force used the term "AFSC". The term
>"MILITARY OCCUPATION SPECIALTIES" was not used in the Air Force.

Okay, we've established that little Davie didn't have an MOS
while in Vietnam bravely serving his country.

Box moving doesn't require going through military schools.

>Uh, isn't that what you're all about?

No. I'm trying to stay focussed on this thread's Subject, not
the brave, valorous military service life of little Davie Heil.

The Subject line title is "Re: The need to save the Novice
Class license." It's right up there on the message header.

>> You don't seem to care about the future, newcomers in ham
>> radio not yet licensed, or anything but those who Believe as You
>> do. You just can't shake that Belief in morse code as needed
>> in amateur radio.
>
>Where has that been indicated in this post or any other by Jim?

Only in about five-plus years of posting by the mighty morsemen.

It's all in Google. If you need a refresher, go there and look for
a month or so.

>Ever hear of the Navy "A" and "B" schools?

No. I served 8 years in the United States ARMY.

Do Navy "A" and "B" schools teach anything about amateur
Novice Class licenses?

>You look just like George Patton up on that soapbox, all wrapped in
>patriotic bunting, "Lennie".

Was George a Novice Class radio amateur?

Did he ever join ARRL?

Could he do morse code?

Tell us about your Novice Class amateur radio experiences in
Vietnam, mighty morse warrior. Did you "hone your skills" there?

534. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:59:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155900.18821.00000527@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66680

In article <3EB8684F.1060805@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> Not at all. It is a book written by Robert Putnam, based on how
>Americans are becoming less and less socially connected with each other.
>It is based on many interviews. The title comes from the author noting
>that while more people bowl than ever before, most do it by themselves
>and not in leagues. We're becoming insular.

Insular...is that made from "dielectric materialism?" :-)

535. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 19:59:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507155900.18821.00000526@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66681

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hehilxb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 06 May 2003 04:20:19 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the
>>general population.
>
> Where did you get your public health degree from?

Gosh, Phil, you one of those Medical Doctors TOO?

Last public health expo I was at, I got 98.2 degrees. :-)

A few thousand TV and radio news broadcasts plus as many
newspapers and newsstand periodicals have all talked about
the obesity problem in the USA lately. None of us need any
"degrees" in listening/viewing news, do we?

>>I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations.
>>I understand the cult like nature (in a good way) that Ham radio
>>often is.
>
> Where did you get your psychology degree from?

Probably the same place you got yours, Phil. :-)

536. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 20:12:42 UTC
From: W471ZE <W47@dkstheyre.org>
Message-ID: <b9bpbtfpk0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66686

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9374A04FB7068elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
> news:20030507150754.08145.00000913@mb-m03.aol.com:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
> >>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
> >>Date: 5/7/2003 8:03 AM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <Xns93745C1D13D36elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
> >
> >>> BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
> >>> issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
> >>> signs per an agreement with the ITU.
> >>>
> >>
> >>CB is not recognised by the ITU as a service
> >
> > Sure it is, Alun. "Land Mobile". Regradless of what "service"
> > name we
> > give it in the United States, that's the category it falls under.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >
>
> True insofar as it goes, but I meant it's not recognised as a separate
> service. Unlike, say ... amateur radio, for example.

So who cares?

Charlie, 3881 net group nightly

537. Re: Spread Spectrum Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 20:38:16 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Y8eua.5350$XE1.4152@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66687

Rec.radio.amateur.policy? Oh ... I don't know of any such nets; one would suspect that your needs would be better met with groups on the internet. There are a number of Yahoo groups discussing quantum theory; Yahoo seems real spotty on spread spectrum, although there are a couple of groups. I'm sure there are newsgroups and/or other internet groups. About the closest I've come with amateur radio was running across a University of Rochester professor on 440 FM at 3:00 AM last summer. He teaches theoretical physics. That was, of course, one on one. Mostly idle chit chat. Perhaps others have a better answer to your query; I suspect, however, that the internet is the way to go.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

538. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 20:41:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507164106.13239.00000667@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66688

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/7/2003 2:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Xns9374A04FB7068elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>True insofar as it goes, but I meant it's not recognised as a separate
>service. Unlike, say ... amateur radio, for example

Ahhhhhh...I see...yes, you are quite correct.

73

Steve, K4YZ

539. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-07-07 20:43:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305071243.375693ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66689

For a look at the British version of the "Novice", see:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/07/3/?nc=1

for a story of the first ~16 months of the "Foundation" licence.

Interesting points:

- UK has 50,000 hams and 650 amateur radio clubs

- Foundation licence has produced about 4000 new amateurs since its inception on Jan 1, 2002

- 25% of the newcomers are under 21 years of age

- Foundation licence gives limited privileges on every UK amateur band from 136 kHz to 440 MHz EXCEPT 10 meters (!)

- Foundation power limit is 10 watts

- Foundation hams CANNOT homebrew. Only approved manufactured gear and approved kits may be used. Some of the approved kits are quite complex.

- Foundation tests are a 20 (soon to be 25) question written and a Morse code "assessment" test. The Morse test requires both sending and receiving but allows all sorts of adaptations such as speeds below 5 wpm and Morse-translation charts (write down dits and dahs, then look 'em up on the chart).

- RSGB supports total elimination of code testing as soon as the treaty (ITU-R S25.5) allows. The "assessment" test was designed to push the envelope of the treaty interpretation.

- UK envisions transition three levels of licence. Instead of "incentive" licensing", they use the term "Progressive".

Does the USA need something like the Foundation licence?

73 de Jim, N2EY

540. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 20:51:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305071251.e6a609f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66690

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hehle9c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 05 May 2003 16:23:21 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> > Fooling around with FAA database, found the following:
> >
> > N2EY 1967 BEECH V35, GIORDANO GARY M, VALLEY AL

I got my first ham license in 1967. Got the present call in 1977.
> >
> > There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama!
>
> It's not an FCC call sign - it's an FAA registration number.

Whew! I thought for a second I might someday hear another N2EY on the air!
>
> FCC Rules s. 87.107(a)(3) provides that the FAA registration number
> minus the "N" can be used when it follows the type of aircraft
> INSTEAD of an FCC-issued call sign, . The proper radio
> identification of the above aircraft would be "Beech 2 Echo
> Yankee".

I always use "November 2 Echo Yankee" on voice.
>
> I got this from the FCC Call Sign Desk in the 1980s when
> California DMV asked for an opinion as to whether an amateur
> call-sign-lookalike aircraft "tail number" was an FCC call sign
> or not. Apparently an aircraft owner wanted to use his 1x2
> N-number on a personalized license plate - under California
> vehicle law, if it looks like a ham call, it can only be issued
> as a ham plate and only if the license holder thereof is one of
> the registered owners of the vehicle.

I wonder if other states have similar rules? I better check PA.
>
> >Maybe I can find it and get my picture taken next to it!
> >
> > Ya want one if I find it, Jim?
>
> Where would he park it?

You have seen my QTH, then, Phil! (I doubt a Bonanza would fit up the driveway!)

But a picture would be really cool, tho.

Tnx for the info.

73 de Jim, N2EY

541. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 20:55:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507165510.13239.00000679@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66691

>Subject: Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/7/2003 2:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507155854.18821.00000519@mb-m10.aol.com>

>That's nice. No go off in PRIVATE e-correspondence and give each
> other high-fives for keeping secrets and chuckling among yourselves.

That's right, Lennie...We're laughing AT you, not WITH you.

>>Different subject. I posted my education - you won't post yours.
>
> I did. In public.
>
> Steamy Stalker bitched, moaned, cried about it for years in
> here, wailing over and over about a "CV."
>
> That's all in Google.

No...I complain about you posting it "over and over"...Not that you did it
any one time. Every chance you get.

>>Do you want me to stop posting? Do you think that you should have the right
>to
>>post here, but that nobody should disagree with you or point out your
>>mistakes?
>
> Poor baby. Negative criticism offends you that much?

It's not "negative criticism". It's an ugly attempt to denigrate and
demean another person in order to plae yourself on that pedastal.

>Are you "going to take the ball and go home" because something
> about the game offends you?

No...we are offering to show YOU the door.

>You have difficulty standing up to the heat in here.

What "heat"...? Your pathological lying and misinformation?

BWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

>Do you live in little Davie's galaxy too?

From what galaxy did YOU arrive?

Steve, K4YZ

542. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 20:59:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507165902.13239.00000682@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66692

>Subject: Re: N2EY Is Flying High!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/7/2003 2:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507155856.18821.00000520@mb-m10.aol.com>

>>The proper radio
>> identification of the above aircraft would be "Beech 2 Echo
>> Yankee".
>
> That's not how the FAA does it in air traffic control, Phil.

On initial contact, the entire callsign is rendered. Then "abbreviated"
after that.

>Any scanner user can vouch for that. No pilot's license required
> to "know it."

Yet another arm chair hero brags aloud.

Steve, K4YZ

543. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 22:43:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507184314.18755.00000571@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66693

In article <20030506233854.19604.00000600@mb-m20.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: N2EY
>
I did not write the following, Vipul. You did:

>>> A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general
>>> population.
>>

I wrote this:

>>How do you know?
>
>It stood out when I was attending Hamfests.

Which simply means that the hams who attended the same hamfests you did had a higher-than-average obesity rate.

A lot of hams don't attend hamfests. I haven't been to one in almost 5 years because my Sundays are otherwise occupied. I'm 6' 3" and tip the scales at around 220. Do you consider that "fat"?

>By the way, the Hams I saw on ATV
>that day often (but not always) were overweight also.

Again, not a random sample.

>And, Hams are often antisocial (but in a good way, I guess).

The term you are looking for is "introverted".
>
>>> I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations.
>>
>>How many? How many of the 686,000+ US hams have you actually observed
>>for fatness?
>
>You can apply this argument to anything. By this logic, nothing is known.

Not at all.

Didn't they teach you about the scientific method and random sampling in EE school?
>
>>> I recently attended an event with a random group of Hams.
>>
>>How do you know it was a random group?

>
>I did not know any of these Hams before. There were no photos of the people
>in the ad. No indication of their weight was given by the text.

Doesn't mean it was a random sample at all.
>
>Also, I know it was random because they invited Hams to attend. I happened to
>be on the mailing list. It is random from my perspective who actually
>attended this event. There were a few new people, like me, that did not attend
before.
>
Apparently you do not know the meaning of the term "random sample".
>
>It was a general activity Ham gathering. (I did PSK31, SSB, ATV, some
>satellite, some HF phone).

So it was not ovberly devoted to Morse code, huh?
>
>>To get a random sample of hams, the selection process must
>>be truly random.
>
>The selection process was completely random here. I chose to attend because
>they had many radio modes I could operate.

Not a random sample at all. You chose for a reason. So did all the others who
attended. Therefore, it was not a random sample.
>
>>Looking at who shows up at club meetings or hamfests
>>is not a random selection process.
>
>Almost any Ham would attend a Hamfest. I don't know of any reason why more
>overweight people would chose to attend Hamfests.

I do. Here are some reasons:

- the food
- they are not out exercising or working
- they don't have to take care of children.
- they decided not to go to church that day
- it doesn't take much effort
>
>>> So, to find typical Hams, one can find a small group of Hams.
>>
>>Just the opposite. You need a large group.
>
>Hamfests are a large group. Also, surveys have been done.

What surveys?

>Its also common sense observation.
>
>>You can

>>> be sure that I ate a normal quantity of food throughout the whole event.
>>> However, I cannot say the same for any of the other adults.
>>
>>Did you actually weigh anyone or compute anyone's BMI?
>
>I did not have to weigh anyone. The 12 that I counted were so overweight,
>there was no doubt that they were overweight. They did eat a large quantity of
><high fat> food, including French toast, bacon, sausage, hamburger, fatty cold
>cuts, and cheese.

Well, there you have it.
>
>>This was all consumed in one day.
>>By whom?
>
>It was not hard to miss that EACH one of them ate a huge quantity of high fat
>foods. In fact, they ate more than I saw them eat. I know they ate the shrimp
>when I was out on my trip.
>
>>20 people can eat a lot of food over the course of a day.
>
>This proves it.
>
>>I gotta get me some of that.
>
>There was plenty of food left over. Some beer were shared with others that
>joined the event for a few minutes. Yes, the free food is one good part of
>some
>Ham events. I try to make use of events that have food served. You can do the
>same - its fun!

FREE food??!!!

Right there you have a BIG selection process that destroys the randomness of
the sample. Folks who eat moderately and eat the right things aren't going to
be very attracted to an all-you-can-eat gathering that serves lots of high-fat,
high-sugar foods. On the other hands, folks who like to chow down on that sort
of stuff will be drawn to it.
>
>It was a fun experience at a very low cost. I got to operate many modes,
>enjoyed touring the town, and had good food and good company. Will I attend
>next year? Sure! I plan on it, if I am not busy.

That's good!
>
>>> Contests require less physical activity, and this could be a reason for
>>>the
>>> weight gain.
>>
>>Nope.
>

>I noticed that there were 30+ cyclists near the event. None of them were fat.
>The events one participate in do seem to affect people's weight.
>
>Contesting requires you to sit in one place for a period of time.

So does using a computer....

>The lack of
>activity does not help one's weight.
>
>If more people participated in radio direction finding, less would be
>overweight. Radio direction finding requires one to move around to find a
>signal. Also, its a more fun activity <to me> than contesting.

There are groups who do that. It's called "radio orienteering". Like many
sports, it is more popular outside the USA.

Be warned: The usual form of radio orienteering requires each contestant to
find his/her way to several hidden transmitters. (A staggered start is used.)
The various transmitters identify themselves using - Morse code!
>
>>It's not a radio problem, it's a problem of American culture.
>
>True, any event, like this, seems to bring such foods. For example, certain
>people that get together for sporting events often have these types of foods
>there.

The spectators, not the contestants.

And you just proved my point. It's not amateur radio, it's American culture.
>
>They just went unbelievably overboard.
>
Some folks think that anything worth doing is worth overdoing.

544. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 22:49:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9c2hd$hb6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66694

Seems to be in a rut don't he?

I don't give a flying PHUCK how many licenses you do or have held. THIS IS
A AMATEUR RADIO GROUP.

Must I continue TURNIP?

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030506202942.18759.00000679@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <b99ertutd1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan Turnip"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Hey Dee.....you can't argue with a turnip.
>
> I know we can't, Dan...we've tried to argue with you for years...:-)
>
> >Neither 'Vshah101', or 'Len over 21' are licensed.
>
> Sorry, Mr. Turnip, I'm licensed and been licensed longer than you
> have. One of those licenses isn't in AMATEUR radio. :-)
>
> >I guess the real issue is why bother with someone that
> >ain't been there and done that.
>
> Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.
>
> FCC doesn't require any commissioner or staff to have
> amateur licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio. :-)
>
> >There minds are already made up.
>
> Translation: We won't switch to your fantasy island thinking.
>
> >All they are doing is keeping the arguements going.
>
> "Arguements?" :-)
>
> So...you feel that everyone MUST think as you do?
>
> Why is that? Are you the supreme judge of something?
>
> >Apparantly neither have a life.
>

> I don't know about Vipul Shah, but I not only have a nice life but
> have made a whole career as a professional in electronics and
> radio. I'm married to a wonderful woman who was my high
> school sweetheart. We own two houses, debt free, in Washington
> and California. Both my wife and I have comfortable incomes even
> though we are both retired.
>
> >You obviously do, and so do the rest of us.
>
> All morsemen have wonderful lives in their own minds, bound
> and determined to keep up a living museum of the air on
> archaic radiotelegraphy.
>
> I wish you all well.
>
> Now, why in the world do you and other morsemen need laws to
> cram morse code ability down all amateur radio newcomers'
> throats?
>
> What's wrong with "live and let live?"
>
> >If it don't meet their approval....so what?
>
> Good question. Apparently morsemen are so narrowly tunnel-vision
> focussed on morse code ability...or so enchanted with themselves
> and their mighty accomplishments in archaic radio...that they
> cannot see their self-righteous eliteism through keeping outdated
> law will only hurt them in the long run.
>
> Mighty morsemen are not only maintaining this Archaic Radio-
> telegraphy Society but are also living in a Fantasyland, one
> where everything stopped advancing when they were first
> licensed. They cannot understand progress, only their own
> stunted abilities bound up in a unique, singular skill that is no
> longer needed in the rest of the radio world or all society.
>
> There is NO arguing with mighty morsemen of the Archaic
> Radiotelegraphy Society. They are locked in, captives of the
> Belief System of the Church of St. Hiram.
>
> But some of us are optimistically trying to free mighty morse-
> men from their own morse-besotted Beliefs. Maybe it is too
> ideal an optimism. We keep on trying while the mighty morse-
> men are just trying everyone else's patience. :-)

545. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 22:51:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507185146.02720.00000790@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66695

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/7/2003 2:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507155857.18821.00000522@mb-m10.aol.com>

>>> Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.
>>
>>They probably weren't aware that they should consult with you.
>
> They are very much aware, little Davie. It is required by LAW.
> The FCC listens to ALL United States citizens

Sorry, Lennie, there are events wherein the FCC doesn't even have to do
that. ESPECAILLY you.

>>If you can have a nice life in your mind, we can have nice lives in our
>>minds.
>
> My wife and I have very nice lives.

Oh? Must be seperate bedrooms.

>My only problem seems to be
> the stubborn, vain, self-righteous, self-appointed-code-police who
> demand that all in a hobby/recreational radio activity test for
> morse code

Then it's your problem and your problem only, Lennie. You make it a habit
of hanging out in a newsgroup for a radio service that you are not a licensee
in and have expressed extreme hatred for.

>Those "SVSS" types insist that all amateurs must
> do as they did long ago.

Who? Who has "insisted" that you take the 1972 Novice Tst? (the one I
took)...I think Jim, N2EY said he was licensed in 68...I don't remember his
suggesting you find a copy of that test either. No Larry, nor anyone else.

Just takes TODAY'S test TODAY. Just like everyone else does.

>>>I wish you all well.
>>
>>You don't sound very sincere.
>
>I am far more sincere in that than little Davie.

Liar.

>I don't expect to change the opinions of das Oberst (little Davie),
> Reverend Jimmie, Steamy Stalker, the bear-hunting Katapult
> King Kellie, big DICK, or the lost bus driver.

You really like making up demeaning adjectives, don't ya, Lennie?

>They consider
> themselves arrogant and smug in their stubborn, vain, self-righteous,
> self-appointed-code-police ("SVSS") attitudes. They demand all
> others do as they did long ago.

Leonard H. Anderson once again utters yet another blatant non-truth.

>I've been a professional in radio since FIFTY years ago.

Uh-uh uhhhhhhhh! LENNIE!

YOUR RULES! We cannot discuss anything that occurred more than five years
and three months ago!

>Never had to use morse code in all those FIFTY years. No need.

No need...no skill...no ability...

>There is NO need to test for morsemanship for an amateur radio
> license just to satisfy the selfish desires of ALREADY licensed
> amateurs.

"Selfish desires"...?!?!

Here I thought it was because the FCC required Morse Code testing in order
for licensure with HF privileges.

The FCC has already stated (and Lennie himself has parroted...) that Morse
Code skill in not necessary, and that when international commitments that bind
it's hands have been ammended, they intend to do away with it.

Of course Lennie ignores this. It takes away from his mission to
denigrate, demean, lie about and otherwise make derrogatory comments about
Amateur Radio in general and some Amateurs in particular.

>US radio amateurs have no law enforcement powers from their
> amateur radio license grants, yet they demand CONTROL over
> who shall get into amateur radio and HOW they do so. That's
> a perverse "control-freak" condition.

This "control", other than the democratic process embodied in the FCC's
NPRM process, does not exist.

Leonard H. Anderson is again lying.

>>How's your progess on getting up to five wpm?
>
> Zero.

Well, that pretty well sums up just about ALL your Amateur Radio
experience, doesn't it, Lennie...?!?!

>>You mean there are those here who disagree with you and that honks you
>>off.
>
> The "SVSS" honk me off. They are control-freaks. They are
> perverse in thinking.

The only thing you are "honked off" about is that you've been unsucessful
in bullying anyonen into your way of thinking. It won't work hee, and it
certainly wouldn't ahve ever worked in person.

>>Izzat in your role as self-appointed "advocate" for something or other?
>
> That's in all rational, thinking observers' perception more or less.
>
> If that upsets you, go honk your own horn. You certainly do that
> often enough in here.

In other words, yes, Lennie's "honked off" about not getting his way.
He's a loser...a brat...a...a...a...

...PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

546. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 23:16:49 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Btgua.804346$S_4.820819@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 66696

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:kRYta.59223$4P1.5439301@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> On Tue, 06 May 2003 22:33:51 GMT, "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote:
>
> >God Bless and I hope you can find more positive things to do with you
time
> >on earth than troll on old worn out arguments.
>
> Yes, using 100+ year old technology and forcing people to pass a test on
it
> so they can press a microphone to talk below 30 MHz

Well Keith you can use your cell phone for that or get on some chat room on the net ...why would you want to spend a lot of bucks on equipment and incur the ire of your neighbors with the antennas? Sort of a no brainer for me as there are a lot of buttons to push to talk in life outside of ham radio. Maybe the freebands .... nah ....guess not.

ertainly absurd and
> stupid. This stupid thinking by hams and the US government has hurt them
> over the years and the stance has alienated millions of potential
operators

Millions OH BOY millions have been alienated ......c'mon get realistic. Stupid thinking ..... well perhaps but if you look at it from the standpoint of knowing a elegant system of communication ....it isn't so stupid. Maybe the better question to ask is what does CW mean to me. I am NOT going to go into the usual pro CW crap I read. I can say that the mode is a stress relief from using voice all day ...perhaps more than I should.
> from Amateur radio that had no desire to use morse code.
> Hopefully next year tens of thousands of US citizens will be able to take
a

Ya know what Keith ..I hope you are right ...I have no interest in keeping the ham radio light under the bushel basket. But I am going to venture a guess that we will not see this huge influx of people into our service because of the necessity to study and spend time to pass a test. You will see this when Uncle Sam gives away the ticket to any comers without the written

written exam and talk anywhere on the ham bands and if they want to use
> morse code they can, just like they can use packet without knowing how to
> decode packet by ear.
Non-sequitor ....apples and grapefruit comparison which has been beaten to death in the same light as "CW always gets through"
>

> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
> Death to 19th century horse and buggy technology in ham radio tests!
>
Eliminate the Morse Code test in 2004!

Keith ..... CW will be used long after our deaths will occur due to the
simplistic-elegant nature of the mode.
It is sort of a sorrow in my mind that people don't even give CW a chance
....at 5 WPM. I could buy the argument at 13 or 20 WPM.

God Bless Tom KI3R Port Vue PA nr Pittsburgh

547. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 23:22:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB99557.3030901@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66697

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <3EB8684F.1060805@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>> Not at all. It is a book written by Robert Putnam, based on how
>>Americans are becoming less and less socially connected with each other.
>>It is based on many interviews. The title comes from the author noting
>>that while more people bowl than ever before, most do it by themselves
>>and not in leagues. We're becoming insular.
>
>
> Insular...is that made from "dielectric materialism?" :-)

HA! good one!

- Mike KB3EIA -

548. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 23:25:13 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <tBgua.247575$Si4.196455@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 66698

Hello Vito .....

Shelfish ...well some people are allergic to that stuff just like they are
not motivated to even try at 5 WPM a mode which offers a simple elegant
means of communication.
If someone tries it and finds that it is stupid, archaic i.e. buggy whip
like then go to phone. BTW this buggy whip - standard shift comparison
belongs in the crapper with the "CW always gets through" mindset.

Take care Vito ..

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R Port Vue Pa.

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EB9320B.2426285D@crosslink.net...
> Keith wrote:
> >
> > Yes, using 100+ year old technology and forcing people to pass a test
on it
> > so they can press a microphone to talk below 30 MHz is certainly absurd
and
> > stupid. ...
>
> It is neither absurd no stupid - it is selfish. Forcing people to pass
> such a test makes perfect sense if your goal is to keep others from
> sharing what is, after all, public property.
>
> 73, K3DWW

549. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-07 23:32:19 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9374C6C2D5337elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66699

"W471ZE" <W47@dkstheyre.org> wrote in news:b9bpbtfpk0@pita.alt.net:

>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9374A04FB7068elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
>> news:20030507150754.08145.00000913@mb-m03.aol.com:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>> >>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>> >>Date: 5/7/2003 8:03 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >>Message-id: <Xns93745C1D13D36elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>> >
>> >>> BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
>> >>> issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
>> >>> signs per an agreement with the ITU.
>> >>>
>> >>
>> >>CB is not recognised by the ITU as a service
>> >
>> > Sure it is, Alun. "Land Mobile". Regradless of what "service"
>> > name we
>> > give it in the United States, that's the category it falls under.
>> >
>> > 73
>> >
>> > Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> True insofar as it goes, but I meant it's not recognised as a separate
>> service. Unlike, say ... amateur radio, for example.
>
> So who cares?
>
> Charlie, 3881 net group nightly
>
>
>
>
>

Well, if CB were recognised as a separate service there might be a little
more harmonisation between countries. Like for example, UHF CB wouldn't be

on 462 MHz in one country and 905 MHz instead in another. It might actually be useful but I don't actually use CB, so it's hard to get worked up about it.

550. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 00:25:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507202522.08129.00000573@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 66700

In article <b9aohh$h4an8$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

> Bingo Jim,

Tnx, Ryan
>
>This was a strong topic of discussion recently at a local continuing
>education credits session I went to as a requirement of my medical
>licensure. The typical lifestyle 50-75 years ago involved a hell of alot
>more work on a day-to-day basis, be it doing chores or having to work
>multiple jobs and that is not the same now.

Doing chores, manual labor, walking at least part of the way rather than
driving, etc. Also, there was a lot less processed food around.

Today we are surrounded by easy, inexpensive food that is bad for us. Check out
how much sodium, sugar, and bad fat is in most processed food. It's enough to
make carbohydrate addicts out of most of us!

Most of all, getting fat was an expensive proposition back then!

>Technology is partially to blame.....

Exactly. It has made a sedentary lifestyle possible for millions of Americans.

73 de Jim, N2EY

My target for tomorrow is to run 37 minutes.
>

>> It's not a radio problem, it's a problem of American culture. Food
>> here is inexpensive, plentiful, and delicious. Usually (and
>> unfortunately) the most inexpensive, plentiful and delicious food is
>> also the most fattening.
>>
>> Add to this the fact that most Americans aren't required to have
>> physically active lives, and the stage is set for the problems you
>> see. Not just among radio amateurs but in the entire population.
>>
>>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

551. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 00:25:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507202523.08129.00000574@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 66801

In article <636F898C60D8A3C5.AEB8600495885770.8FB2E087AA0A0ACC@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>I didn't hear or, at least, don't remember the item you mention. But, NPR
>is my choice of listening!
>
Didja hear the latest, Kim?

Almost all of the US troops, and all of the US aircraft and other major assets,
are being pulled out of Saudi Arabia. Something like 100 military advisers and
training consultants will stay to help the Saudi military learn to use the
hardware they bought from us.

One of OBL's biggest beefs with the West was the presence of "infidel
Crusader/Zionist armies" in the holy land of Arabia. Big recruiting tool - note
how many of the Sept 11 hijackers were Saudis. (I don't think any were Iraqis).
Soon all but a few of those "crusaders" will be gone. OBL gets his way?

73 de Jim, N2EY

552. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 01:08:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9cam2$2if$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 66802

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 06 May 2003 04:20:19 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the
> >general population.
>
> Where did you get your public health degree from?
>
> >I have been at many types of Ham radio events in many locations.
> >I understand the cult like nature (in a good way) that Ham radio
> >often is.
>
> Where did you get your psychology degree from?

If he actually ever attended college, I think -after he gave the faculty the third degree for some time- they gave him a piece of paper and told him it was a degree just to get rid of him.

553. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 01:32:48 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9cc40$5nn$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 66803

Vito wrote:

> Keith wrote:
> >
> > Yes, using 100+ year old technology and forcing people to pass a test on it
> > so they can press a microphone to talk below 30 MHz is certainly absurd and
> > stupid. ...
>
> It is neither absurd no stupid - it is selfish.

It is neigher absurd, stupid nor selfish.

> Forcing people to pass
> such a test makes perfect sense if your goal is to keep others from
> sharing what is, after all, public property.

I took and passed all the code tests, and administered hundreds to others as a longtime VE. So far I've never encountered anyone who was being forced to take any test. Each and every one was there willingly and completely voluntarily.

554. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 01:45:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030507214505.18759.00000738@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66806

In article <kRYta.59223$4P1.5439301@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> writes:

>Yes, using 100+ year old technology and forcing people to pass a test on it
>so they can press a microphone to talk below 30 MHz is certainly absurd and
>stupid. This stupid thinking by hams and the US government has hurt them
>over the years and the stance has alienated millions of potentials operators
>from Amateur radio that had no desire to use morse code.
> Hopefully next year tens of thousands of US citizens will be able to take a
>written exam and talk anywhere on the ham bands and if they want to use
>morse code they can, just like they can use packet without knowing how to
>decode packet by ear.

You mean someone's out there using packet? Where?

73 de Larry, K3LT

555. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 01:45:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030507214506.18759.00000739@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66804

In article <UAEta.57538$4P1.5301413@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> writes:

>Death to horse and buggy technology in ham radio test!
>Eliminate the Morse Code test now!

Translation: I'm too stinking lazy to learn a useful communications skill!
All I wanna do is push a button and talk!

73 de Larry, K3LT

556. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 01:45:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030507214506.18759.00000740@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66805

In article <c2356669.0305060547.308a8290@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>
>http://www.msnbc.com/comics/daily.asp?sFile=td030420
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Nifty! Doncha just love the way that comic strip made fun of all of us mean-spirited, environmentally-unfriendly conservatives -- like me??? Me, that is, the conservative that drives a Toyota Corolla!

73 de Larry, K3LT

557. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 01:45:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030507214507.18759.00000741@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66807

In article <20030505231309.08556.00000750@mb-m04.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>as No-Clue Technicians, and subsequently demand
>>to be accepted as real, full-fledged hams, in spite of the fact that they
>>only
>>skill
>>they bring to the activity is the ability to push a button and talk.
>
>Do you feel that way about all Technician class license holders? Doesn't
>sound
>like supporting the hobby. You know some of them have BSEE degree and can
>design circuits. Hardly just pushing a button.
>
>Some of those with a BSEE are also smart enough NOT to learn code when they
>want to be good at other aspects.

Vipul:

Ah, the "No-code Tech with BSEE" argument. It's an old one, but I guess it's about as good as the NCTA gets. Funny thing is, the only hams I've known with actual BSEE, MSEE, or PhD EE degrees were also CW loving and using Extra-class hams who were entirely in favor of retaining the Pre-Restructuring code tests. They were also very interested and active participants in the latest digital modes. However, all the new No-Code Techs I know are mainly self-limited to the local 2-meter FM repeater -- and use their participation in Public Service events as the main justification for their Ham Hero status. Funny how that works in real life.

73 de Larry, K3LT

558. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 02:23:38 UTC
From: Freddy the Fireman <freddyfireman@firemanfredhero.com>
Message-ID: <b9cf39bqi0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66809

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hehhb28.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 06 May 2003 02:12:37 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >Because a lot of hams get involved in this sort of thing in the
> >hope of being close to the "action" usually participated in by
> >the aforementioned groups, in spite of the fact that they are not
> >qualified to be policemen, firemen, or paramedics themselves.
>
> Tell that to the five ops that we had riding fire apparatus in
> a test of simplex radio suitability for tactical comms via RACES.
> It was all work and no play.....
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
Did all five hams get to wear the official fireman
hats & raincoats & red suspenders? Hams seem to be
the only grown men that continue to play fireman games well
into manhood.

Freddy
3843 round table nightly

559. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 02:53:21 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507225321.21674.00000763@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66810

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> Funny thing is, the only hams I've known
>with actual BSEE, MSEE, or PhD EE degrees were also CW loving

I know an EE that loves CW. He is a software tester, has an amateur radio licence, but does not belong to IEEE. I don't believe a self respecting EE would be CW loving.

My last antenna Prof. never heard of Ham radio. Ham radio is an operator's hobby, not an electronics hobby.

Its nice that you know some EEs that love code.

>However, all the new No-Code Techs I know are mainly
>self-limited to the local 2-meter FM repeater

Perhaps not feel welcome by the CW lovers. Some people with BSEEs have designed circuits, not limited to repeaters. But, the code requirement restricts their ability to design circuits <"legally"> on HF frequencies, as I have.

>Funny how that works in real life.

Its funny. Its also sad.

560. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 02:58:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507225817.21674.00000764@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66811

From: "Phil Kane"

>And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
> the expertise to make the statement above?

None. And proud of it. Also, its common sense that they would normally pay someone a small fee to do these events.

>And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
> the expertise to make the statement above?

I've seen it in their ads that they "train" you the same day.

561. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:00:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507230051.21674.00000765@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66812

From: Mike Coslo

>They could easily train someone,
>> licensed or not, the same day to do it.
>
> Both of ya just don't get it. It isn't what you do when everything is
>going fine. It's what you do when there is a problem. You have to keep
>your cool and do your job. People get hurt and get lost.
>

Like I said, both Hams and non-Hams have that ability.

562. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:04:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507230459.21674.00000767@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66813

From: Mike Coslo

>The fellow who ran the ham end of the event put up a battery powered
>repeater on top of one of the mountains to cover the event. This
>involved some heavy duty 4-wheeling and map studying, and knowledge, as
>well as determination.
>
> Lets see someone be trained in one day to do that!

Thats not public service.

That could be emergency communications. The Hams at the event I attended also had this ability to set up equipment fast, so I will believe that.

What percentage of Hams really are that capable and can be relied on for emergency communications?

563. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:09:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <9Ujua.5804$3f7.4378313@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66808

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030506234931.19604.00000601@mb-m20.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> > Please identify the amateur club
> >by name and location that fits this description.
>
> The four closest clubs to me, the event I recently attended (not a close
by
> group), any Hamfest i've been to. The several states i've heard Hams on
while
> travelling.

NAME them. We don't know where you are.

>
> A Ham may not realize they are different.
>
> >Please state these "other things". I'd bet there are several people in
our
> >local club that do them.
>
> Hams do not like: experimenting with circuits, troubleshooting, tuning,
radio
> direction finding.

Yes some hams do like these things. Just not to the exclusion of all other
aspects.

>
> Hams love: contesting, antennas, HF,CW, collecting cards, ragchewing.
>

Again there is no difference between ham radio operators and amateur radio
operators. Some like these elements and some hate them.

Amateur radio is about communicating. YOUR definition (experimenting with
circuits, troubleshooting, tuning, direction finding) leaves out the
communications element and so is invalid.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

564. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:14:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507231442.21674.00000768@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66814

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.

Right now. Some Hams have this bold overconfident attitude. Expecially those CW lovers that want to impose CW on others.

Once day FCC might want some real reasons to keep the hobby (for example, actually succeeding in 97.1 goals). Then those Hams may not be so overconfident.

565. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:17:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507231745.21674.00000769@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66815

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>FCC doesn't require any commissioner or staff to have
> amateur licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio. :-)

They don't REQUIRE it, but I've heard some FCC interviews for regulator jobs.
I'm sure they would consider an amateur radio licence an asset. It shows
interest.

566. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:35:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507233503.21674.00000771@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66816

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Mighty morsemen are not only maintaining this Archaic Radio-
> telegraphy Society but are also living in a Fantasyland, one
> where everything stopped advancing when they were first
> licensed. They cannot understand progress, only their own
> stunted abilities bound up in a unique, singular skill that is no
> longer needed in the rest of the radio world or all society.

Here is one theory on that. This theory is also known outside amateur radio.
Its the "oppressed outcast".

They know their skill is useless in industry, emergency communications, and
even amateur radio (except as their artificial validation).

They know society would not care about Morse code skill. Also, many Hams tend
to be fat, anti-social. Ham radio is where these people can turn the tables
around.

So, they take a learnable skill and claim superiority for learning this one
skill. They can claim they are superior to BSEEs, when BSEEs can design
circuits and all they do is operate. They use this to block entry to a higher
class license. Code lovers, or "clovers", recruit new members with the strong
desire to learn this skill.

Now, the oppressed outcast is superior in this context.

567. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:49:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hejktgi.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66818

On 08 May 2003 03:00:51 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>> Both of ya just don't get it. It isn't what you do when everything is
>>going fine. It's what you do when there is a problem. You have to keep
>>your cool and do your job. People get hurt and get lost.
>>
>
>Like I said, both Hams and non-Hams have that ability.

But non-licensees are not permitted to operate amateur radio
transmitters. There can do their thing on FRS or CB, but not
on ham radio.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

568. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:49:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hejkvhj.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66819

On 08 May 2003 03:04:59 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>What percentage of Hams really are that capable and can be relied on for
>emergency communications?

Not nearly enough....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

569. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:49:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hejlo7k.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66817

On 07 May 2003 20:59:02 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>Subject: Re: N2EY Is Flying High!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/7/2003 2:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030507155856.18821.00000520@mb-m10.aol.com>
>
>>>The proper radio
>>> identification of the above aircraft would be "Beech 2 Echo
>>> Yankee".
>>
>> That's not how the FAA does it in air traffic control, Phil.
>
> On initial contact, the entire callsign is rendered. Then "abbreviated"
>after that.

Check the FCC rule - full ID is the type of a/c followed by
all the characters after (but not including) the "N" in the FAA
registration ("tail number") while the "abbreviated" ID is the
type of a/c followed by the last three characters of the tail
number. In this case both would be "Beech 2 Echo Yankee", or
would it be "Beechcraft 2 Echo Yankee", no?

>>Any scanner user can vouch for that. No pilot's license required
>> to "know it."

> Yet another arm chair hero brags aloud.

Monitoring for rule compliance is my long suit of clothes,
Steve... <ggg> Knowing the rules and advising clients how to
comply with them is how I earn pocket money now....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

570. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:53:44 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507235344.21674.00000773@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66820

From: k4yz:

> He DID, however, try to conceal this fact for weeks until I did a bit of
>detective work of my own and "outted" him.

I did not conceal that. I identify myself with my name, not my callsign.

> Despite repeatedly stating he "supports" Amateur Radio,

I not longer make that claim that I support amatuer radio.

> Also, he makes all these grandiose assertions about Amateur Radio (cult,
>etc), and how "anti-social" Amateur Radio supposedly is, yet he's never once
>"enlightened" us with his on-the-air activities.
>

I've been on HF phone on 40 meters at an event I went to. Yes, they were
cult-like in how they followed contest rules.

One of them "protested" by making contacts that were taken out of the contest.
He then claimed he would submit these additional contacts as protest of the
contest removing those contacts.

By the way, who comes up with the contest rules?

Also, an adult ask "why are you making that contact?"
One of the children, replied "I can get my 10-10 at the same time".
Then, the adult said "You don't want to do that. Its not proper".

The same child told another child, he was "not good enough" since he did not
know CW yet. The other child said he is in the process of learning CW.

Also, at a recent club meeting, someone had a CB reference menual. People
expressed unhappiness and wanted to get rid of that publication.

The operated through the night.

Cult like in their following of contest rules.
Anti-social in that they kept at their station, when there were plenty of other
activities.
Fat because they ate alot.

>.Yet NO ONE
>has ANY idea as to what "clubs" they are supposed to be, because even people
>who live in his neighborhood don't know what the heck he's talking about.

They are clubs called "XXX Amateur radio society". I have mentioned them.
Perhaps I should not have. I have told some of them in person that "I am not a
Ham". I wish I had asked some of the other questions I wanted to ask them.

571. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 03:58:57 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030507235857.21674.00000774@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66821

From: Dave Heil, k8mn:

>My own heartfelt opinion after reading your latest offering, Vipul, is
>that you are not from this galaxy.

I don't know what U R talking about. What "latest offering"? The only offer I remember making was to start an amateur radio experimenter's club.

572. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 04:13:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB9D9CF.2883CA8A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66822

Vito wrote:
>
> Keith wrote:
> >
> > Yes, using 100+ year old technology and forcing people to pass a test on it
> > so they can press a microphone to talk below 30 MHz is certainly absurd and
> > stupid. ...
>
> It is neither absurd no stupid - it is selfish. Forcing people to pass
> such a test makes perfect sense if your goal is to keep others from
> sharing what is, after all, public property.

I'm not buying. Each member of the public has the very same opportunity
for obtaining an amateur radio license.

The broadcast spectrum is public property. Can you set up your own
broadcast station simply because you want to?

National parks are public property. Most of them charge for use. If
you don't have the money to pay the fees, you don't use.

Dave K8MN

573. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 04:23:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB9DC4A.A8C86A1C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66823

Spectrum wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> > --
> > 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> > District Director (retired)
> > FCC San Francisco District Office
>
> Titles, offices, education, etc. So? Am I supposed to
> be impressed?

You're supposed to be smart enough to realize how completely foolish
you'd be to continue this argument with someone who is an expert on the
subject. I guess there is good reason for your anonymity.

> Is anyone impressed?

I am.

> I mean hell,
> I earned my second Ph. D. in theoretical physics, but
> why should I bother listing that here?

That's right. What does it have to do with radio regulation?

Dave K8MN

574. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 04:26:29 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508002629.21674.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66824

From: k4yz:

>Yeah...anti-social...That's why they organize all these hamfests...so they
>can go out in public and NOT socialize with people.

Yes, they just stay at their radios, operating contests and random contacts,
while others are socializing.

> If Amateurs were the only ones invited, it was not "random".

Isn't that the point I was trying to make?

>You yourself have stated, in this VERY forum, that Hamfests were controlled
>by "only coders" who had NO interest in doing anything BUT Morse Code related
>activities.

I never said only coders control Hamfests. I only said is is POSSIBLE to be an
only coder.

This event was a gathering of a few Hams, not a Hamfest.
Plus, they mentioned several modes in the ad. So, by definition, it was not a
meeting of only-coders.

>But you stated Hamfests were "only coder" events?

No, I never said that. Also, this has nothing to do about random selection. No
need to change the subject to take me away from my point about random selection
of Hams.

> There's your problem, Vippy...You spend entirely too much time at the
>concession stand and too LITTLE time in the hamfest events! If you hang
>around
>food, you're going to see people eating it!

Again, this meeting was NOT a Hamfest as you keep confusing it. It is a meeting
of a small group of Hams, not a Hamfest.

It was a small area. Eating occured often. Snacking occured in the operating
area also. There is no way I could NOT see someone eating!

>Proves WHAT? That over the course of a day people eat...?!?!

Each and every person took a huge amount of food. I know that. It was hard to
miss that.

>WHAT "free food"...?!?! The only "free food" I ever saw was at LOCAL club
>meetings, NOT "hamfests", and then only becasue everyone brought their own
>covered plate.

This was a meeting of Hams, not a Hamfest. They gave away beer to people that stopped at their station. There was plenty of food for them and others. Even with the people that showed up, there was STILL food left over (which they finished by eating).

It was free, since I just showed up and did not have to pay for it. I considered contributing biscuits. But I guess that was too healty for them and they did not take my contribution. Another person contributed a salad. Nobody ate that item either.

>>I try to make use of events that have food served. You can do the
>>same - its fun!
>
> How can THAT be? You spend sooooooooooo much time belittling people who
>eat, Vippy!

Because I know when I can get the free food at club meetings, and now at Ham gatherings like this. I can do this without over-eating. I see others over-eat at the same event.

>>They just went unbelievably overboard.
>
> Kinda like some of your assertions in this forum, Vippy?

So, you agree with that.

575. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 04:35:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB9DE8D.76690E65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66825

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EB88B55.EE6777B0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >It certainly offers promises a way to deal with the kids running those
> >four wheelers up and down my drive on the weekends. It sometimes sounds
> >as if we're in the grandstands for chain saw racing.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Little Davie is NOW all in a dither over the AGE
> of those engaged in a recreational pursuit. :-)
>
> Remember, there are "thousands engaged" in such activity
> "every day" all across the USA.

...not in my driveway there aren't. It just sounds like it.

> Why do you want to prohibit "kids" from enjoying a hobby, sport,
> or recreational activity?

Oops! You engaged fingers in typing before actually reading "my drive".
I don't have to tolerate 120+ db engine noise on my property on Sunday
mornings. If you had a point, it just went bye-bye.

Dave K8MN

576. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 04:53:27 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9dh18$i9hh0$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66835

I worked with a county north of my county a couple years ago in a consulting manner, and we were doing the same thing. Damn it was a busy day!!

We found that the ham gear, and repeaters etc. outperformed the fire service gear in that county! And they were using 80-110 watt range radios! (compared to 40-50 watt range ham mobiles) Based on a variety of factors that county has to deal with, the suggestion of using the remote recievers with the repeaters definitely cleared up the majority of their problem.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hehhb28.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 06 May 2003 02:12:37 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >Because a lot of hams get involved in this sort of thing in the
> >hope of being close to the "action" usually participated in by
> >the aforementioned groups, in spite of the fact that they are not
> >qualified to be policemen, firemen, or paramedics themselves.
>
> Tell that to the five ops that we had riding fire apparatus in
> a test of simplex radio suitability for tactical comms via RACES.
> It was all work and no play.....
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

577. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 04:59:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508005917.21674.00000778@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66826

From N2EY:

>>By the way, the Hams I saw on ATV
>>that day often (but not always) were overweight also.
>
>Again, not a random sample.
>

True. They had to have ATV. They were often overwieght, and anti-social. I doubt this would be accepted outside Ham radio.

>>And, Hams are often antisocial (but in a good way, I guess).
>
>The term you are looking for is "introverted".

Perhaps not introverted, perhaps extoverted. But the word isolated (to only the radio community) fits. This makes them anti-social.

>Didn't they teach you about the scientific method and random sampling in EE
>school?

Thats my point. This was a random sample.

>Apparently you do not know the meaning of the term "random sample".

I have never seen these people before. The event was a radio event, not an eating event. Please tell me how this group was not a random sample.

>Not a random sample at all. You chose for a reason. So did all the others who
>attended. Therefore, it was not a random sample.

They contacted me first. I chose to attend because they had several radio activities.

Are you saying that Hams that participate in several modes tend to eat more than those that only use a few modes?

How is this not a random sample in a way that is meaningfull?
>I don't know of any reason why more
>>overweight people would chose to attend Hamfests.
>
>I do. Here are some reasons:
>
>- the food
>- they are not out exercising or working
>- they don't have to take care of children.
>- they decided not to go to church that day
>- it doesn't take much effort

Those are good reasons.

>Right there you have a BIG selection process that destroys the randomness of
>the sample. Folks who eat moderately and eat the right things aren't going to
>be very attracted to an all-you-can-eat gathering that serves lots of
>high-fat,
>high-sugar foods. On the other hands, folks who like to chow down on that
>sort
>of stuff will be drawn to it.

I don't know anyone who came more for the food than for the radio events.

People who eat moderately, like myself, would refuse excess food. They ate more food because thats how they are, not because more food was available.

578. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:00:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508010036.21674.00000779@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66827

From: "Ryan, KC8PMX"

>Tpyically a majority of hams I have ever met are the introverted,
>stay-at-home types that only get out once in a while and only become
>extroverted in any sense when behind a microphone, keyer or keyboard.
>Although there may be a quantity of ham's that are physically active, most
>aren't.

Thats what I've seen also.

579. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:00:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB9E4EA.E208808@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66828

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EB8954A.92335192@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.
> > >
> > >They probably weren't aware that they should consult with you.
> >
> > They are very much aware, little Davie.

They're aware that they should contact you, Little Lenore?

> It is required by LAW.
> The FCC listens to ALL United States citizens.

Accepting your input doesn't mean action to your liking will be
forthcoming. I'm sure you've already come to this realization.

> They aren't required to listen to extraterrestrials living in another
> galaxy.

I'll jot that down.

> >> FCC doesn't require any commissioner or staff to have
> >> amateur licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio. :-)
> > >
> > >That's right. They're paid to regulate. It is part of the job.
> >
> > REQUIRED BY LAW...but law does not yet require "gladness."

What in the world are you babbling about?

> ONLY for US civil radio.
>
> > >If you can have a nice life in your mind, we can have nice lives in our
> > >minds.
> >
> > My wife and I have very nice lives. My only problem seems to be
> > the stubborn, vain, self-righteous, self-appointed-code-police who
> > demand that all in a hobby/recreational radio activity test for
> > morse code. Those "SVSS" types insist that all amateurs must
> > do as they did long ago.

Maybe a change of scenery will do you good. Perhaps you can undertake
self-appointed advocate status for another endeavor in which you are not
a participant.

As has been pointed out to you a number of times, new amateurs
absolutely cannot do as I did long ago. Under present licensing
requirements, that is an impossibility.

> >> I wish you all well.
> >
> >You don't sound very sincere.
>
> I am far more sincere in that than little Davie.

How so, Little Lenore? I didn't provide you an insincere wish.

> >Why in the world do you think you can force anyone to share your beliefs
> >about morse testing or a minimum age for participation in amateur radio?
>
> I don't expect to change the opinions of das Oberst (little Davie),
> Reverend Jimmie, Steamy Stalker, the bear-hunting Katapult
> King Kellie, big DICK, or the lost bus driver. They consider
> themselves arrogant and smug in their stubborn, vain, self-righteous,
> self-appointed-code-police ("SVSS") attitudes. They demand all
> others do as they did long ago.

Others cannot do as we did long ago. I think you're arrogant in your
demands to change a radio service in which you are in no way involved,
Little Lenore (Foghorn Lenhorn). Just to be sure that I understand your
position, we consider ourselves arrogant? Are you certain that is what
you wanted to write?

> OTHER readers are considered optimistically to be capable of
> rational thought and actually capable of deciding for themselves
> on the proper course of action in changing laws. Perhaps that is
> TOO optimistic considering that the opposition has been spoon-
> fed the Proper Way to Think from the Church of St. Hiram in
> Newington.

I've received a revelation which tells me that you're a horse's ass.

> >Amateur radio has changed quite a bit since I first became a ham forty
> >years back.
>
> Oh, my, another "CV!"

Did you see any specifics?

> I've been a professional in radio since FIFTY years ago.

This newsgroup isn't about professional radio.

> Never had to use morse code in all those FIFTY years. No need.

This newsgroup isn't about professional radio and you aren't involved in
amateur radio in any capacity.

> >The singular skill to which you refer is used daily by
> >thousands on the amateur bands.

>
> Whoopie. Many more thousands ride horses just in Los Angeles
> County every day...not for transportation, but for pleasure.

If you hurry, maybe you can catch the front end of the one your supposed
to be following.

> The state of California does NOT require horsemanship skills to
> operate any motor vehicle. There are about 35.6 million residents
> in the state of California and Californians have the most vehicles
> in any state of the union.

This newsgroup isn't about California law, California's lack of mass
transit or about horsemanship skills.

> There is NO need to test for morsemanship for an amateur radio
> license just to satisfy the selfish desires of ALREADY licensed
> amateurs.

That isn't WHY it is THERE.

> US radio amateurs have no law enforcement powers from their
> amateur radio license grants, yet they demand CONTROL over
> who shall get into amateur radio and HOW they do so. That's
> a perverse "control-freak" condition.

You have no law enforcement powers over amateur radio and you are not
involved in any way with amateur radio, yet you demand CONTROL over who
shall get into amateur radio and HOW they should do so. Now THAT is a
perverse "control freak" condition.

> >I don't live in a fantasy land and I understand progress.
>
> Little Davie lives in another galaxy according to another post in a
> different thread.

Apparently Little Lenore misread that part.

> >How's your progess on getting up to five wpm?
>
> Zero. Passing some irrelevant test is not necessary to discuss
> the need to maintain that irrelevant test in law.

You're just wasting time--yours and ours.

> The specious control-freak's idea that one must "pass a test first
> in order to talk about it" is like requiring all to commit a felony
> crime in order to talk about laws for same.

You're long in the talk department and more than a little shy in the
action department. You are seventy and you haven't made a move toward
obtaining a license.

> >You mean there are those here who disagree with you and that honks you
> >off.

>
> The "SVSS" honk me off. They are control-freaks. They are
> perverse in thinking.

Funny. That's pretty much how I see your antics.

> They have NO authority yet they assume such.

That sounds like you.

> The "SVSS" are the Saddam Husseins and Osama bil Ladens of
> a hobby, a recreational pursuit...demanding to control and judge
> a non-professional activity.

Tell us again, Mullah Anderson, what is it you are attempting?

> >> But some of us are optimistically trying to free mighty morse-
> >> men from their own morse-besotted Beliefs. Maybe it is too
> >> ideal an optimism. We keep on trying while the mighty morse-
> >> men are just trying everyone else's patience. :-)
> > >
> >Izzat in your role as self-appointed "advocate" for something or other?
> >
> That's in all rational, thinking observers' perception more or less.

Do they know you're claiming to represent them?

> If that upsets you, go honk your own horn. You certainly do that
> often enough in here.

Tell us again about your being a professional in radio for FIFTY years.
Aren't you going to ask me if I have a patent?

Dave K8MN

580. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:02:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB9E550.CFF5A257@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66829

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EB89218.3454D84A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >This guy gets my vote for troll of the year.
>
> Jealous? Little Davie has had that title for at least four past years.
>
> Back under your bridge, little Davie.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby. Do you spend your time calling radio talk
shows when you aren't busy haunting this group?

Dave K8MN

581. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:04:40 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508010440.21674.00000783@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66830

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Other
>> interests, such as radio direction finding use more physical activity.

>What does your theory prove?

Simple.
Hams like contesting instead of radio direction finding.
Contesting is both more boring, and requires less physical activity.
The interesting activities happen to require more physical activity.
Hams contest more and do radio direction finding less.
This makes Hams boring and fat.

582. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:19:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9dh1a$i9hh0$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66832

>
> It IS fascinating to see these generalities. The bitterness is
> something else again. Bitterness is one of those things that can become
> addictive to some people.

If anything would turn off a prospective newbie to ham radio, I am sure that would be it. I am not saying we need to get all flowery etc., but if we want to continue to increase our ranks, even at the slow (but steady) pace that it has been, then we need to work on the PR side of the hobby. How many clubs out ther have a Publicity or Public Relations person, and how active is he/she?

>
> But as for generalities, of the people who do the charity event PS for
> our club, there are only one or two who are not highly technically
> inclined. They are just regular tech types. And there are no grandmas to
> be seen - though we'd welcome them. I'm highly technically inclined, and
> I do every event. So I don't know where he gets his data.

Probably from a bad experience in the past, and now uses it in broad-sweeping generalities for the whole ARS when it occured locally. I guess there will always be people like that in any group....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

583. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:25:35 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9dh1b$i9hh0$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66834

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EB92CD4.7060604@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Since Larry can make broad-sweeping generalities, here I go with one.
> > Tpyically a majority of hams I have ever met are the introverted,
> > stay-at-home types that only get out once in a while and only become
> > extroverted in any sense when behind a microphone, keyer or keyboard.
> > Although there may be a quantity of ham's that are physically active,
most
> > aren't.
>
> It is a generalization, but not based on bitterness or emotion.
>
> There are plenty of people who are not social butterflies. If the shy
> one is technically inclined, the ARS can be the ticket out of his/her
> shell. What a great thing!
>
> On average, Hams are probably somewhat less active than other groups
> due to the fact that there are quite a few elderly hams (no problem,
> the ARS is a great hobby for older people)
>
> As for the young and middle aged hams, there might be a few more of us
> active ones than first appear. You bicycle, Jim is a runner, and I play
> Ice Hockey. Those are just the ones I know about

Cool! You play hockey?? 17 of my 33 years was devoted that wonderful
sport! I still think that alot of hams are more of the "homebody" type....
Hell, I am the opposite, the amount of time spent at home for me is pretty
much only for the sleeping and showering thing.

>
>
> > How about encouraging more "bicycle mobiles" out there?? Hell, when I
go
> > riding, I throw an HT in a pocket just in case of an emergency. Once it
> > actually came in handy, as I ran across someone who got stung by a bee
on
> > the local rail-trail, and was having a severe allergic reaction. Being
able
> > to bring up the autopatch, and getting emergency help there rather
quickly
> > probably their day a little better than if they had to wait alot longer
to
> > get help. True that this could have been done with a cellphone but I
still

> > rather carry the HT.
>
>
> At least you'll have a better chance of coverage with the HT! 8^)
>

Possibly true, as the minute you step outside of the city limits of Midland, MI, you are in the boonies and I am sure cell coverage is marginal. I haven't tested the overall capabilities of my cell phone within my county, but I am quite sure there are alot of "dead spots."

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

584. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:31:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB9EB82.26D4CD9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66831

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EB88FCE.46FAF8BA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I'm almost certain that you are incorrect on this one, Leonard. The
> >Navy uses "ratings". The Air Force used the term "AFSC". The term
> >"MILITARY OCCUPATION SPECIALTIES" was not used in the Air Force.
>
> Okay, we've established that little Davie didn't have an MOS
> while in Vietnam bravely serving his country.

We didn't establish it, I established it. You screwed it up totally by
feeding us a load of misinformation about the armed services having
"MILITAY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES", not ratings, Little Leona.

> Box moving doesn't require going through military schools.
>
> >Uh, isn't that what you're all about?
>
> No. I'm trying to stay focussed on this thread's Subject, not
> the brave, valorous military service life of little Davie Heil.

Actually, as is your norm, you've drifted very far afield from the
thread's subject in an effort to impress someone (an unwitting
individual may step forward at any time) with your vast knowledge of
things military. My response to you mentioned nothing about my "brave
valorous military service life", Little Leonid. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor
baby.

> The Subject line title is "Re: The need to save the Novice
> Class license." It's right up there on the message header.

Then what are you doing trying to impress us with your incorrect "MOS"
jive?

> >> You don't seem to care about the future, newcomers in ham
> >> radio not yet licensed, or anything but those who Believe as You
> >> do. You just can't shake that Belief in morse code as needed
> >> in amateur radio.
> >
> >Where has that been indicated in this post or any other by Jim?
>
> Only in about five-plus years of posting by the mighty morsemen.

I didn't ask you about any "mighty morsemen". I asked you about Jim, N2EY.

> It's all in Google. If you need a refresher, go there and look for
> a month or so.

T'aint there. You fabricate.

> >Ever hear of the Navy "A" and "B" schools?
>
> No. I served 8 years in the United States ARMY.
>
> Do Navy "A" and "B" schools teach anything about amateur
> Novice Class licenses?

Does the ARMY teach anything about keeping your yap shut if you don't know anything about a subject? Apparently you don't know much about the Navy or the amateur Novice class.

> >You look just like George Patton up on that soapbox, all wrapped in
> >patriotic bunting, "Lennie".
>
> Was George a Novice Class radio amateur?

Were you?

> Did he ever join ARRL?

Did you?

> Could he do morse code?

Could you?

See you're an awfully lot like Old Blood and Guts.

> Tell us about your Novice Class amateur radio experiences in
> Vietnam, mighty morse warrior. Did you "hone your skills" there?

I was a Novice seven years before my arrival in Viet Nam at age 21. My amateur radio skills and military skills were already honed prior to my arrival. Unlike your rear area service during the Korean War, I was actually stationed in the country where the conflict was taking place. I love it when a fellow like you starts telling someone who didn't serve in the military about your having put your life on the line.

You're a humbug.

Dave K8MN

585. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 05:34:55 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9dh1c$i9hh0$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66833

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030507202522.08129.00000573@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <b9aohh$h4an8$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> > Bingo Jim,
>
> Tnx, Ryan
> >
> >This was a strong topic of discussion recently at a local continuing
> >education credits session I went to as a requirement of my medical
> >licensure. The typical lifestyle 50-75 years ago involved a hell of alot
> >more work on a day-to-day basis, be it doing chores or having to work
> >multiple jobs and that is not the same now.
>
> Doing chores, manual labor, walking at least part of the way rather than
> driving, etc. Also, there was a lot less processed food around.
>
> Today we are surrounded by easy, inexpensive food that is bad for us.
Check out
> how much sodium, sugar, and bad fat is in most processed food. It's enough
to
> make carbohydrate addicts out of most of us!
>
> Most of all, getting fat was an expensive proposition back then!

Gotta love those twinkies eh?? You are right though.

>
> >Technology is partially to blame.....
>
> Exactly. It has made a sedentary lifestyle possible for millions of
Americans.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> My target for tomorrow is to run 37 minutes.

Without being chased??? Just kidding, I am getting the bike back out and
trying to ride at least 1 hour per day, to help shed some of my winter
weight.

Another societal factor is that in the "olden days" cities were small units
with everything fairly close together. Now for example, I drive 12 miles to
work on a daily basis, as well as going to a local college for classes that

is about 30 miles away. Back in those olden days, most places that a person needed to go to might have been only a three mile walk at best. I sure as hell would not want to have to walk that much during the average day (12+ miles) as I would probably be spending as much time walking to work as being there!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

586. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 13:17:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508091705.13815.00000003@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66836

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/7/2003 9:53 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507225321.21674.00000763@mb-m16.aol.com>

>
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>> Funny thing is, the only hams I've known
>>with actual BSEE, MSEE, or PhD EE degrees were also CW loving
>
>I know an EE that loves CW. He is a software tester, has an amateur radio
>licence, but does not belong to IEEE. I don't believe a self respecting EE
>would be CW loving.

Why? What self-depreiciating social stigma is associated with the use of
Morse Code?

>My last antenna Prof. never heard of Ham radio.

I seriously doubt that.

>Ham radio is an operator's hobby, not an electronics hobby.

Bull.

>Its nice that you know some EEs that love code.

It's nice that you KNOW some EE's, Vipul...Don'tya wish you were one?

>Perhaps not feel welcome by the CW lovers. Some people with BSEEs have
>designed
>circuits, not limited to repeaters. But, the code requirement restricts their
>ability to design circuits <"legally"> on HF frequencies, as I have.

There is absolutely NO requirement to learn, know, use or be proficient in
Morse Code use to DESIGN circuits for HF use, Vippy.

Steve, K4YZ

587. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 13:22:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508092229.13815.00000004@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66837

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/7/2003 10:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507230459.21674.00000767@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo
>
>>The fellow who ran the ham end of the event put up a battery powered
>>repeater on top of one of the mountains to cover the event. This
>>involved some heavy duty 4-wheeling and map studying, and knowledge, as
>>well as determination.
>>
>> Lets see someone be trained in one day to do that!
>
>Thats not public service.

Sure it is! No pre-existing emergency existed and it was planned to
support a public event.

THAT is "public service"

>That could be emergency communications. The Hams at the event I attended also
>had this ability to set up equipment fast, so I will believe that.

It COULD have been "emergency communications" had someone ben injured and
required assistance.

That is PART of the purpose of "public service" communicatioons...to help
prevent emergencies from manifesting.

>What percentage of Hams really are that capable and can be relied on for
>emergency communications?

Does it matter? In many cases it is far more prudent to have a small
number of well trained persons, rather than a large number of well-intentioned
but untrained persons.

Steve, K4YZ

588. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 13:38:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508093851.13035.00000004@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 66838

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/7/2003 11:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030508002629.21674.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>

>>Yeah...anti-social...That's why they organize all these hamfests...so they
>>can go out in public and NOT socialize with people.
>
>Yes, they just stay at their radios, operating contests and random contacts,
>while others are socializing.

It's "comments" like this that betray your actual "experience" at Amateur
Radio functions, Vippy.

Did you ever hear that old saying that goes "It Is Better To Be Silent And
Thought A Fool, Than To Open Your Mouth And Confirm It"...???

You need to stop sitting around your apartment, get out into the REAL
world and see what life is really like before it passes you by. Making these
stories up is foolish, too.

>> If Amateurs were the only ones invited, it was not "random".
>
>Isn't that the point I was trying to make?

Who knows? Your subject matter in sentences is so fractured at times that
it's difficult to follow.

>>You yourself have stated, in this VERY forum, that Hamfests were controlled
>>by "only coders" who had NO interest in doing anything BUT Morse Code
>related
>>activities.
>
>I never said only coders control Hamfests. I only said is is POSSIBLE to be
>an
>only coder.

You have very specifically stated on SEVERAL occassions that hamfests were
"only coder" controlled funtions.

You need to keep your stories straight, Vippy.

Perhaps a notebook divided into various rant topics so you can remember
what you've said before? And don't forget to cross reference, ie:
only-coder-hamfests

>This event was a gathering of a few Hams, not a Hamfest.

How can we tell? You keep making reference to different "meetings" but you refuse to identify who these groups are, where they meet, the officers of the club, etc.

Personally, I think you're making it up as you go to have the >appearance< of being factual. Depending on the circumstances, "making it up" can also be called lying. So far, I think you're just being a smart alec with a bad sense of humor. The line is rather thin, however, and you are wavering...

Steve, K4YZ

589. Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 13:57:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508095719.06080.00000013@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66839

>Subject: Re: Call sign redistricting
>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/7/2003 6:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Xns9374C6C2D5337elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>Well, if CB were recognised as a separate service there might be a little
>more harmonisation between countries. Like for example, UHF CB wouldn't be
>on 462 MHz in one country and 905 MHz instead in another. It might
>actually be useful but I don't actually use CB, so it's hard to get worked
>up about it.

This would require some sort of international convention on what "citizens band" should be. There ae countless users of "land mobile" radio, and trying to define each and every one of them would be a never-ending task.

All licenseless communications and one licensed mobile service in the United States are presently under Part 95 of the FCC's rules and regulations. Each subpart (Citizens Band, General Mobile Radio Service, Family Radio Service, Radio Control Service, and others) has it's own "purpose", but none of those that permit voice operation dictate the content of the messages.

CB has rules on power and distances authorized, but the FCC thinks it can dictate physics...It was foolish in the 1950s, and even more foolish today!

Considering there are over 150 signatories to the ITU, which means over 150 different ideas on what "land mobile" should be, I think it would be easier to divide it into "commercial land mobile" and "private land mobile". Those categories are broad enough to allow the individual nations to decide for themselves, yet provide some greater protection for those entities that need radio but are presently impacted by non-commercial users, ie CB.

73

Steve, K4YZ

590. IN DETAIL, Please...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 14:06:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508100616.06080.00000014@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66840

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/7/2003 10:14 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507231442.21674.00000768@mb-m16.aol.com>

>Right now. Some Hams have this bold overconfident attitude. Expecially those
>CW
>lovers that want to impose CW on others.

Present regulations on Morse Code qualifications are "imposed" by the
Federal Communications Commission as is required by Congress due to treaties
signed by the United States Government.

No one is "imposing" CW on anyone other than that required by LAW...You
know, Vipul...those collections of rules and regulations created for the common
good of society. (Notice that is "common" good...not necessarily what YOU
like)

>Once day FCC might want some real reasons to keep the hobby (for example,
>actually succeeding in 97.1 goals). Then those Hams may not be so
>overconfident.

Who's "overconfident", Vippy?

Amateur Radio already meets the criteria of 97.1...97.1 does NOT specify
any MODE to be used in achieving those goals.

Please specify IN DETAIL how ""the hobby" is NOT meeting the requirements
of Part 97.1.

IN DETAIL, Please...

Steve, K4YZ

591. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 14:22:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508102234.06080.00000015@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66842

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/7/2003 10:53 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507235344.21674.00000773@mb-m16.aol.com>

>
>From: k4yz:
>
>> He DID, however, try to conceal this fact for weeks until I did a bit of
>>detective work of my own and "outted" him.
>
>I did not conceal that. I identify myself with my name, not my callsign.

No, you have yet to sign ANY post I have ever seen from you as "Vipul" or
"KB1HMW".

You did, in one post a week or two later, admit that you were KB1HMW, but
have yet to sign it to a post.

>> Despite repeatedly stating he "supports" Amateur Radio,
>
>I not longer make that claim that I support amatuer radio.

Good. You never WERE "supporting" Amateur Radio before, so by dropping
your "support" claim, you are no longer lying.

>> Also, he makes all these grandiose assertions about Amateur Radio (cult,
>>etc), and how "anti-social" Amateur Radio supposedly is, yet he's never once
>>"enlightened" us with his on-the-air activities.
>>
>
>I've been on HF phone on 40 meters at an event I went to. Yes, they were
>cult-like in how they followed contest rules.

"Cult-like" in following rules?

Rules should NOT be followed? Then why have them? Let's just let
everyone gang up on top of each other yelling aimlessly at each other!

(What an idiot...!!!)

>One of them "protested" by making contacts that were taken out of the
>contest.
>He then claimed he would submit these additional contacts as protest of the
>contest removing those contacts.

Contests have time limits and contact criteria...It is those criteria
against which participants are judged.

If they ignore that criteria and jsut do what they darn well please, then
it's not a fair assessment of one competitor against another.

In other words, it's cheating. Cheating is also lying.

>By the way, who comes up with the contest rules?

The contest sponsor, vippy...Just like for those cereal box contests, Miss
America, NASCAR, etc etc etc.

>Also, an adult ask "why are you making that contact?"
>One of the children, replied "I can get my 10-10 at the same time".
>Then, the adult said "You don't want to do that. Its not proper".

Obviously someone was trying to teach the child the rules of the contest.
You obviously don't understand them either.

>The same child told another child, he was "not good enough" since he did not
>know CW yet. The other child said he is in the process of learning CW.

I think this was a VippyLie thrown in to try and validate the preceeding.

>Also, at a recent club meeting, someone had a CB reference menual. People
>expressed unhappiness and wanted to get rid of that publication.

"CB reference menual"...?!?!

WHY would someone bring a CB radio book to an Amateur Radio operating
event, Vippy? Of what purpose was it? Of COURSE you need to get rid of it!
You shouldn't have brought it in the first place.

>The operated through the night.

Do you know what you call contest operators who do NOT operate "through
the night", Vippy?

>Cult like in their following of contest rules.

You mean they followed the rules "religously"...??? They SHOULD!

>Anti-social in that they kept at their station, when there were plenty of
>other
>activities.

In the contests, being AT the station IS thier place, Vipul. One does not
accrue contact points otherwise.

>Fat because they ate alot.

This pertains to what?

>>.Yet NO ONE
>>has ANY idea as to what "clubs" they are supposed to be, because even people
>>who live in his neighborhood don't know what the heck he's talking about.
>
>They are clubs called "XXX Amateur radio society". I have mentioned them.
>Perhaps I should not have. I have told some of them in person that "I am not

>a
>Ham". I wish I had asked some of the other questions I wanted to ask them.

I think the "XXX" you refer to was an adult bookstore and you ahve your stories crossed again.

And if you have named the clubs, I have never seen them. And that is probably best for THEM, for if I had a member in a club >>I<< belonged to as obviously anti-Amateur radio and anti-everything else as you, I'd not want anyone to know about you.

Steve, K4YZ

592. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 14:23:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508102315.06080.00000016@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66841

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/7/2003 10:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030507235857.21674.00000774@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>From: Dave Heil, k8mn:
>
>>My own heartfelt opinion after reading your latest offering, Vipul, is
>>that you are not from this galaxy.
>
>I don't know what U R talking about. What "latest offering"? The only offer I
>remember making was to start an amateur radio experimenter's club.

What an idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

593. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 14:25:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508102538.06080.00000017@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66843

>Subject: Re: N2EY Is Flying High!
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/7/2003 10:49 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hejlo7k.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>Check the FCC rule - full ID is the type of a/c followed by
> all the characters after (but not including) the "N" in the FAA
> registration ("tail number") while the "abbreviated" ID is the
> type of a/c followed by the last three characters of the tail
> number. In this case both would be "Beech 2 Echo Yankee", or
> would it be "Beechcraft 2 Echo Yankee", no?

Check ICAO Phil. Full ID is required on initial contact, then abbreviate
callsigns may be used once positive ID has been established.

>>>Any scanner user can vouch for that. No pilot's license required
>>> to "know it."
>
>> Yet another arm chair hero brags aloud.
>
> Monitoring for rule compliance is my long suit of clothes,
> Steve... <ggg> Knowing the rules and advising clients how to
> comply with them is how I earn pocket money now....

Then you should be aware of regulation that affect specific users other
than United States or FC, Phil.

73

Steve, K4YZ

594. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 14:30:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508103033.06080.00000018@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66844

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 5/8/2003 9:22 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030508102234.06080.00000015@mb-m29.aol.com>

>>The operated through the night.
>
> Do you know what you call contest operators who do NOT operate "through
>the night", Vippy?

The answer is....

LOOSERS!

Steve, K4YZ

595. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 15:42:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EBA7AF2.6010403@psu.edu>
Source record: 66845

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: "Phil Kane"
>
>
>>And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
>> the expertise to make the statement above?
>
>
> None. And proud of it. Also, its common sense that they would normally pay
> someone a small fee to do these events.

Being proud of not helping people is nothing to be proud of.

>>And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
>> the expertise to make the statement above?
>
>
> I've seen it in their ads that they "train" you the same day.

They are assuming you have the basic skills needed to do the work. I took a short training course in SkyWarn recently. It only took an hour or so. But the other skills were acquired long befor this.

Time for the old story about the computer repairman:

A person brought in a computer monitor to be repaired. The repairman took a look at the monitor, removed the cover, and looked around for a moment. After about a minute, he removed a fuse, and put in a new one. This fixed the monitor.

He then handed the owner a bill for 100 dollars. The owner was angry because he saw that the repairman only replaced a cheap fuse. The owner demanded an itemized reciept.

The repairman made one up that read:

Fuse $0.50

Knowing where to look: $99.50

Total $100.00

- Mike KB3EIA -

596. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 15:49:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EBA7C6E.1010600@psu.edu>
Source record: 66846

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo
>
>
>>They could easily train someone,
>>
>>>licensed or not, the same day to do it.
>>
>> Both of ya just don't get it. It isn't what you do when everything is
>>going fine. It's what you do when there is a problem. You have to keep
>>your cool and do your job. People get hurt and get lost.
>>
>
> Like I said, both Hams and non-Hams have that ability.

HAR! A majority of people when faced with an emergency, will either panic, appear relatively calm but make very poor decisions, or slink away in order to not get involved.

This includes hams and non-hams. But since there are people who get involved in amateur radio because they want to perform this sort of service, Hams are more likely to perform well under pressure on average, IMO.

As a person who is proud of their lack of participation in public service, which type are you?

- Mike KB3EIA -

597. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 15:54:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EBA7DC9.6090901@psu.edu>
Source record: 66847

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo
>
>
>>The fellow who ran the ham end of the event put up a battery powered
>>repeater on top of one of the mountains to cover the event. This
>>involved some heavy duty 4-wheeling and map studying, and knowledge, as
>>well as determination.
>>
>> Lets see someone be trained in one day to do that!
>
>
> Thats not public service.

Sure it was. The proceeds went to charity. Our club volunteered our
time. That's public service.

> That could be emergency communications. The Hams at the event I attended also
> had this ability to set up equipment fast, so I will believe that.
>
> What percentage of Hams really are that capable and can be relied on for
> emergency communications?

Dunno. I could, given access to the equipment (I do have). Most of the
hams I hang with could. Many of us have the proper vehicles to get to
the good places to put up one of these. Ya gotta hang with the right crowd.

- Mike KB3EIA -

598. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 16:09:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305080809.a3c011e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66848

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030507155854.18821.00000519@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <20030507042527.18755.00000659@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030503173632.18769.00000420@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <20030503105308.18759.00000578@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>(N2EY)
> >>writes:

> >> All us readers can see is that you are deliberately vague about
> >> what you've done, where you've worked, or all the claimed
> >> expirience. Very vague.
> >
> >Incorrect. All that YOU can see is what I've written here. Some other readers
> >know a lot more about my work experience.
>
> That's nice. No go off in PRIVATE e-correspondence and give each
> other high-fives for keeping secrets and chuckling among yourselves.

"No go off"? What is that supposed to mean?

Did you intend to write

"Now go off in PRIVATE e-correspondence and give each other high-fives
for keeping secrets and chuckling among yourselves." ?

And you say Morse code is error-prone?

The fact is that I have told many people about my work experience in
public, not private, "e-correspondence". Like 7035 kHz CW. Anyone with
the proper license, equipment and skills can listen in. Not private at
all.
>
> >> I've told you as much as you've told everyone else about where
> >> you work or your work experience. :-)
> >
> >Different subject. I posted my education - you won't post yours.
>
> I did. In public.

Refresh our collective memory.
>
> Steamy Stalker

Who?

> bitched, moaned, cried about it for years in
> here, wailing over and over about a "CV."
>
> That's all in Google.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor, poor baby. Does negative criticism offend
you that much? Can't you take a little tweak?

Or are you AFRAID? ;-) ;-)

>
> >Do you want me to stop posting?

> >Do you think that you should have the right to
> >post here, but that nobody should disagree with you or point out your
> >mistakes?
>
> Poor baby. Negative criticism offends you that much?
>
> Are you "going to take the ball and go home" because something
> about the game offends you?
>
> You don't own the ball, Reverend Jimmie. [may not have a pair]
>
> You have difficulty standing up to the heat in here. I'd suggest
> "taking off"...going away to cooler climates where you can try to
> snow others about everything.

In other words, the answer to my questions is "YES". You want me, and
anyone else who disagrees with you, to shut up and go away so you can
rant on and on here without opposition or anyone pointing out the
factual errors and invalid logic in your postings.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor, poor, poor baby. Does negative
criticism offend you that much? Can't you take a little tweak?

599. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 16:15:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EBA828C.9030601@psu.edu>
Source record: 66849

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>It IS fascinating to see these generalities. The bitterness is
>>something else again. Bitterness is one of those things that can become
>>addictive to some people.
>
>
> If anything would turn off a prospective newbie to ham radio, I am sure that
> would be it. I am not saying we need to get all flowery etc., but if we
> want to continue to increase our ranks, even at the slow (but steady) pace
> that it has been, then we need to work on the PR side of the hobby. How
> many clubs out ther have a Publicity or Public Relations person, and how
> active is he/she?
>
>
>
>>But as for generalities, of the people who do the charity event PS for
>>our club, there are only one or two who are not highly technically
>>inclined. They are just regular tech types. And there are no grandmas to
>>be seen - though we'd welcome them. I'm highly technically inclined, and
>>I do every event. So I don't know where he gets his data.
>
>
> Probably from a bad experience in the past, and now uses it in
> broad-sweeping generalities for the whole ARS when it occured locally. I
> guess there will always be people like that in any group....

As Mark Twain said: "If a cat sits on a hot burner It will learn, and
never sit on a hot burner again. But it will never sit on a cold one either"

- Mike KB3EIA -

600. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 16:17:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305080817.6f3f77bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66850

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EB88B55.EE6777B0@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > http://www.msnbc.com/comics/daily.asp?sFile=td030420
>
> It certainly offers promises a way to deal with the kids running those
> four wheelers up and down my drive on the weekends. It sometimes sounds
> as if we're in the grandstands for chain saw racing.

There's a cure for that. Some Afghans are peddling Russian war surplus
mines for cheap.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

601. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 16:26:20 UTC
From: Wayne Dagastino <wdagastino@afteingtonconsults.org>
Message-ID: <b9e0fdjbq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66751

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hehilxb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 06 May 2003 04:20:19 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
>
> Where did you get your public health degree from?
>
> Where did you get your psychology degree from?
>
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

Ah, if it weren't for Phil's vitriolic remarks, often supported
by one or two of his associates, this NG would be so
uninteresting!

Good DX,

Wayne Dagistino, P.E., Ph.D.
Pres. & CEO, Dagistino Consulting (retired)
Professor Emeritus, City Public University, Capetown

602. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 16:34:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EBA8720.5080005@psu.edu>
Source record: 66752

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EB92CD4.7060604@adelphia.net...
>
>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>>>Since Larry can make broad-sweeping generalities, here I go with one.
>>>Tpyically a majority of hams I have ever met are the introverted,
>>>stay-at-home types that only get out once in a while and only become
>>>extroverted in any sense when behind a microphone, keyer or keyboard.
>>>Although there may be a quantity of ham's that are physically active,
>>
> most
>
>>>aren't.
>>
>>It is a generalization, but not based on bitterness or emotion.
>>
>>There are plenty of people who are not social butterflies. If the shy
>>one is technically inclined, the ARS can be the ticket out of his/her
>>shell. What a great thing!
>>
>>On average, Hams are probably somewhat less active than other groups
>>due to the fact that there are quite a few elderly hams (no problem,
>>the ARS is a great hobby for older people)
>>
>>As for the young and middle aged hams, there might be a few more of us
>>active ones than first appear. You bicycle, Jim is a runner, and I play
>>Ice Hockey. Those are just the ones I know about
>
>
> Cool! You play hockey?? 17 of my 33 years was devoted that wonderful
> sport! I still think that alot of hams are more of the "homebody" type....
> Hell, I am the opposite, the amount of time spent at home for me is pretty
> much only for the sleeping and showering thing.

You bet! I know many people think I'm nuts for playing at my advanced age, (48) but it is so darn much fun that I can't quit. It is also a blast that I can play competitive Ice Hockey on the same team (often the same line) with my kid. I have not found a stress reliever yet that can compare. We take it all out on each other on the ice, and off-ice we're all just big teddy bears! 8^)

I've been Captain for about 4 years now, and play Defense mostly. I'm not as fast as the fastest players, but then the fastest ones are less

than half my age, but I'm fast enough to keep right in the play. Most of the other teams players don't think I'm very nice - but they use other descriptive terms.

Seeing how some of the posters in here are showing signs of stress induced crankiness, I heartily recommend they think about taking up a good contact sport.

- Mike KB3EIA - Captain of the NHL's Dragons (Nittany Hockey League)

603. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 16:40:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EBA8895.9030506@psu.edu>
Source record: 66753

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/7/2003 10:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030507230459.21674.00000767@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>
>>From: Mike Coslo
>>
>>
>>>The fellow who ran the ham end of the event put up a battery powered
>>>repeater on top of one of the mountains to cover the event. This
>>>involved some heavy duty 4-wheeling and map studying, and knowledge, as
>>>well as determination.
>>>
>>> Lets see someone be trained in one day to do that!
>>
>>Thats not public service.
>
>
> Sure it is! No pre-existing emergency existed and it was planned to
> support a public event.
>
> THAT is "public service"

Hang on Steve.... I sense another one off definition coming here. Maybe
we should csll them "Vipinitions"?

>
>>That could be emergency communications. The Hams at the event I attended also
>>had this ability to set up equipment fast, so I will believe that.
>
>
> It COULD have been "emergency communications" had someone ben injured and
> required assistance.

Darn right! These Iron men things were grueling, and it is a miracle
that more people aren't hurt. They do some of the craziest stunts. It
takes lots of spotters, and lots of good communications.

> That is PART of the purpose of "public service" communicatioons...to help
> prevent emergencies from manifesting.
>
>
>>What percentage of Hams really are that capable and can be relied on for
>>emergency communications?

>
>
> Does it matter? In many cases it is far more prudent to have a small
> number of well trained persons, rather than a large number of well-intentioned
> but untrained persons.

And most certainly they can't e trained in only a day.

604. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131424.18775.00000508@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66756

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hejlo7k.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>>>Subject: Re: N2EY Is Flying High!
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/7/2003 2:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030507155856.18821.00000520@mb-m10.aol.com>
>>
>>>>The proper radio
>>>> identification of the above aircraft would be "Beech 2 Echo
>>>> Yankee".
>>>
>>> That's not how the FAA does it in air traffic control, Phil.
>>
>> On initial contact, the entire callsign is rendered. Then
>"abbreviated"
>>after that.
>
> Check the FCC rule - full ID is the type of a/c followed by
> all the characters after (but not including) the "N" in the FAA
> registration ("tail number") while the "abbreviated" ID is the
> type of a/c followed by the last three characters of the tail
> number. In this case both would be "Beech 2 Echo Yankee", or
> would it be "Beechcraft 2 Echo Yankee", no?

No.

"November Two Echo Yankee" is required. Identification of
the aircraft type might precede the tail number ID, but the
nation designator prefix must be used ("N" in this example).

>>>Any scanner user can vouch for that. No pilot's license required
>>> to "know it."
>
>> Yet another arm chair hero brags aloud.
>
> Monitoring for rule compliance is my long suit of clothes,
> Steve... <ggg> Knowing the rules and advising clients how to
> comply with them is how I earn pocket money now....

You need deeper pockets...

605. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131425.18775.00000510@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66754

In article <20030507135644.08218.00000766@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>You are NOT licensed in Amatuer Radio.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Spelling errors are proliferating in the Gang of Four.

Bad sign. Downhill slide for the PCTA. QRT soon.

606. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131425.18775.00000509@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66755

In article <20030507142518.18827.00000614@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>When were you in the Navy, Len?

The same time you were. :-)

Get some help, Rev. Jimmie.

607. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131429.18775.00000511@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66757

In article <20030507082514.18828.00000799@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(Miccolis of Borg) writes:

>In article <20030503173634.18769.00000421@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <qSCsa.2730$3f7.2195658@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>According to the book, "Morse Code, The Essential Language" one can
>>achieve
>>>>>5wpm in 30 hours of study if an effective study method is chosen. Of
>>course
>>>>>some people learn much quicker. My older daughter learned it in a week
>>>>>spending not more than an hour or so per day. It took me longer but so
>>>>>what.
>>>>
>>>> According to the Armed Forces of the United States, morse
>>>> code cognition is of such a limited aptitude in the "average"
>>>> person that they kept a morse code aptitude test in the bank
>>>> of recruit tests for two decades...1940s on through to at least
>>>> 1960.
>>>
>>>Where is this stated explicitly?
>>
>> In the US Army it is contained in an "AR" (Army Regulation) which has
>> long been out of date and eliminated from any current regulations. I
>> saw it and discussed it with Captain William Boss, then the Officer
>> in Charge of the ADA Transmitter station (and then a licensed US
>> radio amateur). The morse code aptitude test was discussed in an
>> informal discussion between two US Army commissioned officers
>> at the Far East Command Headquarters in Pershing Heights area
>> of Tokyo about 1954 after my general query to one of them (while on
>> official duties requiring my visit to FEC Hq).
>
>So all we have is your memory of a discussion of an alleged Army regulation of

>a half-century ago. We have the name of one officer, who is unavailable to
>comment today.
>
>The Army is not the entire "Armed Forces of the United States", btw.

The US Army is the largest US military branch, about 100 thousand
more than the US Navy, the next largest branch.

You've never worn any US military uniform in service of your country.

>It has been clearly shown in another post that the level of Morse skill
>required of Morse-skilled US military radio operators was far, far, FAR above
>that required to pass the current amateur test.

Too many "fars" in your sentence, Rev. Jimmie.

>And what difference does my military experience or lack therof have on the
>simple fact that:
>
>The "Armed Forces of the United States" used those aptitude tests to find
>the recruits who would be easiest to train to the skill level they required.
>The required military skill level was far, far, FAR above the 5 wpm amateur
radio
>code test.

Too many "fars" in your sentence, Rev. Jimmie.

You lack both military experience AND first-hand knowledge of
US military communications. As such you cannot possibly
compare US amateur radio requirements to what the US military
requires in communications.

>> Do not try to misdirect on "Technician Plus" testing. The "debate"
>> was on the NOVICE CLASS.
>
>Not misdirection at all. Just proof that your line of 'reasoning' is flawed.

It was misdirection and now you are trying to rationalize it.

I had no "flaw" in "reasoning." I just reminded you of what the
Subject line in the message header has.

You get SO sensitive to errors that you make!

>FCC closed off the Technician Plus class from new licensees even though it
>was growing steadily.

The only "closing" was of the class of license. No one had their
license grant removed or anything else. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

The message header line says "Novice Class" in the Subject line.

It doesn't say "Technician Plus." Tsk, tsk, try to focus.

>Not at all. The Technician class was also growing. Still is, in part due to
the
>renewal of all Technician Plus licenses as Technician.

Irrelevant.

The message header line says "Novice Class" in the Subject line.

It doesn't say "Technician Plus." Tsk, tsk, try to focus.

>>>> The decrease in license numbers was so much and for so
>>>> long that it was obvious to all who bothered to examine that
>>>> Class. The FCC dropped the Novice Class from any new
>>>> license grants following the recent restructuring.
>>>
>>>The FCC also dropped the Technician Plus and Advanced Class from any new
>>>license grants in the same restructuring.
>>
>> Irrelevant again.
>
>Not irrelevant at all. Technician Plus class was growing, yet it was closed to
>new applicants, just like the Novice.

Irrelevant.

The message header line says "Novice Class" in the Subject line.

It doesn't say "Technician Plus." Tsk, tsk, try to focus.

>> ARRL statements for several years prior to 1991 did not
>> think so...they were pushing the NOVICE Class as the
>> "entry" license. They continued to do that for several
>> years following.
>
>Where is that stated explicitly?

In the editorial pages of QST...in the ads for ARRL filling in
space in the rest of QST...for years.

Novice Class license was considered the "entry level" class
to begin the amateur radio experience in the USA according
to ARRL documents.

That has changed in the last few years.

If you need it more "explicit" you ought to go to porn sites.
:-)

>>>> The only US amateur radio license class that kept growth in
>>>> US amateur radio license totals was the no-code-test
>>>> Technician Class.
>>>
>>>Incorrect.
>>
>> Sorry. VERY CORRECT.

>
>Sorry. Incorrect.

Poor baby. Crying his lil heart out, banging his lil fists on the
keyboard...wah, wah, wah, I'm correct and you are wrong, wah,
wah, wah!

All those numbers were given some time ago in here and you
just refused to acknowledge them. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> Two hundred thousand NEW
>> no-code Technician Class licenses between 1991 and
>> mid-2000 make you very wrong.
>
>How do you know that all of those Technicians were not code-tested?

1. There is NO morse code test required to achieve the pre-
Restructuring Technician Class license.
2. It wouldn't make any difference to you if all were polled
for past ham testings since you would refuse to accept
such information and keep trying to make a Big Case
out of your fantasies.
3. See the message header Subject line up there?

>More important, how do you know that none of those who obtained a Technician
>license in that period would have done so if a code test was involved?

How do I know you are fully rational and not insane?

I don't and there are many hints in your posting and preoccupation
with accepting only desired data and rejection of other data
against your viewpoints. I'll put you down as "borderline."

>What does your crystal ball say?

Do you believe in "crystal balls?" I think you are progressing
towards insanity.

I don't have "crystal balls." Do you have "crystal balls?"

>>>The above 'alternate history' statement assumes that none of those who
obtained
>>>Technician Class licenses after February 1991 would have done so if that
>>>license had not lost its code test. That is clearly incorrect.

I'm beginning to wonder if you worked with the Iraqi Ministry of
Information prior to March 9, 2003. There's an eerie resemblance
of rhetoric of yours to theirs.

Try to remember what happened to that government.

>> You cannot possibly know the motivations
>> of two hundred thousand no-code Technican Class licensees.
>
>Neither can you, Len. Yet you ASSUME none of them would have gotten amateur

>radio licenses if a code test were involved.

Okay, Mr. Minister, PROVE that they were eager and ready to take
code tests. Beyond a shadow of a doubt. :-)

>How? Was there no growth in the number of US hams from 1980 to 1990?

Not in the Novice Class.

Remember that message header Subject line? What it say?

Didn't say anything about totals of licenses, did it?

>How do you explain the FACT that US amatuer radio grew as much in the '80s
>(when all licenses required a code test and there were no code test waivers)
as
>it did in the '90s (with waivers and a class of license without a code test)?

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

There is NO "amatuer" radio in the USA, not now, not ever.

If you keep making all these errors and mistakes, no one will
take you seriously...

>Then explain the FACT that US amatuer radio grew as much in the '80s (when all
>licenses required a code test and there were no code test waivers) as it did
in
>the '90s (with waivers and a class of license without a code test).

See? You did it again. Bad puppy...

>Then explain the FACT that US amatuer radio grew as much in the '80s (when all
>licenses required a code test and there were no code test waivers) as it did
in
>the '90s (with waivers and a class of license without a code test).

Number 3 in a series. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Not at all. You are the one who cannot admit a mistake.

I know how to spell "amateur," mistah perfect. :-)

>Nope. It's the credibility of the source that matters. You don't have much.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the mighty resort to personal attacks when
outraged. Their typing goes into rage-induced error mode again.
:-)

Poor baby.

>The fact is that YOUR statements are suspect due to your long history of
>unadmitted mistakes and faulty reasoning.

Poor baby. Are you living in the same remote galaxy as das Oberst?

608. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131430.18775.00000512@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66760

In article <b9c2hd$hb6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Seems to be in a rut don't he?
>
>I don't give a flying PHUCK how many licenses you do or have held. THIS IS
>A AMATEUR RADIO GROUP.
>
>Must I continue TURNIP?

How does one "turnip," mistah morseman? :-)

Shouldn't that be "turniping" instead?

Looks like your tuning wasn't quite right...final wasn't neutralized
and went into oscillation. Bad operating practice. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Remember: Peak the grid and dip the plate.

Beep, beep.

609. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131431.18775.00000513@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66758

In article <20030507231442.21674.00000768@mb-m16.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>> Sometimes I wonder why the FCC puts up with amateurs.
>
>Right now. Some Hams have this bold overconfident attitude. Expecially those CW
>lovers that want to impose CW on others.

Those "some" are the Gang of Four plus big DICK.

>Once day FCC might want some real reasons to keep the hobby (for example,
>actually succeeding in 97.1 goals). Then those Hams may not be so
>overconfident.

Won't happen in the morsemen's life experience. They will resist
until the last morse key is pried from their cold dead fingers. :-)

Morsemen sort of remind me of the Borg and their Collective hive
mind...except the Borg are more handsome. :-)

610. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131432.18775.00000514@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66759

In article <20030507233503.21674.00000771@mb-m16.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Mighty morsemen are not only maintaining this Archaic Radio-
>> telegraphy Society but are also living in a Fantasyland, one
>> where everything stopped advancing when they were first
>> licensed. They cannot understand progress, only their own
>> stunted abilities bound up in a unique, singular skill that is no
>> longer needed in the rest of the radio world or all society.
>
>Here is one theory on that. This theory is also known outside amateur radio.
>Its the "oppressed outcast".

That analogy seems applicable.

>They know their skill is useless in industry, emergency communications, and
>even amateur radio (except as their artificial validation).

Yes and no. Most mighty morsemen are very proud of their
mighty skill...but that may blind them from the harsh reality
of all other radio services dropping morse as a communications
mode or never even considering it in the beginning.

>They know society would not care about Morse code skill. Also, many Hams tend
>to be fat, anti-social. Ham radio is where these people can turn the tables
>around.

One person operating a radio alone is the usual picture of being
"in the shack."

CW operators have absolutely no human-sense clue to another
distant operator except through the monotonic aperiodic tones
in their ears. No other audible clues, no voice tones, inflections,
dialect, patois that all other humans hear in normal verbal
communications.

That sort of aloneness allows them a great deal of time to spend
imagining things about the CW distant operator...as well as
imagining things about themselves. The distant operator could
very well be of opposite gender than what they stated...there's no
way to determine that through monotonic beeping of CW.

>So, they take a learnable skill and claim superiority for learning this one
>skill.

That may be their only claim. :-)

>They can claim they are superior to BSEEs, when BSEEs can design
>circuits and all they do is operate.

I could, and was designing circuitry for pay a number of years
before I got my degree. Education, acquired skill in theory,
actual practice in electronics hardware is not dependent on an
accreditation from an academic institution.

>They use this to block entry to a higher class license.

That's a survival tactic. Such is necessary to insure survival of
their rank, status "above" the mundane.

>Code lovers, or "clovers", recruit new members with the strong
>desire to learn this skill.

Another survival tactic, preservation of the "tribe." :-)

>Now, the oppressed outcast is superior in this context.

A very limited context, but they survive and that is the basic
motivation of all humans.

611. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:14:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508131432.18775.00000515@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66761

In article <Xns9374A04FB7068elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>>>> BZZZZZZZT! wrong again. Soon after the CB call was
>>>> issued they reverted to a spec category of random intended call
>>>> signs per an agreement with the ITU.
>>>
>>>CB is not recognised by the ITU as a service
>>
>> Sure it is, Alun. "Land Mobile". Regradless of what "service"
>> name we give it in the United States, that's the category it falls
under.
>
>True insofar as it goes, but I meant it's not recognised as a separate
>service. Unlike, say ... amateur radio, for example.

Throughout Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, the word
"service" is a regulatory term denoting the type and kind of
radio activity being regulated.

Some radio amateurs have become obsessed with their own
"importance" in a hobby and recreational activity, self-elevating
themselves into some "higher service" to their community,
equivalent (in their minds) to "in service to the nation" or even
"in service to their fellow man." :-)

The really far-out fantasizers want to misuse the "service"
word of regulations as somehow equivalent to military service.
Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

612. ARNewsline 1342 - May 2 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 17:44:35 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508134435.03359.00000027@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66762

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1342 - May 2, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1342 with a release date of Friday, May 2 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. An all ham crew takes over the International Space Station, another new record on 136 Kilohertz and the FCC asks the Amateur Auxiliary to help clean up the 10 meter band. Find out more on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1342 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: TWO-MAN EXPEDITION 7 HAM RADIO CREW ARRIVES AT ISS

A two ham Expedition 7 crew arrived at the International Space Station on April 28th to replace the crew currently on board. Amateur Radio Newsline's Roy Neal, K6DUE, has the rest of the story:

- -

There are five men in the crew aboard the International Space Station. Those numbers ARE different. Now that U S Space Shuttles are temporarily out of commission, the Russian Soyuz has been pressed into service as a ferry. Much of its space is filled with food and supplies and the crew size has been cut from 3 down to 2 for the time being.

Two men...cosmonaut Yuri Malenchenko, RK3DUP and astronaut Ed Lu, KC5WKJ, have arrived....the first teamever to get to the I S S aboard a Russian spacecraft. They will replace 3 men...Commander Ken Bowersox, KD5JBP, Don Pettit, KD5MDT, and Nikolai Budarin, RV3FB. That team is scheduled to fly back to earth on the third of May, using a Soyuz that has been docked in orbit since the Columbia shuttle disintegrated killing all seven people on board.

A NASA investigation apppears to be centering on a piece of foam insulation as the cause of disaster...foam that broke loose during liftoff, hitting the Shuttle's left wing.

A final report on the accident may be several more months in coming. Until then Russia's Soyuz is the only crew transport to and from the i s s and the International Space Program has slowed to a mere trickle of its former self. Space officials of the 9 countries directly concerned with building and flying the shuttle are optimistic, saying the delay gives them time better to prepare for the very complex missions of the next ten years.

Roy Neal, K6DUE

--

The two man Expedition 7 crew will spend the next six months on-orbit conducting scientific experiments. Because of the reduced workload they may also have more time for additional ham radio operations and especially school contacts from space. (ARNewsline™ from published reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR AUXILIARY ASKED TO ASSIST FCC IN 10 METER CLEAN-UP

Back on Mother Earth, the FCC has asked the assistance of the ARRL' s Amateur Auxiliary as part of a clean-up of illegal users of the 10 meter band. In a memorandum issued on April 28th, FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, asks the Auxiliary's help for the next 6 months in identifying any unlicensed operation using the 10 meter Amateur spectrum.

From May through October Auxiliary members will be tasked with monitoring the band to determine whether interlopers are domestic business entities. This includes trucking companies, truckers or other individuals who are not licensed to be in the band or simply not licensed at all.

The FCC is not requesting that Auxiliary members provide direction finding. Hollingsworth does ask that where possible that Auxiliary members provide the names and cities of the operators, and license plate numbers and state if the interfering signal is coming from a vehicle.

The project has been assigned case number 2003-583 and Hollingsworth does ask Auxiliary members to use their best judgment as to whether to include tape recordings of what they monitor. Authority to use the ham radio volunteers in this investigation comes under the terms of long standing agreement between the FCC's Field Operations Bureau and the American Radio Relay League. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: 11 METER OPERATION BRINGS FCC WRATH TO IDAHO HAMS

Meantime, the FCC has let a trio of Idaho amateurs know that unlicensed operation outside Amateur Radio frequencies could lead to revocation of their ham tickets. Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has more:

--
The ARRL Letter reports that FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, recently wrote three Boise amateurs, citing allegations that they had transmitted without a license on several frequencies near the 11 meter Blass D CB band.

Letters went out March 17 to Dave Every, KD7QAS; John F. Hail, KD7QAW; and Tom M. Sjoberg, KD7RCS. Every holds a General ticket, while Hail and Sjoberg are Technician licensees.

According to Hollingsworth, the Commission has information indicating that the three hams transmitted without a license on 26.350, 27.420 and 27.700 MHz using SSB and SSTV. These three frequencies involved are above and

below the 11 meter Citizens Radio Band.

Hollingsworth letter pointed out that in addition to the possibility of license revocation proceedings being undertaken, fines for unlicensed operation could also be imposed. These normally range from $7500 to $10,000.

For the Amateur Radio Newslione, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

Hollingsworth says he understands that the unlicensed operations have ceased. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: KANSAS STATION OWNER FINED

The FCC has fined Maria L. Salazar, licensee of Station KTCM - FM in Kingman, Kansas, and owner of an antenna structure near Spivey, Kansas, thirty-nine thousand dollars. This, for what the Commission says are willful and repeated violations of the Communications Act and of the Commission's Rules. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has the details:

--
Specifically, the regulatory agency says that Maria L. Salazar operated a radio station from an unauthorized location and that she failed to maintain prescribed obstruction lighting on an antenna structure. But thats not all. Te FCC says that she also failed to install and maintain Emergency Alert System equipment at the station, failed to maintain a main studio at an authorized location and failed to maintain a public inspection file.

By way of background, on July 18, 2002, the Commission issued a Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture -- better known as a fine -- in the amount of $39,000 to Salazar. Although she received a copy of the N-A-L, she never filed a response. So the FCC has now affirmed the fine and ordered Salizar to -- pay up.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

The FCC has instructed its Enforcement Bureau to do a follow-up investigation to determine whether Salazar has come into compliance. If not, further enforcement action will be taken. That could include the possibility of a license revocation proceeding. (FCC)

**
Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the New Orleans VHF Club's W5MCC 146.86 repeater serving greater New Orleans, Louisiana.

(5 sec pause here)

**

FCC BEGINS INQUIRY REGARDING BROADBAND OVER POWER LINES

The FCC has also launched an inquiry into the use of existing power lines to send and receive broadband data by carrier current as some old timers might call it.

According to Bob Gonsett's CGC Communicator, two different Broadband over Power Line or B-P-L techniques are being considered. "Access B-P-L" uses 1,000 to 40,000 volt power lines to bring Internet and other broadband data to homes and offices. "In-House B-P-L" uses existing electric utility wiring to network computers and printers - as well as smart appliances - within a building.

CGC notes that today's chip sets for this application are capable of generating RF out to at least 80 MHz using advanced modulation techniques and high data rates. The question of radio frequency interference to authorized spectrum users including Amateur Radio will be an important consideration as these systems are looked at by the FCC.

More is at the FCC's website at:
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-233537A1.doc
and http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-100A1.doc
(CGC Communicator)

**

HAM RADIO TESTING: NCVEC REMOVES PSK31 QUESTION FROM POOL

The NCVEC Question Pool Committee has withdrawn the use of a test question has in the Technician pool scheduled for use starting July 1st. The querstion designated number T2B17 deals with PSK-31 communications technology.

Again, this is for the new Technician class exam that goers into service on July 1st. The committee says that it apologizes for any inconvenience. (NCVEC)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC REFUSES TO EXPAND THE NCE FM BAND

The FCC has declined to expand the Non-Commercial Educational FM or NCE broadcast. This, band beyond its current limits of 88.1 to 91.9 MHz.

Specifically, the FCC says that television Channel 6 which runs from from 82 to 88 MHz will not be used for NCE radio. Nor will the upper end of the current NCE band be expanded to 93.9 Mhz.

That said, the agency has indicated the expansion issue could be revisited in another FCC proceeding. (CGC Communicator)

**

RADIO LAW: CALIFORNIA PRB-1 LIKE LAW ON TRACK

ARRL Southwestern Division Director Art Goddard, W6XD, reports that the California limited antenna structure protection measure passed the state Assembly on a vote of 67 to nothing on April 10th. Writing in the division electronic newsletter, Goddars days that the bill, patterned after the ferderal P R B One, was then sent to the state Senate where it received its first reading. It now awaits assignment to a Senate committee and further action. (ARRL SW Div. Newsletter)

**

HAM RADIO IN CYBERSPACE: MIZUHO WEBSITE BACK UP

KU4QD says over the VHF Reflector that the unofficial English language Mizuho website is back up. This site is dedicated to Mizuho built ham radio gear and contains a wealth of reference material that's hard to find anywhere else.

For those of you who don't know about Mizuho, it is a family run business started by a former Trio engineer over 30 years ago. The company is best known for its HF and VHF SSB and CW monoband handhelds. These were manufactured from 1981 until 2002. The company also made some VHF base and portable SSB/CW rigs.

KU4QD says that some of the manuals and schematics haven't been uploaded yet, but everything else is there, including more new pictures and specs for various Mizuho gear. And , oh yes. You will find the website at www.mizuhoradio.com (VHF Reflector)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: K8JE TO SPEAK AT MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY ARC

ARRL Great Lakes Division Director Jim Weaver, K8JE, will visit the Murray State University Amateur Radio Club at the club's May 6 meeting. Weaver will talk on Amateur Radio today and as it will be in the future and all radio amateurs in western Kentucky are invited. The venue is the Freed Curd Auditorium of the I & T Building on the Murray State campus at 7 p.m. local time. Murray State University is located in Murray Kentuckey. For directions contact Ron Ladd by e-mail to UBX@Webtv.net or visit campus.murraystate.edu/org/msuarc (Via e-mail)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: COLORADO IN MAY

The 2003 ARRL Rocky Mountain Division Convention is slated for May 30, 31 and June 1st at the Holiday Inn Estes Park Conference Center. League President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, is slated to be the featured speaker at Saturday Night's Banquet. For more information take your web browser to www.hamconcolorado.org (Via e-mail)

**

HAPPENING AT HAMVENTION 2003r - THE AMSAT FORUM

This years Dayton Hamvention AMSAT Forum will place special emphasis on the status of new satellite projects such as Phase III E and the Eagle ham satellites which are currently being designed. The speakers list so far includes Rick Hambly, W2GPS, Bdale Garbee, KB0G and Gould Smith, WA4SXM, to name only a few.

This years AMSAT Forum will be on will be on Saturday, May 17th from 8:15 to 9:45 EDT in HARA Arena Meeting Room 1. The session is always standing room only. More is on the web at http://www.amsat.org/amsat/activities/dayton (AMSAT)

**

HAPPENING AT HAMVENTION 2003r - THE ANNUAL TOWN MEETING

And Amateur Radio Newsline is again teaming up with the Hamvention to bring you another in its ongoing series of Ham Radio Town Meetings. Ken Lock, N8PJN, has the details:

--

This years topic is how to make Amateur Radio more friendly for kids so that they will stay in the hobby. Our keynote speaker is Mr. Audio himself -- Bob Heil, K9EID. Bob has been a ham since he was a youngster and has some definite ideas on this subject.

Other presenters include New York Educator Carole Perry, WB2MGP, Philadelphia KYW Radio personality Mark Abrams, NT3V and his son - 2002 Young Ham of the Year award recipient Josh Abramowicz, KB3GWY. Josh will cover scouting and its relationship to ham radio youth.

From Florida Richard Paczkowski, Jr., KF4BIA, will be joining us. Richard was our 1998 Young Ham of the Year award winner. He will talk about ways the Internet can be used to interest kids in the hobby.

Others on the speakers roster are Gary Pearce, KN4AQ, of the ARRL's Public Relations Committee and Keith Glispie, WA6TFD, of Suite Sixteen Post in Burbank California. Glispie is a true Amateur Radio success story that took him from a teenage ham to the co-owner of one of televisions most sought after editing facilities.

Also joining us will be John Creel, WB3GXW, who is the outgoing Chairman of the NCVEC and 2003 Radio Amateur of the Year Larry "Tree" Tyree, N6TR, talking about the ham radio children's holiday he created called Kids Day.

And as always there will be door prizes. This year the goodies include an 2 meter HT courtesy of Alinco and a mini-bom-box AM, FM, Cassette radio from Jensen.

So, please join us at Hamvention 2003 for this special session dedicated to making ham radio a friendlier world for the younger set. Rember, kids are the future of the hobby.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Ken Locke, N8PJN.

--

The Ham Radio Town Meeting is from 1 to 3 P.M on Saturday May 17th. The venue is the HARA Arena in Dayton Ohio in meeting room 3. We hope to see you there. (ARNewsline™)

**

HAM RADIO MOVIES: FIELD DAY `71 - REDUX

Two weeks ago we told you that the famed Palisades Amateur Radio Club movie "Field Day 1971" had surfaced after almost two decades in hiding. Now, Southern California hams can get to see it again on Wednesday evening, May 14th. This, in a special screening hosted by the Santa Clarita Amateur Radio Club and Amateur Radio Newsline.

"Field Day 1971" was produced by George Hively, W6GRH, -- then WA6YEA -- over thirty years ago. His half-hour movie is a tongue-in-cheek look at the way one of the regions most famous radio clubs of the 20th century held forth annually to conquer the vagaries of the Ionesphere while having a jolly old time. Or, was it just having a jolly old time with some radios thrown in as an excuse for a hilltop party? Only this movie knows for sure!

The venue chosen for the screening is the City Council Chambers in the City of Santa Clarita California at 7 p.m. Pacific Daylight time. Talk in will be on the 146.79 W6JW repeater. The repeater uses an access tone is 123.0 Hz.

There is only room for about 190 people, so seating will be first-come, first served, with one expeption. If you are a former Palisades Amateur Radio Club member and want to reserve a seat please e-mail wa6itf@arnewsline.org. For more information on the Santa Clarita Amateur Radio Club and the meeting, take your web browser over to www.w6jw.org and click on the word "announcements." (ARNewsline™)

**
BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO RECORDS: FIRST GM TO YU ON 136 KHX

Another new record has been set on 136 Kilohertz. This, as a ham in Scotland contacts his counterpart in Yugoslavia. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has more:

--

Simon Lewis, GM4PLM, completed the first Scotland to Yugoslavia LF contact on the 20th of April. At 2228 UTC on Sunday, Simon had a two-way contact

with Teo, YU7AR, on 137.7kHz.

Simon was using equipment left behind by David Bowman, G0MRF, when the UK 73kHz record was broken, as reported on GB2RS two weeks ago.

GM4PLM is currently the only known GM active on the 136kHz band and at present is using a 125-metre long wire antenna. He plans to improve the antenna system over the summer in preparation for trans-Atlantic tests next winter.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH

--

After completeing the QSO, Lewis paused to thank G0MRF and G3GRO for their help, and for the donation of equipment to allow him to become active on the 136kHz band. (GB2RS)

**

ON THE AIR: SPECIAL EVENT - 58 YEARS SINCE WW-2

On the air, members of the Crimea Contest Club will activate special event station, EO58JM, from the Ukraine between May 5th to the 11th. Their operation is to celebrate the 58 years since World War II. QSL's via KG6AR. (OPDX)

**

ON THE AIR: CELEBRATING SIBERIA

And keep an ear out for special event stations using the call signs UE9OWQ and UE9ORQ to be active between May 10th to the 18th. This to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Radio Prim Correspondence club in Siberia. The two stations are also expected to be on between June 28th to the 30th for the 110th anniversary of the capital city of Novosibirsk Siberia. For more details and on how to receive a special certificate, visit www.nsk.su/~rpc/eh.htm (OPDX)

**

ON THE AIR: THE OREGON QSO PARTY 2003

The 2003 Oregon QSO Party will take place on Saturday, May 10 beginning at 14:00 UTC. Sponsored by the Central Oregon DX Club, the object is to work stations in Oregon, and for Oregon stations to work the world. For full information select the Oregon QSO Party link on the Central Oregon DX Club web page at www.codxc.org (K2DI)

**

DX

In DX, CT1CPP is active as S92UN from Sao Tome and Principe for the next three months. Suggested frequencies are 14.270, 21.270 and 28. 470 MHz on SSB. QSL as directed on the air.

And thirteen members of the F6KOP club station will be active as TM7R from Groix Island through the 12th of May. The operation will be on the HF, VHF and UHF bands using CW, SSB, PSK 31, RTTY and Slow Scan TV.

Lastly, the visit by Bill Burton, T88BA, to the South-West Island of Palau, scheduled been postponed until next month, The reason: A lack of money for fueling the government ship that was to carry him. (DX via OPDX and GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: TALKING TO A NOT SO SILENT S.K.

And finally this week, have you ever talked with a Silent Key? Believe it or not we have. His name is Ray Ortgiesen, WF1B, and last week he was named as an honored Silent Key by the planners of this years Dayton Hamvention. But as you will hrear, Ray is very much alive, well and and delighting the honor:

--

Ortgiesen: "I'm enjoying it so far. Its been quite a gas to get phone calls and e-mail's from so many people concerned about my health."

--

Why is the not so Silent Key recieving all these health and welfare inquiries? Well, heres the story in a nut-shell.

Back in the 1980's, in the Neanderthal days of home computing, Ray wrote RTTY. This program soon became the leading contest software for computerized radio teletype. And last week the Dayton Hamvention decided to honor him by nameing him as one of a group of Silent Key Award recipients. But Ray as we already know, Ray is still very much among the living and his first chore was letting everyone know he was still here.

--

Ortgeisen: "Its been fun. I did send out some e-mails as soon as I found out that it was publicized. I sent out e-mails on the of the major reflectors grearting them from the other side and leetting them know that I was fine, and obviously there was a mistake made."

--

Mistake or not, Ray is now an official walking, talking and breathing Silent Key. So we asked him if he had any special wish for the future of the hobby:

--

Ortgeisen: "I hope with the coming of digital and especially computerization that we can keep people interested in radio."

--

And as to the award itself? WF1B, had these -- er -- parting words:

--

Ortgeisen: "Its nice to know that folks considered me for this award, and I am happier to know it being alive, than not ever having known this fact had I indeed been a Silent Key."

--

How the mistake nameing Ortgiesen as a Silent Key Award winner is not clear. But no matter. Ray says that he' kind of enjoying the honor of being this years Dayton Hamvention -- not so silent -- "Silent Key." (ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline™. Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's™ only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline™, P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2003 Amateur Radio Newsline™ Young Ham of the Year is now open. No significant changes from last year. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our new special website at www.yhoty.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline™ is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

613. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 18:27:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBAA206.9FBEE8D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66763

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Other
> >> interests, such as radio direction finding use more physical activity.
>
> >What does your theory prove?
>
> Simple.

I agree.

> Hams like contesting instead of radio direction finding.

Your theory doesn't prove that.

> Contesting is both more boring, and requires less physical activity.

Your theory doesn't prove that.

> The interesting activities happen to require more physical activity.

Your theory doesn't prove that nor does it establish which activities
are interesting.

> Hams contest more and do radio direction finding less.

Your theory doesn't prove that.

> This makes Hams boring and fat.

Your theory doesn't prove that.

Let me ask you again, Vipul, are you an adult?

Dave K8MN

614. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 19:23:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heksn6n.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66764

On 08 May 2003 13:57:19 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>This would require some sort of international convention on what "citizens
>band" should be. There ae countless users of "land mobile" radio, and trying
>to define each and every one of them would be a never-ending task.

>CB has rules on power and distances authorized, but the FCC thinks it can
>dictate physics...It was foolish in the 1950s, and even more foolish today!

In the 1950s, the FCC's experience with "mass radio operators"
was primarily with amateur radio, and they expected the new
"CB" operators to be as respectful of rules and limitations as
the hams were at that time. The enforcement resources were
large enough then to take care of the small amount of violators
that did emerge in the 1960s. They could not foresee or
plan for the the roguishness of the violations and violators
(the "10-4 good buddy" crowd) which emerged in the 1970s.

By the mid-1970s (when I still had contacts at the ITU) it was
apparent that the rest of the world's radio regulators (an "old
friends' club" who knew each other from all the international
conferences they attended) resented the U S for foisting "C B
Radio" on the world's communications scene and failing to keep
a tight rein on the operators. Some of us guessed that they would
find a way to register their displeasure, and so it happened -
at some conference procedural vote (the details escape me now),
everyone else voted against the U S position - a signal, perhaps....

Remember that in those days most of the world's nations felt
that "the average citizen" had as much right to or need for
uncontrolled personal radio communications as they had for a
machine gun. I'm sure that there are many nations that still
have that attitude in spite of today's easy-to-come-by technology.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

615. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 19:23:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hekth7o.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66765

On 08 May 2003 14:25:38 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Check ICAO Phil. Full ID is required on initial contact, then abbreviate
>callsigns may be used once positive ID has been established.

The FCC Rule - s. 87.107(a)(3) - is fully compliant with that.

I don't think that we differed on that point, Steve.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

616. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 20:26:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508162657.04525.00000434@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66766

In article <b9aohc$h4an8$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Okay.... then next question for ya, for the sake of argument. Who says that
>the ARRL's suggestions meet within the bounds of "good amateur practice"
>then?

ARRL.

They've been saying that for decades. :-)

617. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 20:26:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508162657.04525.00000433@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66767

In article <3EB9DE8D.76690E65@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Oops! You engaged fingers in typing before actually reading "my drive".
>I don't have to tolerate 120+ db engine noise on my property on Sunday
>mornings.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Didn't you "hone your skills" in Vietnam?

Just go out there and apply those war-honed skills on getting
rid of the noise makers.

I'll bet you could do "20 over" their noise just by shouting orders
at them. Strap those jack boots real tight and hit 140 db! :-)

Show them who's boss!

618. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 20:26:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508162658.04525.00000435@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66768

In article <c2356669.0305080809.a3c011e@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (Miccolis of Borg) writes:

>In other words, the answer to my questions is "YES".

Jimmie seems to be having some sort of split personality in here arguing with himself. He sets up some conditions and asks loaded questions, answers them and presumes such to apply to another person. Strange...

That might be an interesting dialogue in a one-person stage performance. Do you need an agent? :-)

>You want me, and
>anyone else who disagrees with you, to shut up and go away so you can
>rant on and on here without opposition or anyone pointing out the
>factual errors and invalid logic in your postings.

Is that what I want? I don't think so.

Poor Jimmie feels hurt. His words are golden gifts of true wisdom that all should feel, appreciate, revere and worship. Opposition shall not be tolerated. Resistance is futile.

Hmmm...the Borg are back...

619. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 20:27:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508162700.04525.00000436@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66769

In article <3EB9EB82.26D4CD9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <E.T. of
the Borg?> writes:

>> Okay, we've established that little Davie didn't have an MOS
>> while in Vietnam bravely serving his country.
>
>We didn't establish it, I established it. You screwed it up totally by
>feeding us a load of misinformation about the armed services having
>"MILITAY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES", not ratings, Little Leona.

"MILITAY?" E.T. was in the Militay? What is that?

>> Box moving doesn't require going through military schools.
>>
>> >Uh, isn't that what you're all about?
>>
>> No. I'm trying to stay focussed on this thread's Subject, not
>> the brave, valorous military service life of little Davie Heil.
>
>Actually, as is your norm, you've drifted very far afield from the
>thread's subject in an effort to impress someone (an unwitting
>individual may step forward at any time) with your vast knowledge of
>things military. My response to you mentioned nothing about my "brave
>valorous military service life", Little Leonid. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor
>baby.

You did not move boxes?

>> >Where has that been indicated in this post or any other by Jim?
>>
>> Only in about five-plus years of posting by the mighty morsemen.
>
>I didn't ask you about any "mighty morsemen". I asked you about Jim,
>N2EY.

A Beechcraft Bonanza aircraft is also called "Jim?" Strange.

Male owners usually call their material things by feminine
names.

Must be something in E.T.'s far-away galactic society not
familiar to us Terrans.

>> It's all in Google. If you need a refresher, go there and look for
>> a month or so.
>
>T'aint there. You fabricate.

Impossible. I can't change contents of the Google site.

>> >Ever hear of the Navy "A" and "B" schools?
>>
>> No. I served 8 years in the United States ARMY.
>>
>> Do Navy "A" and "B" schools teach anything about amateur
>> Novice Class licenses?
>
>Does the ARMY teach anything about keeping your yap shut if you don't
>know anything about a subject? Apparently you don't know much about the
>Navy or the amateur Novice class.

E.T. wasn't in any Army. He doesn't know much about the Navy.

One wonders if E.T. knows anything about the US Air Force.

>> Could he do morse code?
>
>Could you?

Yes.

>See you're an awfully lot like Old Blood and Guts.

Did E.T. know General George Patton?

Where and when? Patton died well before the Southeast Asia
Live Fire Exercise.

>> Tell us about your Novice Class amateur radio experiences in
>> Vietnam, mighty morse warrior. Did you "hone your skills" there?
>
>I was a Novice seven years before my arrival in Viet Nam at age 21.

Practiced box moving in snack bars, did you?

>My
>amateur radio skills and military skills were already honed prior to my
>arrival.

Marvelous. A "hone-y-do!"

>Unlike your rear area service during the Korean War, I was
>actually stationed in the country where the conflict was taking place.

Yes. Moving boxes in a snack bar.

>I love it when a fellow like you starts telling someone who didn't serve
>in the military about your having put your life on the line.

All US Army soldiers do that the minute they enlist...
regardless of where they are stationed as assigned.

How are we supposed to treat the vaporous implications
of meritorious service done by snack bar box pushers?

>You're a humbug.

On Terra we call our species Homo Sapiens. We aren't insects. We are humans.

Perhaps E.T.'s species is insect-like? With antennae attached to their ears 40 meters long?

Beep, beep.

620. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 20:27:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508162701.04525.00000437@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66770

In article <3EB9E4EA.E208808@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> It is required by LAW.
>> The FCC listens to ALL United States citizens.
>
>Accepting your input doesn't mean action to your liking will be
>forthcoming.

Not required. The point is not absolute acceptance, just that
the First Amendment of the United States Constitution is
still operating for all citizens of the United States.

You've heard of the United States Constitution?

Good.

I was afraid that you far-away galactic residents hadn't heard
about our insistence on Freedom and Rights in the United
States of America on Terra.

>> They aren't required to listen to extraterrestrials living in another
>> galaxy.
>
>I'll jot that down.

Always keep a pad and pencil handy, E.T., you might learn
something from us Terrans in our part of the galaxy.

>What in the world are you babbling about?

Do you need a Universal Translator? There are several available
surplus at Paramount Studios, Hollywood. Used in long-running
series of television shows involving space travel. Just the thing
for you, E.T.

>Maybe a change of scenery will do you good. Perhaps you can undertake
>self-appointed advocate status for another endeavor in which you are not
>a participant.

I like it here on Terra in the United States of America.

Here we can discuss laws of all kinds without "being participants."

We can all talk about felonies and misdemeanors without having
to commit such felonies or misdemeanors first.

I'm sorry that your far-away galactic society doesn't allow such
things.

>As has been pointed out to you a number of times, new amateurs
>absolutely cannot do as I did long ago. Under present licensing
>requirements, that is an impossibility.

Hmmm...the cognition assembly in my Universal Translator
seems to be malfunctioning. E.T. isn't translating well...

Perhaps E.T.'s society only communicates in on-off keying?

Their whole set of morals and ethics might be based on on-off
keying modes. That must be the cause of all the translation
problems.

>How so, Little Lenore? I didn't provide you an insincere wish.

E.T. definitely needs that Universal Translator! :-)

>Others cannot do as we did long ago.

True. "Spark" is outlawed in United States radio, all services.

>I think you're arrogant in your
>demands to change a radio service in which you are in no way involved,
>Little Lenore (Foghorn Lenhorn).

Tsk, tsk, tsk. How does changing a regulation on getting into
a licensed activity affect those who have already gotten in?

Oh, yes...it greatly affects the attitudes of those already
licensed...makes them less special and they cannot lord
their "superiority" over newcomers to a hobby. Understood.

>Just to be sure that I understand your
>position, we consider ourselves arrogant?

Absolutely. Positively. Without any trace of doubt.

Note: That's not an uncommon trait among some extra-
terrestrials...even delusions of godhood such as the
Goa'uld exhibit.

>I've received a revelation which tells me that you're a horse's ass.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

It is difficult for us terrestrials to differentiate among the other
galactic societies. Some act like Borg, some act like Goa'uld,
and now some pretend to be human rednecks tawking tuff.

>This newsgroup isn't about professional radio.

It seems to be a forum where mighty macho morsemen
can tawk tuff and pretend to be superior because of their
singular skill in beeping.

>This newsgroup isn't about professional radio and you aren't involved in
>amateur radio in any capacity.

Not even by inductive reasoning. "Resistance" is futile.

E.T. has achieved resonance with a godlike status.

He plays in tune to the music of the spheres and superiors.

>> There is NO need to test for morsemanship for an amateur radio
>> license just to satisfy the selfish desires of ALREADY licensed
>> amateurs.
>
>That isn't WHY it is THERE.

Of course that is why the morse code test is there.

The godlike superiors must be satisfied. All must do as They
command. They are superior for They have said so.

>You have no law enforcement powers over amateur radio and you are not
>involved in any way with amateur radio, yet you demand CONTROL over who
>shall get into amateur radio and HOW they should do so. Now THAT is a
>perverse "control freak" condition.

BZZZT! Wrong, E.T.

Removal of an outdated requirement in regulations represents a
freedom from the existing control freaks.

The US civil radio regulating agency, the one that grants amateur
radio licenses, agrees that the morse code test serves no useful
purpose to them. That has been stated in public by them in 1990
and again in 1999.

>You're just wasting time--yours and ours.

E.T., call home...get funding for the Universal Translator purchase.

You are wasting everyone else's time mumbling about support
for your subsides-for-the-superiors.

>You're long in the talk department and more than a little shy in the
>action department. You are seventy and you haven't made a move toward
>obtaining a license.

Everyone can see you are in desperate need for that Universal
Translator, E.T.

I got my first FCC radio license in 1956, remember? :-)

Maybe in your civilization it is required to commit a felony in
order to establish laws against it. That's not a requirement here
on Terra. We can talk about the requirements of getting into a
radio hobby without first getting into it. Really.

Sorry, I've not been able to identify your species yet. Are you
Goa'uld or Borg or some other unidentified species object?

Beep, beep. Call home, E.T., get that purchase order approved.

That's a nice little Extra Terrestrial...

621. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 21:04:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305081304.3bb13001@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66771

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hehle9c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 05 May 2003 16:23:21 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> > Fooling around with FAA database, found the following:
> >
> > N2EY 1967 BEECH V35, GIORDANO GARY M, VALLEY AL
> >
> > There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama!
>
> It's not an FCC call sign - it's an FAA registration number.

What's the fee for a vanity side number? OYeah, they're out there on
both the airwaves and the airways . . .

w3rv

622. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 21:24:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9ehsu$71r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66772

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030507202523.08129.00000574@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article
<636F898C60D8A3C5.AEB8600495885770.8FB2E087AA0A0ACC@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >I didn't hear or, at least, don't remember the item you mention. But,
NPR
> >is my choice of listening!
> >
> Didja hear the latest, Kim?
>
> Almost all of the US troops, and all of the US aircraft and other major
assets,
> are being pulled out of Saudi Arabia. Something like 100 military advisers
and
> training consultants will stay to help the Saudi military learn to use the
> hardware they bought from us.
>
> One of OBL's biggest beefs with the West was the presence of "infidel
> Crusader/Zionist armies" in the holy land of Arabia. Big recruiting tool -
note
> how many of the Sept 11 hijackers were Saudis. (I don't think any were
Iraqis).
> Soon all but a few of those "crusaders" will be gone. OBL gets his way?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Nice to see someone else noticed.

Dan/W4NTI

623. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 22:25:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508182522.08129.00000601@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 66774

In article <b9dh1c$i9hh0$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030507202522.08129.00000573@mb-m01.aol.com...
>> In article <b9aohh$h4an8$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>> > Bingo Jim,
>>
>> Tnx, Ryan
>> >
>> >This was a strong topic of discussion recently at a local continuing
>> >education credits session I went to as a requirement of my medical
>> >licensure. The typical lifestyle 50-75 years ago involved a hell of alot
>> >more work on a day-to-day basis, be it doing chores or having to work
>> >multiple jobs and that is not the same now.
>>
>> Doing chores, manual labor, walking at least part of the way rather than
>> driving, etc. Also, there was a lot less processed food around.
>>
>> Today we are surrounded by easy, inexpensive food that is bad for us.
>Check out
>> how much sodium, sugar, and bad fat is in most processed food. It's enough
>to
>> make carbohydrate addicts out of most of us!
>>
>> Most of all, getting fat was an expensive proposition back then!
>
>Gotta love those twinkies eh??

Around here we have Tastykakes. (that's the correct spelling)

>You are right though.
>
>> >Technology is partially to blame.....
>>
>> Exactly. It has made a sedentary lifestyle possible for millions of
>Americans.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> My target for tomorrow is to run 37 minutes.
>
>Without being chased???

HAW!

Did it, though. Home before 6 AM. Not a bad morning.

>Just kidding, I am getting the bike back out and
>trying to ride at least 1 hour per day, to help shed some of my winter
>weight.

I like to ride as well, but around here it's either do the workout before 6 AM
or forget it.
>
>Another societal factor is that in the "olden days" cities were small units
>with everything fairly close together.

Yup.

>Now for example, I drive 12 miles to
>work on a daily basis, as well as going to a local college for classes that
>is about 30 miles away. Back in those olden days, most places that a person
>needed to go to might have been only a three mile walk at best.

Yup.

Back in the 1870s, the Pennsylvania Railroad invented the idea of commuting out
here on Philadelphia's "Main Line". They bought up farmland along their
right-of-way, divided it up into building lots and sold them to well-to-do
businessmen who didn't want to live in the city anymore. PRR ran short,
frequent, fast trains to and from the city, and it became practical for at
least some of the population to live far from where they worked.

About that time or soon after, the PRR's main rival, the New York Central,
began doing the same thing in and around New York City. The Long Island Rail
Road (a PRR subsidiary) also got into the act.

In the decades that followed, New York City and Boston installed elevated
trains and subways, making it practical for almost everyone in those cities to
live far from where they worked. Other cities soon followed, with various forms
of trolley lines and interurbans. The automobile extended the process, but in
so doing helped create sprawl, congestion, pollution and long commutes.

>I sure as

[expletive deleted]

>would not want to have to walk that much during the average day (12+
>miles) as I would probably be spending as much time walking to work as being
>there!!
>
Let's see - 12 miles per day at 3 miles per hour is 4 hours per day walking!

73 de Jim, N2EY

624. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 23:16:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <GzBua.6299$3f7.4728386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66773

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030507235344.21674.00000773@mb-m16.aol.com...
> From: k4yz:
>
> > Also, he makes all these grandiose assertions about Amateur Radio (cult,
> >etc), and how "anti-social" Amateur Radio supposedly is, yet he's never
once
> >"enlightened" us with his on-the-air activities.
> >
>
> I've been on HF phone on 40 meters at an event I went to. Yes, they were
> cult-like in how they followed contest rules.
>
> One of them "protested" by making contacts that were taken out of the
contest.
> He then claimed he would submit these additional contacts as protest of
the
> contest removing those contacts.

So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the rules. Then that must mean the Olympics, pro football, state fair cooking contests, the Van Cliburn piano competition and every competition for anything in the world is a cult. If you do not follow the rules precisely in any competition of any sort, you will penalized or disqualified entirely. Considering competition a cult is very strange as one has the option not to compete. In cults, one has no option.

Competitions have rules so you can decide the winners. If you don't have rules, you can't determine winners or rankings. Without winners and rankings, you don't have a contest. It's an activity but not a competition.

I really should resist answering this troll but he's a lot more fun than Len Over 21.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

625. Re: ARNewsline 1342 - May 2 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-08 23:55:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508195528.11841.00000075@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66775

>HAM RADIO MOVIES: FIELD DAY `71 - REDUX

>His half-hour movie is a tongue-in-cheek look at
>the way one of the regions most famous radio clubs of the 20th century held
>forth annually to conquer the vagaries of the Ionesphere while having a
>jolly old time. Or, was it just having a jolly old time with some radios
>thrown in as an excuse for a hilltop party? Only this movie knows for
>sure!

A movie documentary showing real Hams in action! I would like to see that
movie.

626. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 00:00:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508200006.11841.00000076@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66776

From: k4yz:

>>Yes, they just stay at their radios, operating contests and random contacts,
>>while others are socializing.
>
> It's "comments" like this that betray your actual "experience" at
>Amateur
>Radio functions

No, I've been there. This is what the Hams did at the event I went to. It also fits what they are doing at Hamfests.

>Personally, I think you're making it up as you go to have the >appearance<
>of being factual.

No, I've been to field day. I've been to Hamfests. I've joined a random group of Hams recently. Hams have said the stuff I've mentioned.

627. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 00:05:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508200535.11841.00000077@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66777

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the
>rules.

Competition does not mean cult. The rules of this "contest" are cult like in nature. It requires you to "work" certain segments in certain ways for no apparent reason.

Also, he mentioned working some areas were "not proper". The contest rules do not forbid you from making EXTRA contacts, so why would certain contacts be not proper?

628. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 00:26:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508202615.11841.00000079@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66778

From K4YZ:

>Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
>Communications Commission.

Contests, while not FCC rules, should be followed exactly. The thing that makes it a cult is the arbitrary rules to "work" certain segments to collect points.

> I would not
>>recommend any EE join the hobby
> That's becasue you are narrow minded and selfish.

I honestly feel an EE would be frustrated with the hobby, like I was.

>>Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea.
> That's only because you are hopelessly narrowminded.

Hams only want to do their activities. They will pose for a homebrewing photo, but never want to homebrew.

>> Do you know what you call contest operators who do NOT operate "through
>>the night", Vippy?
>
> The answer is....
>
> LOOSERS!

That's what you call contest operators that DO operate through the night.

>"Cult-like" in following rules?

As I explained, there is no apparent reason for these rules. The contest rules are defined in a strange way.

>>One of them "protested" by making contacts that were taken out of the
>>contest.
>>He then claimed he would submit these additional contacts as protest of the
>>contest removing those contacts.
>
> Contests have time limits and contact criteria...It is those criteria
>against which participants are judged.
>

Okay, but he made additional contacts and submitted them to the contest as some kind of "protest". He wanted these contacts to be allowed.

He seems to understand the hidden meanings behind the contest rules. I sure don't.

> In other words, it's cheating.

Having EXTRA contacts than the contest asks for is not cheating.

>>One of the children, replied "I can get my 10-10 at the same time".
>>Then, the adult said "You don't want to do that. Its not proper".
>
> Obviously someone was trying to teach the child the rules of the
>contest.

No, EXTRA contacts are allowed. You can contact anyone using legal modes. He said that it is improper to make "10-10" contacts. Apparently, "10-10" contacts are improper in the Ham traditions!

>>The same child told another child, he was "not good enough" since he did not
>>know CW yet. The other child said he is in the process of learning CW.
>
> I think this was a VippyLie thrown in to try and validate the
>preceeding.

No, the child really said that. It is possible that children sometimes say these "insensitive" things and did not really mean it.

>WHY would someone bring a CB radio book to an Amateur Radio operating
>event

CB is just another operating frequency. It is not something evil as is often implied at different Ham meetings.

>>Anti-social in that they kept at their station, when there were plenty of
>>other
>>activities.

Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.

>>>.Yet NO ONE
>>>has ANY idea as to what "clubs" they are supposed to be, because even
>people
>>>who live in his neighborhood don't know what the heck he's talking about.

Believe me, they exist. I cant come up with all this info without actually going to club meetings and Hamfests.

629. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 01:30:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508213032.11841.00000085@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66779

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>As a person who is proud of their lack of participation in public
>service, which type are you?

Sorry, I am not proud of not doing public service. What I meant is I would not do these types of events - road races, etc.

630. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 01:35:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508213543.11841.00000086@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66780

From K4YZ:

>What self-depreiciating social stigma is associated with the use of
>Morse Code?

It shows you put effort into a non worthwhile skill. Thats why I don't want General Class license unless code requirement goes away.

>It's nice that you KNOW some EE's, Vipul...Don'tya wish you were one?

Yes, it would be nice. But I really don't need to be an EE. I will end up making more money in my new field.

631. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 01:40:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508214007.11841.00000087@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66781

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>Most of the
>hams I hang with could. Many of us have the proper vehicles to get to
>the good places to put up one of these. Ya gotta hang with the right crowd.

How do you find the "right crowd"?

632. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 01:48:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.helb2es.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66782

On 8 May 2003 14:04:37 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> It's not an FCC call sign - it's an FAA registration number.
>
>What's the fee for a vanity side number? OYeah, they're out there on
>both the airwaves and the airways . . .

Ask Steve...he's the expert on FAA registrations.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

633. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 01:48:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.helbcyt.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66783

On 09 May 2003 00:00:06 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>From: k4yz:
>
>>>Yes, they just stay at their radios, operating contests and
>>>random contacts, while others are socializing.

>>It's "comments" like this that betray your actual "experience" at
>>Amateur Radio functions
>
>No, I've been there. This is what the Hams did at the event I went to.
>It also fits what they are doing at Hamfests.

Those are major facets of ham radio. If that's not what you
want, find another hobby. If you want "socializing" join a dance
club where there are plenty of babes and let us hams do our hamming.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

634. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 01:48:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.helavjr.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66784

On Thu, 8 May 2003 12:26:20 -0400, Wayne Dagastino wrote:

>Ah, if it weren't for Phil's vitriolic remarks, often supported
>by one or two of his associates, this NG would be so
>uninteresting!

We aim to please.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

635. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 01:52:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <rRDua.5574$Gy.4219@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66785

Steve,

Back in the '50s, radios that operated much over 30 MHz were expensive and (compared to today's radios) quite insensitive. 11 meters wasn't used much by amateurs and was the 'radio junk bin' of that era (what is it ... Industrial, Scientific, Medical ... or something like that?). We take our 440 HTs for granted as well as cell phones. Back in the 60s, a tiny 440 rig was likely an aluminum box in the form of a 6 inch or larger cube with a 1 tube super regenerative receiver/transmitter in it. I saw one. Good for 1/4 mile - assuming you could find someone else with a similar setup. I'm trying to remember what was a good front end. Too many years. 6AF4? I forget, but 4 dB noise figure was decent. No, back then 27 MHz probably made sense to the FCC. Whether it has made any sense after the 50s or not ... well, make that after the 60s. There was still very active enforcement during the 60s. After that, it has been all down hill :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/03

636. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:16:12 UTC
From: Anonymous <Anon@anonnooneyouknow.com>
Message-ID: <b9f320kcj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66787

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.helb2es.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...

> Ask Steve...he's the expert on FAA registrations.....
>
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

Ahhh, therein is the basis of why this news group
provides endless free entertainment. Just about everyone
here considers himself an "expert" of some sort. a.k.a.
the clash of egos and an endless parade of primadonnas.
Too funny!

Anon

637. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:17:40 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508221740.11841.00000089@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66788

From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

>It is also rude to
>slow down a contester by asking for non-contest information such as say
>10-10 numbers when the contester is trying to run a pile up quickly and
>efficiently. So that would also be improper, i.e. distracting the
>competitor.

It had nothing to do with being efficient. The adult briefly gave some background info about the 10-10. The adult explained to me the 10-10 contacts were not desirable under any situation, contest or not. He did not want the child to try for that award.

Its improper because it did not fit the Ham traditions.

638. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:27:13 UTC
From: No Spam Please <larrystranlator@anaddress.net>
Message-ID: <5c4mbvses5pf2vijb7nc5i2ff11ipja2tt@4ax.com>
Source record: 66790

On 05 May 2003 00:44:11 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <bh5abvgvpn94snrqn5tlmugsk9fs97skea@4ax.com>, No Spam Please
><larrystranlator@anaddress.net> writes:
>
>>>That about covers it.
>>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>Yup it sure does
>
>Hey, "tranlator" (sic): Tranlate this -- No Spam Please is a big fat jerk!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>*** Is a "tranlator" anything like an Interocitor?
>

Don't you and your lover Robeson just wish you attack me personally.

Tanlate this Roll has been rolled.

FOaD

639. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:42:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030508224231.18755.00000588@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66791

In article <3EB86A01.7050401@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>>>Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
>>>
>>>>>regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.
>>>>
>>
>> A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general
>population.
>
> Mike Doesn't write this. Larry writes this. I don't write disparaging
>things about the obese.

Mike is correct. I write disparaging things about the obese. Obesity
is a self-chosen, self-inflicted condition which causes untold human
misery is an expensive social burden -- and the main reason why it is a
growing social problem is because of the politically-correct attitude that
obese people are unable to control themselves for reasons that are no fault of
their own.

Personally, I'd love to sit in front of the TV and put away a half-gallon of
ice cream every night myself. But I don't, because I realize that this is
destructive behavior. Obese people are obese because they eat too much
of the wrong foods. Perhaps a couple of percent of them have some
legitimate physical condition that contributes to their being overweight.
Obesity is not a good thing and I, for one, don't sugar-coat it (pun intended).

73 de Larry, K3LT

640. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:42:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030508224232.18755.00000589@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66793

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hehhb28.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>>Because a lot of hams get involved in this sort of thing in the
>>hope of being close to the "action" usually participated in by
>>the aforementioned groups, in spite of the fact that they are not
>>qualified to be policemen, firemen, or paramedics themselves.
>
> Tell that to the five ops that we had riding fire apparatus in
> a test of simplex radio suitability for tactical comms via RACES.
> It was all work and no play.....

Phil:

I'm sure they were in their glory, and loved every minute of it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

641. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:42:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030508224233.18755.00000590@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66792

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hehhfk9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>>The grandmother, who is the XYL of an active ham, who gets her No-Clue
>>Tech ticket and then carries her HT to the Walk-A-Thon is NOT my fellow
>>ham in any respect whatsoever.
>
> You are so right. She's a far better ham that you will ever be
> with your attitude.

Phil:

Only in the mind of someone who has forgotten what ham radio is supposed
to be about -- and has adopted the current New Age, politically-correct,
touchy-feely attitude that ham radio is all things to all people, and that we
get to pick and choose our level of knowledge and skill and still be considered
a full-fledged "Real Ham." The technically uninvolved "Public Service" types
are the exactly WRONG hams to be involved in Public Service. They are
the ones who will lose their ability to communicate the minute the strong,
full-quieting repeater goes down and their HT batteries go flat. If ALL the
repeaters in a 50-mile radius go down, which can happen in a large-scale
regional disaster, then what are they supposed to do? Stand around in their
International Day-Glo Orange jumpsuit with RACES and club patches and
look important? All I can say is, they'd better be damn good at looking
important!

I sorry if my attitude doesn't appeal to you. I'm just one of those
inconvenient,
politically-incorrect types who thinks radio amateurs need a full range of
technical and operational skills in order to be fully-capable emergency
communicators. Give the grandmother at the Walk-A-Thon an FRS HT
and she won't know the difference.

73 de Larry, K3LT

642. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:42:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030508224233.18755.00000591@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66794

In article <b9aohf$h4an8$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>How about encouraging more "bicycle mobiles" out there?? Hell, when I go
>riding, I throw an HT in a pocket just in case of an emergency. Once it
>actually came in handy, as I ran across someone who got stung by a bee on
>the local rail-trail, and was having a severe allergic reaction. Being able
>to bring up the autopatch, and getting emergency help there rather quickly
>probably their day a little better than if they had to wait alot longer to
>get help. True that this could have been done with a cellphone but I still
>rather carry the HT.

Ryan:

The cellphone is one heck of a lot more reliable for such "emergencies"
than an HT. If you own a cellphone but carry your HT instead of the cell,
then all you are doing is showing that you are a Ham Hero looking for a
piece of the action.

I own a cell phone but it is not activated. It is an old "bag phone" I bought
at a hamfest for $4.00, and I use it strictly for dialing 911 in case I
encounter
an "emergency" situation on the highway. I have owned it for several years,
and have used it exactly twice. Every now and then, I plug it in and dial
611 to verify it's operation by listening to the Verizon customer service
menu and occasionally talking to one of their support help people.

73 de Larry, K3LT

643. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:42:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030508224234.18755.00000592@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66795

In article <b9aohd$h4an8$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>> The grandmother, who is the XYL of an active ham, who gets her No-Clue
>> Tech ticket and then carries her HT to the Walk-A-Thon is NOT my fellow
>> ham in any respect whatsoever. She is a pretender; a dumbed-down fake;
>> a wannabe, if you will. She can be replaced by any other grandmother and
>> a GMRS/FRS/MURS handie-talkie. She has no more interest in or
>> commitment to the ARS than her pet cat. All she is doing is borrowing a
>> frequency.
>>
>
>Wow... it is almost astonishing to see the level of bitterness and
>broad-sweeping generalities. I hope you learn to deal with this bitterness
>in a positive way before it consumes you. It is is attitudes like this that
>bring the amateur service "one step closer to extinction."
>
>Try to have a better day,
>
>--
>Ryan, KC8PMX
>FF/MFR

Ryan:

I appreciate your concern, but be assured that I am not the least bit
"bitter" about ANYTHING having to do with amateur radio. All I do
here is occasionally amuse myself by responding to postings by relating
some of my own thoughts and ideas. This newsgroup does not reflect
even ten percent of my involvement in ham radio. When I make comments
like the above, I am simply giving my opinion of certain types of hams I
have personally known, based on the behaviors I have personally
witnessed. A lot of hams get involved in Public Service as a way of
attaining some sort of personal validation -- glory, if you will. I guess
I'm just unlucky enough to have found that type more often than other
hams have. They have had the effect of turning me off to Public Service.
That is their fault, not mine.

73 de Larry, K3LT

644. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 02:55:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB18AC.7090909@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66796

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>Most of the
>>hams I hang with could. Many of us have the proper vehicles to get to
>>the good places to put up one of these. Ya gotta hang with the right crowd.
>
>
> How do you find the "right crowd"?

As a tech, I assume you have a HT. Get on some of the repeaters and talk to people. You're in the Boston area IIRC. This meand you are blessed with one of the largest collections of technoweenies in the world nearby (MIT) Get on the air and start talking. You'll find the people you are looking for soon enough. And they will likely be glad to have you there.

- Mike -

645. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:02:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vTEua.6654$3f7.4819282@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66786

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030508200535.11841.00000077@mb-m12.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the
> >rules.
>
> Competition does not mean cult. The rules of this "contest" are cult like
in
> nature. It requires you to "work" certain segments in certain ways for no
> apparent reason.

Regardless of the activity, sport or whatever, the rules of any competition have no apparent reason for being. It's just the way to determine what are valid points and how those points are accumulated. Once the rules are set, you follow the rules exactly. That goes for everything from piano competitions to the Olympics.

>
> Also, he mentioned working some areas were "not proper". The contest rules
do
> not forbid you from making EXTRA contacts, so why would certain contacts
be not
> proper?
>

Depending on the particular contest, certain contacts will net you no points. So they are improper to tie up your time and the other guy's time on something that doesn't earn either of you any points. It is also rude to slow down a contester by asking for non-contest information such as say 10-10 numbers when the contester is trying to run a pile up quickly and efficiently. So that would also be improper, i.e. distracting the competitor.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

646. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:09:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB1C24.2020902@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66797

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3EB86A01.7050401@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>>>Obviously I am not nearly overweight enough to be a
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>regular participant in Amateur Public Service events.
>>>>>
>>>A significant percentage of Hams are fat, more so than the general
>>
>>population.
>>
>> Mike Doesn't write this. Larry writes this. I don't write disparaging
>>things about the obese.
>
>
> Mike is correct. I write disparaging things about the obese. Obesity
> is a self-chosen, self-inflicted condition which causes untold human
> misery is an expensive social burden -- and the main reason why it is a
> growing social problem is because of the politically-correct attitude that
> obese people are unable to control themselves for reasons that are no fault of
> their own.
>
> Personally, I'd love to sit in front of the TV and put away a half-gallon of
> ice cream every night myself. But I don't, because I realize that this is
> destructive behavior. Obese people are obese because they eat too much
> of the wrong foods. Perhaps a couple of percent of them have some
> legitimate physical condition that contributes to their being overweight.
> Obesity is not a good thing and I, for one, don't sugar-coat it (pun intended).

Ahh, yes the old obesity as a moral/mental defect. Lots more to it than
that. I have to (willingly) participate in strenuous sports activities
and watch every calorie I eat just to stay somewhere on the heavy end of
normalcy -large frame Muscular- but a months lapse pushes me over the
edge. Yet my wife, who lives on a diet of Nachos with the works, has
never carried over 115 lbs on her 6 foot frame.

People should not be obese. But sanctimony only provees the prejudice
of the sanctimonious.

- Mike KB3EIA -

647. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:19:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <c7Fua.6738$3f7.4823971@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66789

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030508221740.11841.00000089@mb-m12.aol.com...
> From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> >It is also rude to
> >slow down a contester by asking for non-contest information such as say
> >10-10 numbers when the contester is trying to run a pile up quickly and
> >efficiently. So that would also be improper, i.e. distracting the
> >competitor.
>
> It had nothing to do with being efficient. The adult briefly gave some
> background info about the 10-10. The adult explained to me the 10-10
contacts
> were not desirable under any situation, contest or not. He did not want
the
> child to try for that award.
>
> Its improper because it did not fit the Ham traditions.

Wrong. Either the adult bungled the situation, did not know any better himself or you misunderstood his explanation. Collecting 10-10 numbers is one of the many (and optional) time honored ham traditions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

648. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:30:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9f7ch$r62$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 66798

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hehle9c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 05 May 2003 16:23:21 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > > Fooling around with FAA database, found the following:
> > >
> > > N2EY 1967 BEECH V35, GIORDANO GARY M, VALLEY AL
> > >
> > > There's a Beech Bonanza with a really cool callsign in Alabama!
> >
> > It's not an FCC call sign - it's an FAA registration number.
>
> What's the fee for a vanity side number? OYeah, they're out there on
> both the airwaves and the airways . . .

Yep. Guy I know with initials RW flies a Cessna 195 with tail nr. N195RW.

649. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:31:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB2198.8B32E15F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66800

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EB9DE8D.76690E65@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Oops! You engaged fingers in typing before actually reading "my drive".
> >I don't have to tolerate 120+ db engine noise on my property on Sunday
> >mornings.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Didn't you "hone your skills" in Vietnam?

That has nothing to do with your misreading of what I write and nothing
to do with 4-wheelers on my driveway.

> Just go out there and apply those war-honed skills on getting
> rid of the noise makers.

I thought I'd invite you to visit and you could bore them to death.

> I'll bet you could do "20 over" their noise just by shouting orders
> at them. Strap those jack boots real tight and hit 140 db! :-)

What is any of this to you? :-) :-)

> Show them who's boss!

On this particular hunk of West Virginia, I am. You may, of course,
invite all the 4-wheelers in your neighborhood to run up and down the
drive at either of your mortgage-free homes.

Dave K8MN

650. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:32:06 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9f7fm$r62$1@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 66799

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> I really should resist answering this troll but he's a lot more fun than Len
> Over 21.

Yes, Dee, he's just almost totally clueless, while Lennie gets downright
vicious.

651. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:46:39 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030508234639.04525.00000452@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66701

In article <GzBua.6299$3f7.4728386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the >rules.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...another newsgroup neophyte trying to use the "reducto ad absurdum" non-argument.

>Competitions have rules so you can decide the winners. If you don't have >rules, you can't determine winners or rankings. Without winners and >rankings, you don't have a contest. It's an activity but not a competition.

Amateur radio DX contesting is called "radiosport."

"Sport" involves athletic activity.

A number of older men sitting alone at their radios for hours on end doing nothing but listening and twitching fingers of one hand is NOT any sort of athletic activity.

Amateur radio DX contesting is nothing but a GAME.

>I really should resist answering this troll but he's a lot more fun than Len >Over 21.

I don't think you can stand the open competition of newsgroup discussion, Dee. I would suggest that you give serious thought to stopping access this newsgroup. It isn't a woman's syncophantic ARRL auxilliary site.

652. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:46:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB251B.7CD06F5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66702

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Thu, 8 May 2003 12:26:20 -0400, Wayne Dagastino wrote:
>
> >Ah, if it weren't for Phil's vitriolic remarks, often supported
> >by one or two of his associates, this NG would be so
> >uninteresting!
>
> We aim to please.....

Jeez, Phil. How do you rate hecklers from liberated South Afrika?

Dave K8MN

653. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:50:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB25E3.92987C7F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66703

No Spam Please wrote:
>
> On 05 May 2003 00:44:11 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >In article <bh5abvgvpn94snrqn5tlmugsk9fs97skea@4ax.com>, No Spam Please
> ><larrystranlator@anaddress.net> writes:
> >
> >>>That about covers it.
> >>>
> >>>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >>Yup it sure does
> >
> >Hey, "tranlator" (sic): Tranlate this -- No Spam Please is a big fat jerk!
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >*** Is a "tranlator" anything like an Interocitor?
> >
>
> Don't you and your lover Robeson just wish you attack me personally.
>
> Tanlate this Roll has been rolled.
>
> FOaD

Oh, I get it now. It's Mark Morgan enrolled in the Witness Protection
Program.

Dave K8MN

654. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 03:56:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB274D.B1D75BB1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66704

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030507135644.08218.00000766@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >You are NOT licensed in Amatuer Radio.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Spelling errors are proliferating in the Gang of
> Four.
>
> Bad sign. Downhill slide for the PCTA.

> QRT soon.

You could have some productive years ahead of you if you'd just quite
wasting your time and everyone else's.

Dave K8MN

655. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:03:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9gg1g$ii3su$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66734

Not meant as a derogatory comment either, just merely an observation.

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030508010036.21674.00000779@mb-m16.aol.com...
> From: "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>
> >Tpyically a majority of hams I have ever met are the introverted,
> >stay-at-home types that only get out once in a while and only become
> >extroverted in any sense when behind a microphone, keyer or keyboard.
> >Although there may be a quantity of ham's that are physically active,
most
> >aren't.
>
> Thats what I've seen also.

656. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:11:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB2A39.809EAE97@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66705

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030507082514.18828.00000799@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (Miccolis of Borg) writes:
>
> >In article <20030503173634.18769.00000421@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <20030503082658.18783.00000320@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>(N2EY)
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>>In article <20030502203100.18775.00000343@mb-m11.aol.com>,
> >lenover21@aol.com
> >>>(Len Over 21) writes:

> >So all we have is your memory of a discussion of an alleged Army regulation of
> >a half-century ago. We have the name of one officer, who is unavailable to
> >comment today.
> >
> >The Army is not the entire "Armed Forces of the United States", btw.
>
> The US Army is the largest US military branch, about 100 thousand
> more than the US Navy, the next largest branch.
>
> You've never worn any US military uniform in service of your country.

That makes you just about even. You've never held a Novice class
amateur radio ticket.

> You lack both military experience AND first-hand knowledge of
> US military communications. As such you cannot possibly
> compare US amateur radio requirements to what the US military
> requires in communications.

Let's tackle this one "Len style": Have you ever heard of the Bill of
Rights? Why are you attempting to stifle opposing comments? Can't you
take STRONG opposition? Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.

> >> Do not try to misdirect on "Technician Plus" testing. The "debate"
> >> was on the NOVICE CLASS.
> >
> >Not misdirection at all. Just proof that your line of 'reasoning' is flawed.
>
> It was misdirection and now you are trying to rationalize it.
>

> I had no "flaw" in "reasoning." I just reminded you of what the
> Subject line in the message header has.
>
> You get SO sensitive to errors that you make!

Are you never embarrassed?

> The message header line says "Novice Class" in the Subject line.
>
> It doesn't say "Technician Plus." Tsk, tsk, try to focus.

Yet here you were, telling us all of Military Occupational Specialties.
Go figure.

Dave K8MN

657. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:23:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB2D2E.372BDE6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66706

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Yes and no. Most mighty morsemen are very proud of their
> mighty skill...but that may blind them from the harsh reality
> of all other radio services dropping morse as a communications
> mode or never even considering it in the beginning.

Here's some harsh reality for you Len: I don't know any hams who care a whit what modes other services use. Morse is in widespread use in amateur radio whether you like it or not.

> One person operating a radio alone is the usual picture of being
> "in the shack."

That'd be much like one lone soul sitting along while drafting his newsgroup posts.

> CW operators have absolutely no human-sense clue to another
> distant operator except through the monotonic aperiodic tones
> in their ears. No other audible clues, no voice tones, inflections,
> dialect, patois that all other humans hear in normal verbal
> communications.

Hmmmm. Much like newsgroup posters with only the clicking of their keyboards and no audible clues. Morse is used as a real time mode though. This isn't.

> That sort of aloneness allows them a great deal of time to spend
> imagining things about the CW distant operator...as well as
> imagining things about themselves. The distant operator could
> very well be of opposite gender than what they stated...there's no
> way to determine that through monotonic beeping of CW.

Again, just like newsgroup posters. One former poster here even attempted to play the part of both genders. There was no way to tell from his posts until he felt compelled to tell us.

> A very limited context, but they survive and that is the basic
> motivation of all humans.

Are you in the gene pool, Len?

Dave K8MN

658. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:25:57 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9gg1h$ii3su$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66735

>
> You bet! I know many people think I'm nuts for playing at my advanced
> age, (48) but it is so darn much fun that I can't quit. It is also a
> blast that I can play competitive Ice Hockey on the same team (often the
> same line) with my kid. I have not found a stress reliever yet that can
> compare. We take it all out on each other on the ice, and off-ice we're
> all just big teddy bears! 8^)

Nah... you're not nuts..... it's a great sport and alot of fun. Just a fact that as we age, we don't heal as fast and well, so the agressive level one might play in their teens or twenties may not be the same.

>
> I've been Captain for about 4 years now, and play Defense mostly. I'm
> not as fast as the fastest players, but then the fastest ones are less
> than half my age, but I'm fast enough to keep right in the play. Most of
> the other teams players don't think I'm very nice - but they use other
> descriptive terms.

Being 6foot 4 1/2inches tall, and hitting the scales at about 250-260, you can get what position I used to play....

>
> Seeing how some of the posters in here are showing signs of stress
> induced crankiness, I heartily recommend they think about taking up a
> good contact sport.
>

Yeah.... everyone needs to find some positive outlet for that stress. My other favorite is expending that built-up energy on the salvage and overhaul stage of fires we go on.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

659. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:28:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB2EDC.9351084C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66711

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0305080809.a3c011e@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (Miccolis of Borg) writes:
>
> >In other words, the answer to my questions is "YES".
>
> Jimmie seems to be having some sort of split personality in
> here arguing with himself. He sets up some conditions and
> asks loaded questions, answers them and presumes such
> to apply to another person. Strange...

Why don't you find it strange when you're the one doing it?

> >You want me, and
> >anyone else who disagrees with you, to shut up and go away so you can
> >rant on and on here without opposition or anyone pointing out the
> >factual errors and invalid logic in your postings.
>
> Is that what I want? I don't think so.

You might tell us why you wrote it then.

> Poor Jimmie feels hurt. His words are golden gifts of true wisdom
> that all should feel, appreciate, revere and worship. Opposition
> shall not be tolerated. Resistance is futile.

Wittle Wennie has a vewy active imagination. Wennie's pompous
condescent is wegend. By the way, Wennie--resistance is quite common in
ewectwonics. Now cwick your heels together while saying, "There's no
pwace wike ohm".

> Hmmm...the Borg are back...

Nope. They were bought out by a motion picture studio and are now known
as Borg-Warner.

Dave K8MN

660. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:28:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.helhdyu.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66707

On Thu, 8 May 2003 22:16:12 -0400, Anonymous wrote:

> Ahhh, therein is the basis of why this news group
>provides endless free entertainment. Just about everyone
>here considers himself an "expert" of some sort. a.k.a.
>the clash of egos and an endless parade of primadonnas.
>Too funny!

We aim to please. No extra charge for reruns.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

661. Re: N2EY Is Flying High!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:28:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.helhgkv.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66708

On 9 May 2003 03:30:25 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Yep. Guy I know with initials RW flies a Cessna 195 with tail nr. N195RW.

IIRC all of United Airlines' planes have tail numbers ending in UA.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

662. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:28:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heli59x.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66709

On Fri, 09 May 2003 03:46:42 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>Jeez, Phil. How do you rate hecklers from liberated South Afrika?

Forty years ago my next-door neighbor was a chap who emigrated
from South Afrika (or was it Rhodesia) when he and his wife saw
what was on the horizon.

Unfortunately I have forgotten the unique S.A. swear phrases
that he would occasionally come out with.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

663. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:28:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.helhu7w.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66710

On 09 May 2003 02:42:32 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> Tell that to the five ops that we had riding fire apparatus in
>> a test of simplex radio suitability for tactical comms via RACES.
>> It was all work and no play.....
>
>I'm sure they were in their glory, and loved every minute of it!

You gave got to be kidding. All five de-volunteered themselves
for that assignment in the future, just as I de-voluntered
myself from riding aboard a USCG 46-footer again after a
morning of running some water-borne field strength measurments
in San Francisco Bay quite a while ago.

Fire apparatus on country roads did not provide a "Cadillac
ride", they said.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

664. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:32:24 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9gg1j$ii3su$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66736

Right here in Mid-Michigan Larry! Actually, we are trying now, after alot of prodding, on working together to get a "network" going again in District 3 region of the lower peninsula of Michigan (eastern region) so that either plain old routine or "pleasure" messages as well as public service and/or emergency traffic can be sent throughout the region.

In fact, I operate mobile packet exclusively. An older laptop, a 166mhz machine, with packet modem and it's off I go. (No, I don't drive down the road and type!! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030507214505.18759.00000738@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <kRYta.59223$4P1.5439301@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
Keith
> <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Yes, using 100+ year old technology and forcing people to pass a test on
it
> >so they can press a microphone to talk below 30 MHz is certainly absurd
and
> >stupid. This stupid thinking by hams and the US government has hurt them
> >over the years and the stance has alienated millions of potentials
operators
> >from Amateur radio that had no desire to use morse code.
> > Hopefully next year tens of thousands of US citizens will be able to
take a
> >written exam and talk anywhere on the ham bands and if they want to use
> >morse code they can, just like they can use packet without knowing how to
> >decode packet by ear.
>
> You mean someone's out there using packet? Where?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

665. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:40:38 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9gg1k$ii3su$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66737

I haven't seen whatever is at the link, but in regards to the car listed below, I would almost consider getting something like that as well, merely from a miles-per-gallon standpoint. Criminy sakes..... my stupid truck gets 15mpg if I am lucky and a good tail wind behind me!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> Jim:
>
> Nifty! Doncha just love the way that comic strip made fun of all of us
> mean-spirited, environmentally-unfriendly conservatives -- like me???
> Me, that is, the conservative that drives a Toyota Corolla!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

666. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:44:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB3293.7758565D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66712

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EB9EB82.26D4CD9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <E.T. of
> the Borg?> writes:
>
> >> Okay, we've established that little Davie didn't have an MOS
> >> while in Vietnam bravely serving his country.
> > >
> > >We didn't establish it, I established it. You screwed it up totally by
> > >feeding us a load of misinformation about the armed services having
> > >"MILITAY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES", not ratings, Little Leona.
> >
> > "MILITAY?" E.T. was in the Militay? What is that?

Who is E.T.? Is that your attempt at another dodge of your screwup?

> > >Actually, as is your norm, you've drifted very far afield from the
> > >thread's subject in an effort to impress someone (an unwitting
> > >individual may step forward at any time) with your vast knowledge of
> > >things military. My response to you mentioned nothing about my "brave
> > >valorous military service life", Little Leonid. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor
> > >baby.
> >
> > You did not move boxes?

You ever read any of the stuff posted here?

> > >> >Where has that been indicated in this post or any other by Jim?
> > >>
> > >> Only in about five-plus years of posting by the mighty morsemen.
> > >
> > >I didn't ask you about any "mighty morsemen". I asked you about Jim,
> > >N2EY.
> >
> > A Beechcraft Bonanza aircraft is also called "Jim?" Strange.
> >
> > Male owners usually call their material things by feminine
> > names.

Do they? I know some Spanish and French speaking individuals who give
feminine names to some objects and masculine names to others. Maybe
they've not heard of your theory.

> > >> It's all in Google. If you need a refresher, go there and look for
> > >> a month or so.
> > >

> >T'aint there. You fabricate.
>
> Impossible.

It is not only possible, you do it frequently.

> I can't change contents of the Google site.

Yeah, that's one of the best things about it.

> >> >Ever hear of the Navy "A" and "B" schools?
> >>
> >> No. I served 8 years in the United States ARMY.
> >>
> >> Do Navy "A" and "B" schools teach anything about amateur
> >> Novice Class licenses?
> >
> >Does the ARMY teach anything about keeping your yap shut if you don't
> >know anything about a subject? Apparently you don't know much about the
> >Navy or the amateur Novice class.
>
> E.T. wasn't in any Army.

Who is E.T.? I wasn't in the Army. That's why I asked you the
question.

> He doesn't know much about the Navy.

He knew enough to tell you that the Navy uses the term "rates".

> One wonders if E.T. knows anything about the US Air Force.

Who is E.T.? I knew enough to tell you that the Air Force uses the term
"AFSC". That's only a couple of things which I knew about the military
that you didn't know. There are others.

> >> Could he do morse code?
> >
> >Could you?
>
> Yes.

It has not been demonstrated.

> >See you're an awfully lot like Old Blood and Guts.
>
> Did E.T. know General George Patton?

Who is E.T.? I knew Patton about as well as you. I've seen the movie,
viewed documentaries, read books.

> Where and when? Patton died well before the Southeast Asia
> Live Fire Exercise.

...and well before Korea. He wouldn't have directed his operations from
Japan so you still wouldn't have run into him.

> >> Tell us about your Novice Class amateur radio experiences in
> >> Vietnam, mighty morse warrior. Did you "hone your skills" there?
> >
> >I was a Novice seven years before my arrival in Viet Nam at age 21.
>
> Practiced box moving in snack bars, did you?

Are you literate?

> >My
> >amateur radio skills and military skills were already honed prior to my
> >arrival.
>
> Marvelous. A "hone-y-do!"
>
> >Unlike your rear area service during the Korean War, I was
> >actually stationed in the country where the conflict was taking place.
>
> Yes. Moving boxes in a snack bar.

Are you literate?

> >I love it when a fellow like you starts telling someone who didn't serve
> >in the military about your having put your life on the line.
>
> All US Army soldiers do that the minute they enlist...
> regardless of where they are stationed as assigned.

They do? That's assinine. Obviously you participated and have yet to
stop.

> How are we supposed to treat the vaporous implications
> of meritorious service done by snack bar box pushers?

I didn't know any snack bar box pushers. Must have been some rear area
slang from the days when you won the Korean War from Tokyo.

Dave K8MN

667. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:48:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB3374.7B226857@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66713

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the
> >rules.
>
> Competition does not mean cult. The rules of this "contest" are cult like in
> nature. It requires you to "work" certain segments in certain ways for no
> apparent reason.

You mean "not apparent" to you?

> Also, he mentioned working some areas were "not proper". The contest rules do
> not forbid you from making EXTRA contacts, so why would certain contacts be not
> proper?

If they waste time which one could be using to work other stations for
contest points, they are not proper within the timeframe of the contest.
Contest rules don't forbid you from taking time to watch a movie or from
sleeping half of the contest period away. You wouldn't expect to be
competitive and do either of those things.

Dave K8MN

668. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 04:57:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB35B2.49DB3336@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66714

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ:
>
> >Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
> >Communications Commission.
>
> Contests, while not FCC rules, should be followed exactly. The thing that makes
> it a cult is the arbitrary rules to "work" certain segments to collect points.

You find the contest rules arbitrary? Don't operate in the contest.
You must not tire of being one of the newsgroup buffoons.

> I honestly feel an EE would be frustrated with the hobby, like I was.

N2EY is a EE. He isn't frustrated with amateur radio. Jim Jaeger K8RQ
is a EE who founded Cincinnati Microwave. He isn't frustrated with
amateur radio.

> >>Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea.
> > That's only because you are hopelessly narrowminded.
>
> Hams only want to do their activities. They will pose for a homebrewing photo,
> but never want to homebrew.

That's simply an untruth. Do you know what a person who tells untruths
is called?

> As I explained, there is no apparent reason for these rules. The contest rules
> are defined in a strange way.

So everything you don't understand has no apparent reason for being.
Anything you don't understand becomes "cult like". Take my advice,
Vipul: Stay away from VFW and Shriners conventions.

> Okay, but he made additional contacts and submitted them to the contest as some
> kind of "protest". He wanted these contacts to be allowed.

That's simple stupidity on his part.

> He seems to understand the hidden meanings behind the contest rules. I sure
> don't.

It is painfully obvious.

> Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.

Sure. There are those Whitbread Cup entrants out on the boat while others are socializing. There is a time for competition and a time for socializing. You don't see marathon runners stopping to chat with those in the crowd.

Dave K8MN

669. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:04:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB36B7.F5E4E637@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66715

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ:
>
> >What self-depreiciating social stigma is associated with the use of
> >Morse Code?
>
> It shows you put effort into a non worthwhile skill.

I don't like working on cars. I pay money to have others work on my cars. That does not mean that I find car repair to be a non-worthwhile or useless skill. Your gears aren't meshed, Vipul.

> Thats why I don't want
> General Class license unless code requirement goes away.

I love your attitude. My response to you is: I don't care whether you obtain a General Class license or not. Sit and wait it out for years if necessary. You're all about negativity in regard to amateur radio anyway.

> >It's nice that you KNOW some EE's, Vipul...Don'tya wish you were one?
>
> Yes, it would be nice. But I really don't need to be an EE. I will end up
> making more money in my new field.

A guy with your persuasive skills should be in a real moneymaker like telemarketing.

Dave K8MN

670. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:06:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB3757.28EC248B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66716

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil, k8mn:
>
> >My own heartfelt opinion after reading your latest offering, Vipul, is
> >that you are not from this galaxy.
>
> I don't know what U R talking about.

I fully understood that when I read your reply.

> What "latest offering"? The only offer I
> remember making was to start an amateur radio experimenter's club.

I'm thinking about going on the road with a comedy act and am in need of
a straight man. Would you be interested?

Dave K8MN

671. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:18:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB3A03.5686C91D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66717

Avery Fineman wrote:
>
> In article <GzBua.6299$3f7.4728386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the
> >rules.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...another newsgroup neophyte trying to use the
> "reducto ad absurdum" non-argument.
>
> >Competitions have rules so you can decide the winners. If you don't have
> >rules, you can't determine winners or rankings. Without winners and
> >rankings, you don't have a contest. It's an activity but not a competition.
>
> Amateur radio DX contesting is called "radiosport."

Take it up with the Europeans. They provided that name. Most of us on
this continent use the term "contesting".

> "Sport" involves athletic activity.

I think I agree with you, Leonardo. You're talking about guys like
Minnesota Fats playing billiards, Rafe Williams tossing darts or a group
of old Italians playing Bocci Ball. I see your point.

> A number of older men sitting alone at their radios for hours on
> end doing nothing but listening and twitching fingers of one
> hand is NOT any sort of athletic activity.
>
> Amateur radio DX contesting is nothing but a GAME.

You write that with less authority than a guy like Vipul Shah.
Can you even stay awake for 48 hours, much less be coherent enough to
remain competitive at rates which at times can hit 200-300 per hour?

> >I really should resist answering this troll but he's a lot more fun than Len
> >Over 21.
>
> I don't think you can stand the open competition of newsgroup
> discussion, Dee. I would suggest that you give serious
> thought to stopping access this newsgroup. It isn't a woman's
> syncophantic ARRL auxilliary site.

"Auxiliary" still has but one "L", Aviary. You sore because Dee changed
the channel on you?

Dave K8MN

672. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:20:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBB3AEF.C944E34D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66718

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Fri, 09 May 2003 03:46:42 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >Jeez, Phil. How do you rate hecklers from liberated South Afrika?
>
> Forty years ago my next-door neighbor was a chap who emigrated
> from South Afrika (or was it Rhodesia) when he and his wife saw
> what was on the horizon.

If he was a Rhodesian, we ran into numbers of them in Botswana. Most of the Brits called 'em "whenwe's" since most of their conversations began, "When we were in Rhodesia...".

> Unfortunately I have forgotted the unique S.A. swear phrases
> that he would occasionally come out with.....

...after firing up the braai and downing a few Castle lagers.

Dave K8MN

673. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:25:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509012518.08674.00000022@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66719

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/8/2003 12:04 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030508010440.21674.00000783@mb-m16.aol.com>

>>> Other
>>> interests, such as radio direction finding use more physical activity.
>
>>What does your theory prove?
>
>Simple.
>Hams like contesting instead of radio direction finding.

I'd probably be wasting my time to point out to this trolling idiot that
both QST and CQ have run several pieces on RDF/Orienteering in the last few
months.

>Contesting is both more boring, and requires less physical activity.

Oh...?!?! The Let's see you try to do it, Vipul.

>The interesting activities happen to require more physical activity.

Like chasing preety fems...?!?!

>Hams contest more and do radio direction finding less.
>This makes Hams boring and fat.

You're young, arrogant an ill-informed.

Steve, K4YZ

674. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:29:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509012917.08674.00000023@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66720

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 5/8/2003 11:40 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EBA8895.9030506@psu.edu>

>Hang on Steve.... I sense another one off definition coming here. Maybe
>we should csll them "Vipinitions"?

I LIKE it!

I also suggest we change the term used to describe the technique of making intentionally inflammatory comments "vipulling", rather than "trolling". That way we won't offend anglers!

73

Steve, K4YZ

675. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:30:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509013041.08674.00000024@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66721

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/8/2003 8:30 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030508213032.11841.00000085@mb-m12.aol.com>

>Sorry, I am not proud of not doing public service. What I meant is I would
>not
>do these types of events - road races, etc.

What you mean is you are too good to do them, or your mommy won't let you
got without adult supervision?

Steve, K4YZ

676. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 05:33:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509013339.08674.00000025@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66722

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/8/2003 8:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030508214007.11841.00000087@mb-m12.aol.com>

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>>Most of the
>>hams I hang with could. Many of us have the proper vehicles to get to
>>the good places to put up one of these. Ya gotta hang with the right crowd.
>
>How do you find the "right crowd"?

Were you or Lennie there?

No?

Then it was the right crowd!

Steve, K4YZ

677. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 11:22:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509072233.13850.00000045@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66723

Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
Date: 5/8/2003 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
Message-id: <20030508202615.11841.00000079@mb-m12.aol.com>

From K4YZ:

>>Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
>>Communications Commission.

>Contests, while not FCC rules, should be followed exactly. The thing that
makes
>it a cult is the arbitrary rules to "work" certain segments to collect points.

WHAT A FREAKIN', NARROWMINDED, IGNORANT IDIOT!

Just HOW do you suggest that those "rules" be set up in order to allow
points to be obtained, Vipidiot? By seeing who can get the lowest SWR? To see
who can "keydown" the most "swing" (you ARE a CBers, Vippy...)

These rules are NOT "arbitrary". The more popular contests have been
around for decades, and with evry passing of the "tests", changes are made
primarily on the input of the contesters themselves.

You do not know this since you refuse to do anything except whine and wail
about how Morse Code is holding you down.

>>> I would not
>>>recommend any EE join the hobby

>> That's becasue you are narrow minded and selfish.

>I honestly feel an EE would be frustrated with the hobby, like I was.

That's because you are narrowminded and selfish.

>>>Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea.
>> That's only because you are hopelessly narrowminded.

>Hams only want to do their activities. They will pose for a homebrewing photo,
>but never want to homebrew.

That's because they want to tick you off. The KNEW you'd be watching.

>>>Do you know what you call contest operators who do NOT operate "through
>>>the night", Vippy?
>
>> The answer is....
>>

> LOOSERS!

>That's what you call contest operators that DO operate through the night.

Some of Amatuer Radio's most prolific contesters are in your back yard,
Vipidiot...Perhaps I will pass your ranting around and let them know how "one
of the locals" feels about them...

>>"Cult-like" in following rules?

>As I explained, there is no apparent reason for these rules. The contest rules
>are defined in a strange way.

You've "explained" nothing.

The rules are set up to try and give every reasonably determined contester
a chance at scoring well. Without the establishment of rules and goals, thre
is nothing to "compete" for.

>>>One of them "protested" by making contacts that were taken out of the
>>>contest.
>>>He then claimed he would submit these additional contacts as protest of the
>>>contest removing those contacts.
>
>> Contests have time limits and contact criteria...It is those criteria
>>against which participants are judged.

>Okay, but he made additional contacts and submitted them to the contest as
some
>kind of "protest". He wanted these contacts to be allowed.

If he made the contacts outside the parameters of that contests rules,
then he will LOSE points. Almost every contest has a "penalty" for "illegal"
or improper contacts or poor sportsman like conduct on the air.

>He seems to understand the hidden meanings behind the contest rules. I sure
>don't.

There are no "hidden meanings" behind the rules. They are there in black
and white for all to see and assimilate..

YOU don't understand the rules because you are a fool.

>> In other words, it's cheating.

>Having EXTRA contacts than the contest asks for is not cheating.

It certainly is if you acquire improper contacts and then attempt to submit
them for credit!

>>>One of the children, replied "I can get my 10-10 at the same time".
>>>Then, the adult said "You don't want to do that. Its not proper".
>
>> Obviously someone was trying to teach the child the rules of the
>>contest.

>No, EXTRA contacts are allowed. You can contact anyone using legal modes. He
>said that it is improper to make "10-10" contacts. Apparently, "10-10"
contacts
>are improper in the Ham traditions!

WHAT contest, Vippy?

If you interrupt a fellow who is trying to work a contest just to get a
10-10 numbeer and at least don't throw the guy a contest point, you DESERVE to
get scolded. Some of these contest groups work for months to prepare for these
events, and to ahve to stop thier routine to do something other than what the
plan calls for is annoying.

>>>The same child told another child, he was "not good enough" since he did not
>>>know CW yet. The other child said he is in the process of learning CW.
>
>> I think this was a VippyLie thrown in to try and validate the
>>preceeding.

>No, the child really said that. It is possible that children sometimes say
>these "insensitive" things and did not really mean it.

I think it was a VippyLie thrown in to try and validate the preceeding.

>>WHY would someone bring a CB radio book to an Amateur Radio operating
>>event

>CB is just another operating frequency. It is not something evil as is often
>implied at different Ham meetings.

No, it is NOT "just another operating frequency". It's an entirely
different radio service, with different rules, basis and purpose. CB rules,
regulations, and operating techniqes haev absolutely NOTHING to do with Amateur
Radio.

NOTHING.

>>>Anti-social in that they kept at their station, when there were plenty of
>>>other
>>>activities.

>Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.

Uh huh.

>>>.Yet NO ONE
>>>has ANY idea as to what "clubs" they are supposed to be, because even
>people
>>>who live in his neighborhood don't know what the heck he's talking about.

>Believe me, they exist. I cant come up with all this info without actually
>going to club meetings and Hamfests.

Come up with WHAT "info", Vipul?

You've not cited ONE piece of verifyable "evidence" to anyone in this forum. You say you've been to "hamfests" in "other states", yet you never cite those events, times, etc.

What you are doing is lying. You are making up stories in order to try and vindicate yourself. It's not working. You are digging yourself an ever deepeining hole of mistruths, stories and blatant lies that even you ae starting to have a hard time keeping track of.

Steve, K4YZ

678. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 11:25:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509072558.13850.00000046@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66724

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/8/2003 7:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030508200006.11841.00000076@mb-m12.aol.com>

>> It's "comments" like this that betray your actual "experience" at
>>Amateur
>>Radio functions
>
>No, I've been there. This is what the Hams did at the event I went to. It
>also
>fits what they are doing at Hamfests.

My assertion still stands. Your lack of experience is glaring, Vippy.

>>Personally, I think you're making it up as you go to have the >appearance<
>>of being factual.
>
>No, I've been to field day. I've been to Hamfests. I've joined a random group
>of Hams recently. Hams have said the stuff I've mentioned.

Field Day is ALL ABOUT operating the radios, Vipul. How would you suggest
they "operate" the radios if not sitting in front of them?

Steve, K4YZ

679. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 11:27:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509072725.13850.00000047@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66725

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/8/2003 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.helbcyt.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
>
>On 09 May 2003 00:00:06 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>From: k4yz:
>>
>>>>Yes, they just stay at their radios, operating contests and
>>>>random contacts, while others are socializing.
>
>>>It's "comments" like this that betray your actual "experience" at
>>>Amateur Radio functions
>>
>>No, I've been there. This is what the Hams did at the event I went to.
>>It also fits what they are doing at Hamfests.
>
> Those are major facets of ham radio. If that's not what you
> want, find another hobby. If you want "socializing" join a dance
> club where there are plenty of babes and let us hams do our hamming.

Yeah...them "preety fems" are just waiting for you at the local roller rink or dance club...Get a move on!

Steve, K4YZ

680. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 11:30:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509073013.13850.00000048@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66726

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/8/2003 8:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030508213543.11841.00000086@mb-m12.aol.com>

>It shows you put effort into a non worthwhile skill. Thats why I don't want
>General Class license unless code requirement goes away.

Then whatever the General Class has to offer you, Vippy, is worthless. If
you upgrade AFTER code is taken away, it will be no les than what it is, ergo
you wasted time waiting on it.

>>It's nice that you KNOW some EE's, Vipul...Don'tya wish you were one?
>
>Yes, it would be nice. But I really don't need to be an EE. I will end up
>making more money in my new field

You never WERE an EE, Vipul.

And what's your "new field" supposed to be? Satellite dish installation
tech?

Steve, K4YZ

681. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 11:33:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509073334.13850.00000049@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66727

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: No Spam Please larrystranlator@anaddress.net
>Date: 5/8/2003 9:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5c4mbvses5pf2vijb7nc5i2ff11ipja2tt@4ax.com>

>Don't you and your lover Robeson just wish you attack me personally.

I can right now.

You're a coward.

See...simple enough.

Steve

682. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 12:13:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305090413.4d67e9b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66728

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EBB35B2.49DB3336@earthlink.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From K4YZ:
> >
> > >Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
> > >Communications Commission.
> >
> > Contests, while not FCC rules, should be followed exactly.

Only if you want the contacts to count for points in the contest.

> > The thing that makes it a cult is the arbitrary rules to "work"
> > certain segments to collect points.

Weirdest definition of a "cult" I've ever seen.

Sounds like Vipul belongs to a cult that assigns strange new
definitions to things.
>
> You find the contest rules arbitrary? Don't operate in the contest.

Exactly!
>
> > I honestly feel an EE would be frustrated with the hobby, like I was.
>
> N2EY is a EE. He isn't frustrated with amateur radio.

And I've been interested in amateur radio since about 1965 (which is
when I found out what it was), licensed since 1967, and an EE since
1976.

> Jim Jaeger K8RQ
> is a EE who founded Cincinnati Microwave. He isn't frustrated with
> amateur radio.
>
Cecil, W5DXP, formerly W6RCA and some other calls, is an EE who worked
for Intel (and several other companies). I don't think he is
frustrated with
amateur radio.

In previous postings Vipul has expressed his frustration with EE, too.

> > >>Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea.

All depends on what you mean by "for the better". If you think large
numbers of American hams are going to homebrew complex, time

consuming, expensive projects when they can buy equivalent
manufactured or kit equipment, forget it.

> > > That's only because you are hopelessly narrowminded.
> >
> > Hams only want to do their activities.

PEOPLE only want to do their activities.

> > They will pose for a homebrewing photo,
> > but never want to homebrew.

Makes me wonder who built all that homebrew stuff in my basement, my
attic, various storage spaces folks are letting me use.......
>
> That's simply an untruth. Do you know what a person who tells untruths
> is called?
>
ahhhhhhh........mistaken?
>
> > As I explained, there is no apparent reason for these rules.

Give us some examples of rules that have no apparent reason.

> > The contest rules
> > are defined in a strange way.

Not really.
>
> So everything you don't understand has no apparent reason for being.
> Anything you don't understand becomes "cult like". Take my advice,
> Vipul: Stay away from VFW and Shriners conventions.

One word: Golf. A big part of that game is the rules and the process
that decides them.

> > Okay, but he made additional contacts and submitted them to the contest as > > some
kind of "protest". He wanted these contacts to be allowed.
>
> That's simple stupidity on his part.

A letter to the contest organizers would make more sense.
>
> > He seems to understand the hidden meanings behind the contest rules. I sure
> > don't.
>
> It is painfully obvious.
>
> > Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.
>
> Sure. There are those Whitbread Cup entrants out on the boat while
> others are socializing.

What's the Whitbread Cup? Sounds like fun.

> There is a time for competition and a time for
> socializing. You don't see marathon runners stopping to chat with those
> in the crowd.
>
HAW! Been there, done that, a marathon runner saves ever bit of time
and energy for the race.

Seems to me that there's a certain mindset that cannot grasp the
concept of sports and games, and the rules needed to make them go.

73 de Jim, N2EY

683. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 12:13:45 UTC
From: Jim <jim801@altaolnewsposter.org>
Message-ID: <b9g62imkp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66729

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030509072725.13850.00000047@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
> >From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
> >Date: 5/8/2003 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.helbcyt.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
> >
> >On 09 May 2003 00:00:06 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> >>From: k4yz:
> >>
> >>>>>Yes, they just stay at their radios, operating contests and
> >>>>random contacts, while others are socializing.
> >
> >>>It's "comments" like this that betray your actual "experience" at
> >>>Amateur Radio functions
> >>
> >>No, I've been there. This is what the Hams did at the event I went to.
> >>It also fits what they are doing at Hamfests.
> >
> > Those are major facets of ham radio. If that's not what you
> > want, find another hobby. If you want "socializing" join a dance
> > club where there are plenty of babes and let us hams do our hamming.
>
> Yeah...them "preety fems" are just waiting for you at the local
roller
> rink or dance club...Get a move on!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Actually, one can meet some pretty hot babes at places like
roller rinks, not that you would take them home to meet mommy,
but... I find most hams, like the self-appointed "experts" found
in this forum, would be scared off by the likes of strong willed
women who join roller skating teams. I dated one roller skating
babe for over a year and never had to worry about big mouth
guys in bars. She kicked ass and took names later. Sort of like
the big mouth "experts" in this forum, except here they hide behind
key boards and microphones and spin stories of yesteryear on how
great I was and how many important people I knew. Hams are
big name droppers you know! Hmmm, maybe I'll give Angie
a call tonight and see if she wants to go up to Dayton with me.
It'd be fun to watch pee will hams make passes at her, only to
get a left to the chops, just above the pencil protector and to the

right of the clip-on microphone.

Jim
Leisure City AZ

684. Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 14:01:01 UTC
From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu
Message-ID: <df510dbe.0305090601.78480fe5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66730

Hello,

I have a couple questions.

Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without having to take any of the subsequent examination elements?

I've looked at the theory part of the exam, and everything looks straightforward. However I need to learn Morse code. I was wondering, perhaps, if people can tell me how they went about learning Morse mode.

Thank you,

-Chris

685. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 14:29:44 UTC
From: Anon73 <anon73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <rXOua.4004$Pc5.2198@fed1read01>
Source record: 66731

Chris -- from the W5YI Site http://www.w5yi.org/AmRadio.htm#EXTRA

Quote: Amateur Extra Operator Class license:In addition to Element 1 (the 5 wpm Morse code test), Element 2 (Technician written test) and Element 3 (General written test), you will have to pass another 50 question multiple choice examination (called Element 4). The minimum passing score is 37 questions answered correctly. There are 665 possible questions in the Extra Class question pool. Again they are all known and are contained in our study material. End Quote

For how folks learn Morse code -- See URL:

http://ac6v.com/morseaids.htm#Learn

Good Luck

Anon73

--
"Chris" <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> wrote in message
news:df510dbe.0305090601.78480fe5@posting.google.com...
> Hello,
>
> I have a couple questions.
>
> Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without having
> to take any of the subsequent examination elements?
>
> I've looked at the theory part of the exam, and everything looks
> straightforward. However I need to learn Morse code. I was wondering,
> perhaps, if people can tell me how they went about learning Morse
> mode.
>
> Thank you,
>
> -Chris

686. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 15:02:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBBC316.9050402@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66732

Phil Kane wrote:
> On 09 May 2003 02:42:32 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
>>> Tell that to the five ops that we had riding fire apparatus in
>>> a test of simplex radio suitability for tactical comms via RACES.
>>> It was all work and no play.....
>>
>>I'm sure they were in their glory, and loved every minute of it!
>
>
> You gave got to be kidding. All five de-volunteered themselves
> for that assignment in the future, just as I de-voluntered
> myself from riding aboard a USCG 46-footer again after a
> morning of running some water-borne field strength measurments
> in San Francisco Bay quite a while ago.

oooh, did you get to roll? The boat that is, not Larry! 8^) Just once,
I would like to at least see that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

687. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 15:04:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBBC389.8000807@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66733

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 5/8/2003 11:40 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3EBA8895.9030506@psu.edu>
>
>
>>Hang on Steve.... I sense another one off definition coming here. Maybe
>>we should csll them "Vipinitions"?
>
>
> I LIKE it!
>
> I also suggest we change the term used to describe the technique of making
> intentionally inflammatory comments "vipulling", rather than "trolling". That
> way we won't offend anglers!

Done!

- Mike KB3EIA -

688. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 15:31:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBBC9B0.50FF9F4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66738

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EBB35B2.49DB3336@earthlink.net>...
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> > >

> > That's simply an untruth. Do you know what a person who tells untruths
> > is called?
> >
> ahhhhhhh........mistaken?

One time is "mistaken". After numerous corrections, another word
applies.

> > So everything you don't understand has no apparent reason for being.
> > Anything you don't understand becomes "cult like". Take my advice,
> > Vipul: Stay away from VFW and Shriners conventions.
>
> One word: Golf. A big part of that game is the rules and the process
> that decides them.

Another that comes to mind is Cricket. So many out for so many overs,
Toad in the Hole there you have it. Bob's your uncle.

> > > Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.
> >
> > Sure. There are those Whitbread Cup entrants out on the boat while
> > others are socializing.
>
> What's the Whitbread Cup? Sounds like fun.

It's a yearly world class sailing race. Europeans, South Africans,
Australians and New Zealanders are passionate over the race.

> > There is a time for competition and a time for
> > socializing. You don't see marathon runners stopping to chat with those
> > in the crowd.
> >
> HAW! Been there, done that, a marathon runner saves ever bit of time
> and energy for the race.

Think of all the socializing you're missing :)

> Seems to me that there's a certain mindset that cannot grasp the
> concept of sports and games, and the rules needed to make them go.

Careful! You'll arouse Leonard's ire. According to him, there's an ocean of difference between sport and games.

Dave K8MN

689. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 15:35:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBBCAA6.9C6C82F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66739

Jim wrote:
>
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030509072725.13850.00000047@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
> > >From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
> > >Date: 5/8/2003 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.helbcyt.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
> > >
> > >On 09 May 2003 00:00:06 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
> > >
> > >>From: k4yz:
> > >>
> > >>>>Yes, they just stay at their radios, operating contests and
> > >>>>random contacts, while others are socializing.
> > >
> > >>>It's "comments" like this that betray your actual "experience" at
> > >>>Amateur Radio functions
> > >>
> > >>No, I've been there. This is what the Hams did at the event I went to.
> > >>It also fits what they are doing at Hamfests.
> > >
> > > Those are major facets of ham radio. If that's not what you
> > > want, find another hobby. If you want "socializing" join a dance
> > > club where there are plenty of babes and let us hams do our hamming.
> >
> > Yeah...them "preety fems" are just waiting for you at the local
> roller
> > rink or dance club...Get a move on!
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Actually, one can meet some pretty hot babes at places like
> roller rinks, not that you would take them home to meet mommy,
> but... I find most hams, like the self-appointed "experts" found
> in this forum, would be scared off by the likes of strong willed
> women who join roller skating teams. I dated one roller skating
> babe for over a year and never had to worry about big mouth
> guys in bars. She kicked ass and took names later. Sort of like
> the big mouth "experts" in this forum, except here they hide behind
> key boards and microphones and spin stories of yesteryear on how
> great I was and how many important people I knew. Hams are
> big name droppers you know! Hmmm, maybe I'll give Angie
> a call tonight and see if she wants to go up to Dayton with me.

> It'd be fun to watch pee will hams make passes at her, only to
> get a left to the chops, just above the pencil protector and to the
> right of the clip-on microphone.

If you're through name dropping about the roller derby queens you know, want to clue us in on what is a "pee will ham"?

For the record, I'm not afraid of a woman who drinks beer from the bottle, has tattoos and who fist fights men. I just wouldn't want to go out with one.

Dave K8MN

690. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 16:55:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305090855.36d66cd8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66740

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b9ehsu$71r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030507202523.08129.00000574@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > In article
> <636F898C60D8A3C5.AEB8600495885770.8FB2E087AA0A0ACC@lp.airnews.net>,
> > "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >I didn't hear or, at least, don't remember the item you mention. But,
> NPR
> > >is my choice of listening!
> > >
> > Didja hear the latest, Kim?
> >
> > Almost all of the US troops, and all of the US aircraft and other major
> assets,
> > are being pulled out of Saudi Arabia. Something like 100 military advisers
> and
> > training consultants will stay to help the Saudi military learn to use the
> > hardware they bought from us.
> >
> > One of OBL's biggest beefs with the West was the presence of "infidel
> > Crusader/Zionist armies" in the holy land of Arabia. Big recruiting tool -
> note
> > how many of the Sept 11 hijackers were Saudis. (I don't think any were
> Iraqis).
> > Soon all but a few of those "crusaders" will be gone. OBL gets his way?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Nice to see someone else noticed.

I'm glad I wasn't the only one.

Of course with SH gone from power, most of the reason for those forces
to be in SA vanishes.

Which raises some interesting questions: Where is SH and where is OBL?
If they were "in custody", do you think that info would be made
public?

73 de Jim, N2EY

691. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 17:12:03 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86vfwknixo.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 66741

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Chris" == Chris <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> writes:

Chris> Hello, I have a couple questions.

Chris> Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without
Chris> having to take any of the subsequent examination elements?

You have to have taken and passed the technician and general theory
exams and the 5wpm exam before taking the extra theory exam, if I
recall correctly.

Chris> I've looked at the theory part of the exam, and everything
Chris> looks straightforward. However I need to learn Morse code. I
Chris> was wondering, perhaps, if people can tell me how they went
Chris> about learning Morse mode.

I'm comfortable with writing small computer programs, so my approach
was to build a tool to help me.

First, I did some research and determined that the Koch method was the
one most likely to work for me. I then found an old old C program on
the net called "tomorse" which converted text strings to an audio
file. I rewrote tomorse to use libsndfile and to sound a little
better, then wrote a perl script to feed tomorse characters in the
Koch method, then wrote a shell script to build multiple audio files
(2-a.wav, 2-b.wav, 3-a.wav, 3-b.wav, 4-a.wav, 4-b.wav -- two files
each for two, three, and four characters) and corresponding text
files.

I burn those .wav files to a CDRW and stick it in my portable CD
player so I can listen while I'm on the commute or when work gets
slow. I compare my notes to the corresponding text files. When I get
90% accuracy or more, I move up a level.

I'm actually doing very well with this system. I'm currently doing it
the lame and easy way with 20wpm characters and 5wpm spacing, but once
I get all the characters, I'll tighten the spacing up to 13wpm spacing
and start again.

One of these days I will make a web page with my stuff for people to
download. However, I've supplied enough information for you to be
able to solve the problem yourself if you're inclined. If you want
the programs and scripts, send me email.

Chris> Thank you,
```

Best of luck!

Chris> -Chris

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+u+FqGPFSfAB/ezgRAjeuAKDs3sGV2SQKoTSbkdWWZ505PKMKfwCdGgmv
BhMPOBslDl7/njQbN+yxrZE=
=Ag/+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

692. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 17:34:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305090934.77e630ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66742

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>...

> What about those former electronic technicians who actually
> ARE electronic engineers, have the demonstrated capability
> and the experience and the accreditation and continue in that
> endeavor? That is my category.

It is? Where did you get your EE degree(s), Len? What date(s) are on
the diploma(s)?
>
> Here's a partial listing of past "commentary" by the Stalker -
>
> 1. I've given a very short listing of past employers in here.

Why? Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

> 2. I've given references to living US radio amateurs who know me
> personally (one was Best Man at my wedding). No one,
> certainly not the Stalker, seems to have contacted them for
> any confirmation. In essence, he simply ignored such
> references.

So we should ask your friends about you? What would that prove? You
won't take the testimony of my friends about me....
>
> 3. I've digitized my First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial)
> Operator License first received in 1956, including the reverse
> side showing the radio and television stations worked at that
> year and duties, written in handwriting by the Chief Engineers
> at those stations...and sent those by e-mail SEVERAL TIMES
> to the Stalker. He refused to acknowledge them, claiming all
> were some kind of "lie" due to an unfortunate accident that
> attached the wrong image on the first sending.

I think you also sent that unsolicited junk email to me. Why? Has
anyone doubted that you held a commercial FCC license? Does your
holding such a license somehow prove that you know more about how
AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

> 4. The Stalker then made up a libelous "homepage" on AOL
> which was a prima facie bit of personal insult easily
> evidenciary of libelous behavior in any civil court. AOL
> removed that immediately as well as his equally-libelous
> new screen name when notified.

Sounds like you can dish it out but you can't take it, Len ;-)

Do you think your behavior here causes others to respect you? Here's a hint: IT DOESN'T.

> 5. The Stalker tried to manufacture some kind of "case" of
> "cowardice" about my US Army Signal Corps duties and
> location, repeatedly refering to my military occupation
> specialty as "rear area radio clerk."

Did he use the word cowardice?

> He continued to do so
> despite my pointing out what they really were, explicit
> details of duties and responsibility which were not only
> referencible through government archives but were witnessed
> by a still-living radio amateur who was assigned to the same
> unit and military radio station and who did the same duty.

We all know what you did in Japan, Len. You've told us many, many, MANY times.

I do remember you mentioning the message totals for ADA in a way that could be mistaken to imply that you did it all by yourself. Shall I get that one from Google? ;-)

> The Stalker has not made any explicit details of his own
> military service and "battle experience/heroism" other than
> the vague generality of "seven hostile actions."

Some folks do, some folks don't.

The way you have described your military service could give some people the wrong impression, Len. I recall a bunch of postings about being Bear bombers and how close you were to Korea, etc.

More important, you don't show much respect towards other veterans who served if those veterans disagree with you on other issues. Interesting.

Here's a classic example.

(The following is edited for length. All of the following quoted words are Len's. See GOOGLE for the entire posting)

BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE

From: lenof21@aol.com (Lenof21)
Subject: Re: Morse monkeys are the worst!
Date: 2000/03/28
Message-ID: <20000328122107.02129.00001001@nso-fp.aol.com>

That's all very nice and dramatic but this was the United States Coast Guard, right? The same USCG that gave you food, lodging, shelter, and free clothes that you could wet in as needed? The same USCG that taught you morse code cognition? It wasn't

amateur radio, was it?

Jeff, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in the USCG is past for you. That was not amateur radio, it was PROFESSIONAL radio. You were paid for what you did (in several ways). It was your JOB. I'm sure that the USCG did not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it. I don't see how all that makes you some Number One Ichiban HAM Honcho NOW.

Transmitters don't "scream" Jeff. They are inanimate things that run on electricity. When the radio room on that unfortunate ship flooded, many things could have temporarily put the transmitter on full Continuous Wave and also to shift frequency slightly. The "scream" you heard, if it was not in your head alone, could have been a true CW with a frequency shift just enough to make it sound something like a "scream."

You were safe on shore, listening to a radio...provided by the USCG, the same military service that provided you with food, lodging, shelter, clothes (to wet in), and a modest monetary stipend each month for your JOB. I'll bet you even got Rank with that USCG service.

...you knew the job was dangerous when you took it...

As I said, the time for Medals For Meritorious Radio Service in the USCG is past for you, Jeff. You were safe on shore, no lifeboats needed, and, when your watch was over, you could go off duty, hit the bunk, or chow down on USCG food after changing your pants.

Thank you Superham, once more you've saved Metropolis.

Of course, if you want some "comparisons," you can always hang around a TRACON sometime at a busy Center if radio "marathons" are your cuppa. Plenty "runners" in that radio "marathon," a whole room full plus lots in the sky, all doing things on voice. If there be "screams," then they can be heard on cockpit voice recorders.

Jeff, you've never been under Incoming, have you? While trying to get return artillery support on a radio while your ears, your whole body is numbed by HE infall on your

position? Most folks in that position don't wet their
pants...every sphincter tightens up, ears go deaf, eyes
close tight, and every breath may be the last.

Why don't you quit the shore station histrionics and go
back to ancient radio history. It will ease your troubled
mind...and keep your pants dry.

Len Anderson
ex-RA16408336

END GOOGLE QUOTE

Gee, Len, you really showed another veteran some respect, huh? And
that was in a thread where you weren't even being addressed.

That part about the s*******s makes that post both memorable and easy
to find.

Have you ever been "under incoming", Len? Not in training - the real
thing. I haven't. Have you?

> 6. In my 14 pages of text on my Reply to Comments (of another)
> on FCC NPRM 98-143 (received and made public record on
> 13 January 1999), Robeson sent a single paragraph (on the
> public record of 25 January 1999, past the stated cut-off date)
> that I should be deprived of any consideration on Restructuring.

So? Isn't that his right under the First Amendment?

Your 14 pages were classified by the FCC as REPLY COMMENTS. Most of
those REPLY COMMENTS consisted of you telling the FCC to disregard the
comments of one Michael P, Deignan.

Why is it OK for you to tell the FCC to disregard another's comments,
but not OK for someone to tell the FCC to disregard yours?

> In essence, he was so enraged by newsgroup messaging on
> the code test issue that he had to carry this to an extreme.

How? All he did was express an opinion to the FCC. Is that wrong?

You sent your 14 pages to the FCC so late that there was no way anyone
could reply before the January 15 deadline.

> Such an action was little more than more bullying tactics
> that would have deprived a US citizen and military veteran of
> exercising his Constitutional Rights (First Amendment to the
> US Constitution).

BULLSHIT.

There's just no other word for it, Len.
>

> > "Pedantic Parson"..."Herr Oberst"...."Jackbooted thug"..."elitist
> >Morsemen"..."Dill Sergeant"...All various "nicknames" bestowed on licensed
> >Radio Amateurs who happen to disagree with Lennie.
>
> Only after those same individuals used similar nicknames, false
> accusations, and personal insults to me FIRST.

Really? OK, show me where I have called you nicknames, made false accusations or made personal insults to you FIRST.

C'mon, Len, you made the claim, you back it up. Show us the actual postings.

You may find a "Lennie" or "LHA" back a few years, but that's about it. As for "false accusations", you won't find any of those. As for personal insults, you sure seem to take any sort of disagreement as a personal insult.

Find 'em and show 'em, Len. Can you? I think not.

693. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 18:03:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBBED9E.30509@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66743

Jim wrote:

> big name droppers you know! Hmmm, maybe I'll give Angie
> a call tonight and see if she wants to go up to Dayton with me.
> It'd be fun to watch pee will hams make passes at her,

OHMYGAWD. Now *that* is kinky! But why do you think hams will want to watch that?

I'm really, really hoping that's some kind of typo.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

694. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:14:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EBC1A49.E7B75240@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66745

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 08 May 2003 13:57:19 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >This would require some sort of international convention on what "citizens
> >band" should be. There ae countless users of "land mobile" radio, and trying
> >to define each and every one of them would be a never-ending task.
>
> >CB has rules on power and distances authorized, but the FCC thinks it can
> >dictate physics...It was foolish in the 1950s, and even more foolish today!
>
> In the 1950s, the FCC's experience with "mass radio operators"
> was primarily with amateur radio, and they expected the new
> "CB" operators to be as respectful of rules and limitations as
> the hams were at that time. The enforcement resources were
> large enough then to take care of the small amount of violators
> that did emerge in the 1960s. They could not foresee or
> plan for the the roguishness of the violations and violators
> (the "10-4 good buddy" crowd) which emerged in the 1970s.
>

The 55 MPH speed limit probably made CB popular. Truckers
talking to each other to identify speed traps. With their managers
pushing for higher "productivity", i.e., stuff delivered faster, they
had little choice. And nobody wanted to be easily traced, so
nobody bothered with licenses. Then the song "Convoy" came
out the fall of 1975, and many people got on CB. Then people
noticed DX (when the sunspots were in) and found it fun to
do the DX. This essentially exploded overnight and the FCC
was overwhelmed, and eventually said screw it and didn't worry
about violations not involving non type accepted equipment.

I had a CB license KAAR5167 back in 1976, then "upgraded"
to ham radio in August 76 "WA2ISE".

People who say 2m or some other band is just like CB ought to
listen to the 27MHz CB band sometime....

695. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:28:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509172851.18771.00000506@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66852

In article <3EBB2EDC.9351084C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Wittle Wennie has a vewy active imagination. Wennie's pompous
>condescent is wegend. By the way, Wennie--resistance is quite common in
>ewectwonics. Now cwick your heels together while saying, "There's no
>pwace wike ohm".

Heil has definitely gone into mind rot. Poor baby.

>> Hmmm...the Borg are back...
>
>Nope. They were bought out by a motion picture studio and are now known
>as Borg-Warner.

Incorrect.

Warner Brothers studio facilities (and Warner "Ranch Facilities"
outdoor location) are south down Hollywood Way from my house,
in Burbank. Hollywood Way is a major north-south thoroughfare
in the east end of San Fernando Valley.

Paramount Pictures owns the rights to "Star Trek" (and the
alien characters known as "the Borg"). Paramount Pictures
is farther south, over the Santa Monica Mountains, in the Los
Angeles area known as Hollywood.

"Borg-Warner" is a separate entity not involved with either show
business or fictitious aliens or amateur radio or attempts at
humor by baby-talking old men with control-freak obsessions.

696. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 21:28:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509172855.18771.00000507@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66749

In article <rRDua.5574$Gy.4219@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Back in the '50s, radios that operated much over 30 MHz were expensive and
>(compared to today's radios) quite insensitive. 11 meters wasn't used much
>by amateurs and was the 'radio junk bin' of that era (what is it ...
>Industrial, Scientific, Medical ... or something like that?). We take our
>440 HTs for granted as well as cell phones. Back in the 60s, a tiny 440 rig
>was likely an aluminum box in the form of a 6 inch or larger cube with a 1
>tube super regenerative receiver/transmitter in it. I saw one. Good for
>1/4 mile - assuming you could find someone else with a similar setup. I'm
>trying to remember what was a good front end. Too many years. 6AF4? I
>forget, but 4 dB noise figure was decent. No, back then 27 MHz probably
>made sense to the FCC. Whether it has made any sense after the 50s or not
>... well, make that after the 60s. There was still very active enforcement
>during the 60s. After that, it has been all down hill :)

Citizens Band Radio Service in the USA started in UHF in the 1950s,
not first in the former 11m ham band. "Class A" and "Class B" CB
were in what is now the 460 MHz PLMRS band. "Class C" (radio
control) and "Class D" (voice) at 11m were authorized later, in 1958.

The major problems facing any UHF or higher user of radio in the
1950s was CO$T and the limitations of vacuum tubes. Class B
CB equipment was limited to the superregen-receiver/modulated-
oscillator single-tube RF stage design tried in the 1930s. (the
6AF4 tube type mention sounds very familiar, heh heh) As far as
I recall, there was only one such low-cost Class B UHF trans-
ceiver design manufactured in the USA at the time. I used one
briefly, including adding a Yagi in place of the supplied drooping
groundplane wire antenna. Not very good beyond about 4 miles
range with a Yagi, otherwise only a half-mile with supplied
groundplane. About a cubic foot in size, real leather handle on
top (which rotted quickly in storage), built-in speaker and cheap
microphone, all RF connectors some non-standard press-fit
variety.

Commercial radios for 460 MHz Class A CB were few and far
between in the 1950s...and quite expensive...crystal controlled
FM or PM output with many multiplier stages between crystal
oscillator and final...tubes were too close to the limitation of
electronic transit time (much slower than light speed travel of
electrons from cathode to anode). The highest frequency triodes
were of the lighthouse structure with an absolute limit of about
2.5 GHz (GE type 2C39, an "inverted lighthouse"). The micro-

wave region required klystrons, magnetrons, and that brand-new (then) thing called a Traveling Wave Tube, the only true broadband vacuum tube for lower microwave regions.

Only commercial and government users could afford transmitting equipment at UHF in the 1950s. "Consumer electronics" at UHF was largely limited to UHF TV converters for the (then) brand-new US TV channels beginning at 14. Land Mobile radios of the 1950s stabilized in VHF at 160 MHz tops in frequency. Those had the advantage of history of many WW2 military radios at VHF using vacuum tubes (10-channel "tank radios", TRC-1 radio relay Rx-Tx separates, all crystal controlled and FM-PM). Civil airways radios on 108-136 MHz went to AM internationally, but those seldom needed more than 50 W RF output, even in ground stations. The practical limit using vacuum tubes seems to have been the military aviation band of 225-400 MHz and the generic AN/ARC-27 in use for decades in the US afterwards.

While transistors were in production in the 1950s, it took nearly the whole decade to get reliable, useable transistor junctions capable of reasonably-efficient operation above VHF. The venerable US military manpack VHF transceiver, AN/PRC-25, had transistors everywhere inside except the final amplifier, a tube. The PRC-77 follow-on which appeared in Vietnam later years, was essentially a PRC-25 with the final amplifier a transistor. About a hundred thousand (give or take) of that basic family were made and used for two decades by other militaries besides the USA.

The first handheld transceivers (semiconductors almost a necessity in structure) began appearing for commercial and local government work in the late 1950s...limited to the lower half of VHF, single-channel fixed-tuned FM PTT...and those proliferated in non-amateur HT applications in the 1960s. All solid-state vehicular VHF radios were right alongside the HTs in use and growth. While their USE is different than in amateur radio, the internals are generic to any application; difference was mainly in controls, external lables, and who sold them. Many Southern California amateurs were busy acquiring "surplus" commercial-government VHF radios in and about 1970 for relatively simple conversion to ham radios.

UHF business and government bands opened in the 1960s-1970s were as a result of demand now that solid-state radios could be designed and made profitably on up to 500 MHz. The old Class A and Class B Citizens Band bands were quietly dropped, relatively unused, all in favor of many, many more commercial-government users wanting that bandspace.

By about 1980 the design labs showed that semicoductors could work well in the 900 to 1200 MHz region and the push to cellular telephone systems began. Throughout the 1980s UHF radio design, coupled with advances in Information and Coding Theory, and growth in transistor manufacture took a virtual multiple quantum leap progress over previous, lower frequency radio. By the year 2002 there were over 300 MILLION handheld cellular telephones designed, made, and used...all operating at multiple crystal-controlled UHF in low L-band. At the end of 2002 the US Census Bureau said that one in three Americans had cellular telephone subscriptions.

Radio service applications above 1 GHz proliferated in the 1990s for both convenience, networking, or security. Keyless auto lock systems using UHF quietly arrived, the entire unit the size of a key chain fob. The "ISM" bands multiplied to include 2.4 GHz, then twice that frequency by the end of the 1990s. Off-shore manufacturing of US designs made millions of various UHF and microwave region devices available to the average consumer. Cordless telephone sets at 2.4 GHz now offer extremely good security from RF eavesdropping compared to the 49 MHz cordless units of three decades past...even while working in the same band as other, close-by 2.4 GHz cordless phones of the same design.

The point of this long missive emphasizing frequency is that progress in design, innovation, invention is due to thousands upon thousands of people in commercial (and some academic) organizations working to advance states of the art in communications all over the world. Those who only operate front panel controls cannot possibly know the explosive growth of radio communications technology in just a half century. RF upper frequency limits were reached, overcome, supplanted by new ways to do things many times over. What was barely do-able in 1950 was long-accomplished fact by 2000.

Right now laboratories are pushing transistor design up into X-band frequencies and beyond. Ultra-wideband radio regulations are being worked on at the FCC. The software-derived radios have already arrived. Some radio amateurs who know what is good for everyone demand that all amateurs test to the standards and practices of the 1930s in radio.

697. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:28:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509172856.18771.00000508@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66747

In article <20030509073013.13850.00000048@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, the Foul Mouthed Extra Terrific writes:

>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/8/2003 8:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030508213543.11841.00000086@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>>It shows you put effort into a non worthwhile skill. Thats why I don't want
>>General Class license unless code requirement goes away.
>
> Then whatever the General Class has to offer you, Vippy, is worthless. If
>you upgrade AFTER code is taken away, it will be no les than what it is, ergo
>you wasted time waiting on it.
>
>>>It's nice that you KNOW some EE's, Vipul...Don'tya wish you were one?
>>
>>Yes, it would be nice. But I really don't need to be an EE. I will end up
>>making more money in my new field
>
> You never WERE an EE, Vipul.
>
> And what's your "new field" supposed to be? Satellite dish installation tech?

That is more than a purchasing agent job...and pretense of knowing
all about electronic engineering duties and responsibilities...

698. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:28:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509172857.18771.00000509@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66851

In article <20030509072233.13850.00000045@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, keeper of the Magic Mirror) writes:

> Come up with WHAT "info", Vipul?
>
> You've not cited ONE piece of verifyable "evidence" to anyone in this
>forum. You say you've been to "hamfests" in "other states", yet you never
>cite those events, times, etc.

All the readers in this newsgroup have yet to know When and
Where of the Stalker's "seven hostile actions" while in USMC.

> What you are doing is lying. You are making up stories in order to try
>and vindicate yourself. It's not working. You are digging yourself an ever
>deepeining hole of mistruths, stories and blatant lies that even you ae
>starting to have a hard time keeping track of.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Steamy is holding up a mirror and forgetting he is looking at the
reflecting surface, seeing himself. That has been evidenciary
in here for at least 4 years spanning many claimed activities
and experiences.

For example, Robeson makes remarks as if he has first-hand
knowledge of electronic engineering. In actual fact he never
worked a day in his life IN any engineering activity, never had
any engineering responsibility. He was only a purchasing agent
in a corporation for less than a year.

Robeson has attempted to denigrate others' radio communication
experience outside of amateur radio, especially so in the military.
Never once did he state anything showing the Robeson DID do
any military radio communications. All of Robeson's claims have
been vague, generalized implications outside of amateur radio.

Mind rot is spreading among the Extra Terrifics in here...

699. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:28:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509172858.18771.00000510@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66750

In article <3EBB35B2.49DB3336@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> From K4YZ:
>>
>> >Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
>> >Communications Commission.
>>
>> Contests, while not FCC rules, should be followed exactly. The thing that
makes
>> it a cult is the arbitrary rules to "work" certain segments to collect
points.
>
>You find the contest rules arbitrary? Don't operate in the contest.
>You must not tire of being one of the newsgroup buffoons.

That has not tired you.

>> I honestly feel an EE would be frustrated with the hobby, like I was.
>
>N2EY is a EE. He isn't frustrated with amateur radio. Jim Jaeger K8RQ
>is a EE who founded Cincinnati Microwave. He isn't frustrated with
>amateur radio.

There is no one in any records of electronic engineering graduates
with the surname of "N2EY." Absolutely none.

"Jim Jaeger K8RQ" is not a participant in this newsgroup.

"Cincinnati Microwave" was not mentioned previously in any
posting.

Further, "K4YZ" never worked one day in his life IN any electric
or elecronic engineering department anywhere, never got any
engineering degree. [again, no record anywhere on that]

>> >>Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea.
>> > That's only because you are hopelessly narrowminded.
>>
>> Hams only want to do their activities. They will pose for a homebrewing
photo,
>> but never want to homebrew.
>
>That's simply an untruth. Do you know what a person who tells untruths
>is called?

Dave Heil...Steve Robeson...as two examples...

>So everything you don't understand has no apparent reason for being.
>Anything you don't understand becomes "cult like". Take my advice,
>Vipul: Stay away from VFW and Shriners conventions.

What do "VFW and Shriners conventions" have to do with
amateur radio or saving the Novice Class license?

Heil's continuing confusion adds more credence to mounting
evidence of his mind rot.

He goes into more such confusion on mentions of "Whitbread
Cup entrants" (whatever they are) and "marathon runners,"
neither of which have anything to do with radio per se, let
alone amateur radio or the Novice Class license for same in
the USA.

Heil should seek some mental therapy. If not for himself,
then for all the readers in here...

700. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:29:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509172901.18771.00000512@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66746

In article <b9f7fm$r62$1@208.206.142.85>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>> I really should resist answering this troll but he's a lot more fun than Len
>> Over 21.
>
> Yes, Dee, he's just almost totally clueless, while Lennie gets downright
>vicious.

Better vicious than viscous, vacuous...

701. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:29:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509172901.18771.00000511@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66748

In article <3EBB3293.7758565D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3EB9EB82.26D4CD9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <E.T. of
>> the Borg?> writes:
>>
>> >> Okay, we've established that little Davie didn't have an MOS
>> >> while in Vietnam bravely serving his country.
>> >
>> >We didn't establish it, I established it. You screwed it up totally by
>> >feeding us a load of misinformation about the armed services having
>> >"MILITAY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES", not ratings, Little Leona.
>>
>> "MILITAY?" E.T. was in the Militay? What is that?
>
>Who is E.T.? Is that your attempt at another dodge of your screwup?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are the one bragging of YOUR galaxy.

>> >Actually, as is your norm, you've drifted very far afield from the
>> >thread's subject in an effort to impress someone (an unwitting
>> >individual may step forward at any time) with your vast knowledge of
>> >things military. My response to you mentioned nothing about my "brave
>> >valorous military service life", Little Leonid. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor
>> >baby.
>>
>> You did not move boxes?
>
>You ever read any of the stuff posted here?

Yes. Quite amusing sometimes...all the militay [sic] heroes
knowing all about military communications when they've not
stated anything about such...all the militay [sic] heroes
bragging about how they were "in" a country at war, therefore
connecting them to "fighting action."

The famous claim of another comes to mind..."seven hostile
actions" [sick] without a single one identified as to either time
or place or military unit.

Then there's this "communications expert" serving with the
State Department who revolutionized HF operations in a tiny
country in the middle of Africa back in the 1980s.

>Do they? I know some Spanish and French speaking individuals who give
>feminine names to some objects and masculine names to others. Maybe
>they've not heard of your theory.

Is that anything like calling another "Leona" or "Leonid?" :-)

Perhaps you should restrict your socializing to those Spanish
and French speaking individuals who exhibit gender confusion.

>> >> It's all in Google. If you need a refresher, go there and look for
>> >> a month or so.
>> >
>> >T'aint there. You fabricate.
>>
>> Impossible.
>
>It is not only possible, you do it frequently.

I cannot change or "fabricate" anything on the Google archives.

Are you another one of the Archair Radiotelegraphy Society
who lives in past postings archived in Google?

>> I can't change contents of the Google site.
>
>Yeah, that's one of the best things about it.

Make up your mind. First you say I "fabricated" things on
Google then you say "one of the best things about it" being
an inability to change anything on Google.

Your differing personalities are arguing among themselves.

>Who is E.T.? I wasn't in the Army. That's why I asked you the
>question.

You are, Galactic Traveler.

Don't misdirect with meaningless questions.

>> He doesn't know much about the Navy.
>
>He knew enough to tell you that the Navy uses the term "rates".

If you were never in the USN, how can you be such an expert
on USN terminology? :-)

>> One wonders if E.T. knows anything about the US Air Force.
>
>Who is E.T.? I knew enough to tell you that the Air Force uses the term
>"AFSC". That's only a couple of things which I knew about the military
>that you didn't know. There are others.

You may be suffering from battle fatigue after being IN a country
at war 30 years ago. Or just plain mind rot. Hard to tell...

>> >> Could he do morse code?
>> >
>> >Could you?
>>
>> Yes.
>
>It has not been demonstrated.

Neither has your heroic military action IN a country at war.

>> Did E.T. know General George Patton?
>
>Who is E.T.? I knew Patton about as well as you. I've seen the movie,
>viewed documentaries, read books.

You failed to answer questions such as "did Patton have a ham
license."

Why do you misdirect with all those MILITAY [sic] questions?

The Subject line in the message header says "Novice Class
license." It isn't about MILITAY or military history.

>> Where and when? Patton died well before the Southeast Asia
>> Live Fire Exercise.
>
>...and well before Korea. He wouldn't have directed his operations from
>Japan so you still wouldn't have run into him.

I was assigned to do military radio communications while on US Army
duty in Japan, 1953 to 1956.

Extra Terrific hasn't said squat about doing any radio communications
while he was IN Vietnam. Nothing.

>> >> Tell us about your Novice Class amateur radio experiences in
>> >> Vietnam, mighty morse warrior. Did you "hone your skills" there?
>> >
>> >I was a Novice seven years before my arrival in Viet Nam at age 21.
>>
>> Practiced box moving in snack bars, did you?
>
>Are you literate?

Straight A grades in all college English courses, professional
writer since 1968 with a 97% acceptance rate on submitted
manuscripts to national periodicals, Associate Editor with Ham
Radio Magazine for two years.

Do you need more? :-)

>> >My
>> >amateur radio skills and military skills were already honed prior to my
>> >arrival.
>>

>> Marvelous. A "hone-y-do!"
>>
>> >Unlike your rear area service during the Korean War, I was
>> >actually stationed in the country where the conflict was taking place.
>>
>> Yes. Moving boxes in a snack bar.
>
>Are you literate?

Straight A grades in all college English courses, professional
writer since 1968 with a 97% acceptance rate on submitted
manuscripts to national periodicals, Associate Editor with Ham
Radio Magazine for two years.

Do you have short-term memory loss problems?

>> >I love it when a fellow like you starts telling someone who didn't serve
>> >in the military about your having put your life on the line.
>>
>> All US Army soldiers do that the minute they enlist...
>> regardless of where they are stationed as assigned.
>
>They do? That's assinine. Obviously you participated and have yet to
>stop.

You DO exhibit mental problems on comprehension of what
the US military does today as well as centuries past.

What is NOT "obvious" to anyone in here on what EXACTLY
Mr. Extra Terrific did in Vietnam.

>> How are we supposed to treat the vaporous implications
>> of meritorious service done by snack bar box pushers?
>
>I didn't know any snack bar box pushers. Must have been some rear area
>slang from the days when you won the Korean War from Tokyo.

The Korean War NEVER ENDED. There was no "winning" or
"losing," no "victory" or "defeat." The 38th Parallel remains as a
dividing line between North and South Koreas, as it has been
for over half a century.

I am shocked that a former employee of the US Department of
State is so ignorant of past history of United States and United
Nations involvement in Asia. It was in all the newspapers...

Such total ignorance is not any sort of virtue.

Combined with vague, ambiguous claims of being IN a country
at war yet never detailing anything in that regard, that makes
such claims appear false.

It seems that nothing of Mr. Extra Terrific's confused postings
has anything to do with amateur radio and certainly not about any

Novice Class amateur license.

I put Mr. Extra Terrific into the mind rot victim category.

Get well soon.

702. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:40:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hemj2y0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66853

On Fri, 09 May 2003 15:35:26 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>For the record, I'm not afraid of a woman who drinks beer from the
>bottle, has tattoos and who fist fights men. I just wouldn't want to go
>out with one.

My wife does not drink beer from a bottle or otherwise, does
not have tattoos, and does not fist fight men. She's a rather
good looking "mild mannered" lady who takes pride in her 60
year old's figure which many 30 year olds would die for. But
she's held her own with the loudmouth louts while working in
the heavy construction industry for over 30 years and I would
advise anyone to never start anything unpleasant with her. I've
seen her "in action" just once - "protecting me" she said - and
it wasn't pleasant for the other guy.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

703. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 21:40:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hemjmx1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66854

On Fri, 09 May 2003 15:02:17 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:

> oooh, did you get to roll? The boat that is, not Larry! 8^) Just once,
>I would like to at least see that.

And pitch and yaw. "Keeping station" by radar means a LOT of
three dimensional movement in a tidal bay, and I found out the
difference between a seafarer and a landlubber (I fall into
the latter catgeory). My wife, OTOH, was a co-partner in a
trimaran during her first marriage. Neither lasted very long....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

704. Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 22:09:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9h8ucbdc1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66856
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB033
ARLB033 FCC Declares General Communications Emergency for Oklahoma
Area

ZCZC AG33
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 33 ARLB033
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT May 9, 2003
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB033
ARLB033 FCC Declares General Communications Emergency for Oklahoma
Area

The Federal Communications Commission has declared a general
communications emergency for the Oklahoma area. Effective
immediately, amateurs are required to refrain from using 3900 kHz,
plus or minus 3 kHz, unless they are taking part in the handling of
emergency traffic.

The declaration was announced May 9, 2003, in cooperation with ARRL
Oklahoma Section leadership and under the authority of Section
97.401 of the FCC's Amateur Radio Service rules and regulations [47
CFR Part 97].

The FCC said the declaration is to support amateur communications on
behalf of The Salvation Army's tornado relief efforts. The order,
signed by Technical and Public Safety Division Chief Joseph P. Casey
of the FCC's Enforcement Bureau, remains in effect until rescinded.
NNNN
/EX

705. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 22:17:54 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBC2912.D5FB9CAD@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66744

Jack Twilley wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Chris" == Chris <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> writes:
>
> Chris> Hello, I have a couple questions.
>
> Chris> Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without
> Chris> having to take any of the subsequent examination elements?
>
> You have to have taken and passed the technician and general theory
> exams and the 5wpm exam before taking the extra theory exam, if I
> recall correctly.

That is incorrect. One may take the General then Extra written exams before the code exam and will be given a certificate of credit if you pass. The certificate conveys NO priviledges. One must then take the code test within a certain time before being granted either license.

706. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 22:25:09 UTC
From: Ole King Cat <bovordde333@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ebc2ab5@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66857
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> quoted in message
news:b9h8ucbdc1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB033
> ARLB033 FCC Declares General Communications Emergency for Oklahoma
> Area
>
> The Federal Communications Commission has declared a general
> communications emergency for the Oklahoma area. Effective
> immediately, amateurs are required to refrain from using 3900 kHz,
> plus or minus 3 kHz, unless they are taking part in the handling of
> emergency traffic.

While I have *no problems whatsoever* in FCC declaring
a "communications emergency frequency" in a situation
such as this, I think it will be VERY curious to see what
happens tonight as both the 3.898 Group and the "3.903"
Century Club both operate on, and seem to be "quite
possessive" of these freqs.

It would have been much better IMHO if the FCC had
declared 3.990 to 4.000 as the declared emergency
channel(s) in the 75M band.

707. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 22:45:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bcWua.7469$3f7.5126536@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66855

"Avery Fineman" <averyfineman@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030508234639.04525.00000452@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <GzBua.6299$3f7.4728386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the
> >rules.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...another newsgroup neophyte trying to use the
> "reducto ad absurdum" non-argument.
>

No just pointing out the absurdity of what Vshah101 was saying. If we let his definition stand that ham radio is a cult because contestor's follow the rules, then we buy into his beliefs and to be consistent would need to apply that same definition to other activities.

By the way your snipping choice is so poor that others cannot tell what led up to my comment or determine whether my comment is or is not a "reducto ad absurdum."

>
> >Competitions have rules so you can decide the winners. If you don't have
> >rules, you can't determine winners or rankings. Without winners and
> >rankings, you don't have a contest. It's an activity but not a
competition.
>
> Amateur radio DX contesting is called "radiosport."
>
> "Sport" involves athletic activity.
>
> A number of older men sitting alone at their radios for hours on
> end doing nothing but listening and twitching fingers of one
> hand is NOT any sort of athletic activity.

I never referred to contesting as radio sport. I never said anything about sport or athletic activity. I was discussing competition. Competition exists in many realms not just the realm of sports. The jam and jelly competition at the local fair is a competition even though it is not a sport.

In other words competition is NOT a synonym for sport or athletic activity.

>
> Amateur radio DX contesting is nothing but a GAME.

I never said otherwise. Besides games have rules in order to determine winners and rankings. Games are also a form of competition although it may be just against oneself as in solitaire.

>
> >I really should resist answering this troll but he's a lot more fun than Len
> >Over 21.
>
> I don't think you can stand the open competition of newsgroup
> discussion, Dee. I would suggest that you give serious
> thought to stopping access this newsgroup. It isn't a woman's
> syncophantic ARRL auxilliary site.

And how did you come with this non-sequiter? Since I am a duly licensed Extra class operator (from before the latest restructuring for those to whom it matters), why would I have any interest in an ARRL auxiliary.

Why should I stop? I'm having fun and some people agree with me.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

708. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 23:22:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509192201.03151.00000118@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66858

From K4YZ:

> Just HOW do you suggest that those "rules" be set up in order to allow
>points to be obtained, Vipidiot? By seeing who can get the lowest SWR?

Thats a good award. Instead of Worked All States, there should be awards for station setup time, Worked All Bands (with homebrew bonus), distance awards, low power, radio direction finding.

In other words, awards for real skills and real competition. Instead of turning the dial and calling CQ.

>If you interrupt a fellow who is trying to work a contest just to get a
>10-10 numbeer and at least don't throw the guy a contest point, you DESERVE
>to
>get scolded.

The adult explained to me that a 10-10 contact should not be done, contest or not.

>You've not cited ONE piece of verifyable "evidence" to anyone in this
>forum. You say you've been to "hamfests" in "other states", yet you never
>cite
>those events, times, etc.

CT hamfest was called "Microwave update". Boxboro,MA Hamfest in Aug had Wuoff Hong. Hosstaders in Hopkinton, NH is another Hamfest I went to.

I won't cite the event I went to recently, the clubs I've been to for obvious reasons- I will run into these people again, perhaps at Field Day.

>What you are doing is lying.

No, these are true accounts of the events I've been to, from my point of view.

709. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 23:28:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509192831.03151.00000119@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66859

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Obesity
>is a self-chosen, self-inflicted condition.

At these events, they often eat alot. They eat alot after antenna setups,
events such as the one I went to, hamfests, etc.

This, combined with radio not being an active hobby.

This is why Hams are overweight.

710. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 23:31:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509193110.03151.00000120@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66860

From K4YZ:

>>Contesting is both more boring, and requires less physical activity.
>
> Oh...?!?! The Let's see you try to do it, Vipul.

I've participated in contests.

.>>The interesting activities happen to require more physical activity.
>
> Like chasing preety fems...?!?!

K4YZ seems to have something against pretty females.

711. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 23:34:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509193410.03151.00000123@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66861

From K4YZ:

>Then whatever the General Class has to offer you, Vippy, is worthless. If
>you upgrade AFTER code is taken away, it will be no les than what it is, ergo
>you wasted time waiting on it.

Thats interesting. It sort of makes sense.

> And what's your "new field" supposed to be? Satellite dish installation
>tech?

Satellite dish installation tech may involve some EE stuff. I am no longer in
EE field at all.

712. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 23:37:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509193751.03151.00000124@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66862

From: "Phil Kane"

>If you want "socializing" join a dance
> club where there are plenty of babes and let us hams do our hamming.

"Hamming" is a measure of digital code performance. Now, are Hams going to do this manually as well?

UR right, fewer fems in Ham radio than even EE field.

713. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-09 23:45:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509194511.03151.00000125@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66863

From K4YZ:

> My assertion still stands. Your lack of experience is glaring, Vippy.

Ham radio SHOULD be interesting. What about those who have not been to so many events, perhaps just one?
If they are bored there after seeing contests, they would not want to join Ham radio.

714. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 00:20:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509202046.18771.00000525@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66865

In article <c2356669.0305090934.77e630ce@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>> What about those former electronic technicians who actually
>> ARE electronic engineers, have the demonstrated capability
>> and the experience and the accreditation and continue in that
>> endeavor? That is my category.
>
>It is? Where did you get your EE degree(s), Len? What date(s) are on
>the diploma(s)?

I have it. For details, you don't have any right to know.

You already know my work resume, all employers. You
won't reveal yours. Okay, by the same token I don't have
to reveal where or when my degree was granted. :-)

>Why? Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

I know enough radio technology to have corporations pay me for
the responsibility of radio design...and many have done so.

I don't have much information on US amateur radio of the 1930s.

The 1930s' standards and practices of amateur radio continue
today, 70 years later, complete with the "necessity" to test for
morse code skills in a hobby-recreational radio activity.

I have one textbook on 1930s radio, "Communications
Engineering," by Everitt, copyrighted and published 1932.
Interesting book, contains radio technology information that
was considered "up-to-date" in my 1978 ARRL Handbook.
I traded another textbook for that with a radio amateur in
New York state; we were both authors of different articles on
the same technology in Ham Radio Magazine.

>So we should ask your friends about you? What would that prove?

It would prove you can dare venture outside Google and
the past. I don't think you have the courage to do that.

>You won't take the testimony of my friends about me....

What "friends?" In here there are only Heil who calls me a
"horse's ass," Kellie who tries to emulate Steamy Stalker
by calling me "putz."

With "friends" like that YOU don't need enemies. :-)

>I think you also sent that unsolicited junk email to me. Why?

Why not?

>Has anyone doubted that you held a commercial FCC license?

Yes. [didn't you look hard enough in Google?]

>Does your
>holding such a license somehow prove that you know more about how
>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
deliberate public information on any answers. It was taken once
and passed before most of the participants in this din of inequity
were either alive or had taken ANY tests of ANY kind.

Neither the staff nor the commissioners of the FCC need to have
passed any amateur radio test in order to determine whether any
VEC QPC question-answer is suitable for any FCC-approved test
for radio amateurs. The FCC regulates US amateur radio as well
as all other US civil radio services.

In case you haven't read the rather simple law on the subject, the
FCC is obliged to accept ALL US citizen input insofar as US radio
regulations on ANY US radio service they regulate.

The grant of an amateur radio license, regardless of date of issue,
does NOT give you or any other radio amateur licensee any sort
of power or control over who should be allowed to comment on US
law of any kind. Neither does it yield any special knowledge of law
over and above anyone not licensed in amateur radio. Neither does
it impart some significant knowledge of amateur radio on amateur
radio matters other than the licensee's experience in amateur
radio.

>> 4. The Stalker then made up a libelous "homepage" on AOL
>> which was a prima facie bit of personal insult easily
>> evidenciary of libelous behavior in any civil court. AOL
>> removed that immediately as well as his equally-libelous
>> new screen name when notified.
>
>Sounds like you can dish it out but you can't take it, Len ;-)

I've "taken it" in here for years. But, I've never been so obsessed
with any particular message arguement to carry sore losing to
such great lengths as:

1. Creating a special Home Page on an ISP deliberately
designed to libel one individual so severely as did Robeson.
That was an outrageous, sick act on his part.

2. Send a specific one-paragraph Comment to the FCC 10 days
after comment cut-off period with the sole subject being his
objection to my commenting to my government plus his
demand that my comment be disregarded.

I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
court lawsuit on grounds of libel. I can afford such things as
attorney fees for a protacted period. Such a lawsuit would be
almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are
(and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
money.

Rather than "take it" to court, I simply contacted AOL and pointed
out the clear evidence of libel. AOL removed that Home Page
and the newly-created defamatory screen name he created. That
was the honorable course of action on my part and AOL's part.
Robeson remains vengeful, foul-mouthed in an obvious condition
of sociopathic behavior in this newsgroup.

>Do you think your behavior here causes others to respect you? Here's a
>hint: IT DOESN'T.

Irrelevant. All unmoderated newsgroups are free-for-alls where
anyone can post at any time on any subject with freedom to
say whatever they wish to say.

This medium isn't the printed page which remains intact in
thousands of identical copies in many places. This medium
isn't a court of law presided over by a judge...even though some,
like yourself, presume to BE a judge and RULE over those
whom you wish to rule.

This newsgroup is a "24/7" street fight arena subject only to the
vagaries of computer hardware reliability.

"Respect" is not earned by mouthing platitudes and beliefs
espoused by some membership organization for years and then
attempting to demean those who do not accept such beliefs.
"Respect" is a very objective condition, very individual in nature
and you have no, repeat NO, lock on who has or has no "respect."

>> 5. The Stalker tried to manufacture some kind of "case" of
>> "cowardice" about my US Army Signal Corps duties and
>> location, repeatedly refering to my military occupation
>> specialty as "rear area radio clerk."
>
>Did he use the word cowardice?

Yes.

He has never proven that at any time other than mouthing off in
many and varied postings made in here.

>We all know what you did in Japan, Len. You've told us many, many,
>MANY times.

That disturbs you? Too bad. You've never done anything
similar so your apparent anguish over others having done so
seems to indicate jealousy on your part. Not my problem.
I did my military duties as ordered, where ordered, received
an Honorable Discharge from the US Army.

Some of you have a great deal of trouble with anyone serving
in the US military including yourself being highly critical of what
I did. Is that because you've never served in the US military?

>I do remember you mentioning the message totals for ADA in a way that
>could be mistaken to imply that you did it all by yourself. Shall I
>get that one from Google? ;-)

Feel free to post the entirety of what I've ever posted in this
newsgroup. Do it as many times as you wish. You have the
freedom to do that. What will that "gain" you?

It gains you only the irritation of others tired of your sore-loser
attitude attempting to "get" another correspondent. Such wastes
everyone's time, including your own.

>> The Stalker has not made any explicit details of his own
>> military service and "battle experience/heroism" other than
>> the vague generality of "seven hostile actions."
>
>Some folks do, some folks don't.

That is a NULL comment. The Stalker has given NO details of
where or when those took place. It remains vague, undefined.
In other venues it would be called a "fish story." A LIE.

>The way you have described your military service could give some
>people the wrong impression, Len. I recall a bunch of postings about
>being Bear bombers and how close you were to Korea, etc.

I was IN Korea on one short TDY. Irrelevant.

I don't have any power to command others how they are supposed
to read what I write. I can't control your little temper tantrums,
either. Not my problem. Yours.

I enlisted voluntarily at a time when the Korean War was in an
active phase. I was assigned to an Army unit based in the
Tokyo area doing military communications. I didn't have any
control over that. Eugene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, was assigned
to the same unit and the same time and with identical jobs, but

on different work shifts. We were US Army soldiers and signalmen. We all knew the proximity of the USSR and North Korea and did extra training weekly in infantry skills.

Do you wish extreme accuracy in ALL military-oriented comments as to plan, position, strategy, and tactics? Why? You've never served in any military, have absolutely NO experience of being IN a position where you may be in direct danger at any time and for prolonged periods of time. The 19 members of my signal battalion did not want to perish in that crash in Korea on July 1, 1950...they never got to "fight" in any combat in Korea. They were flown from their unit in Japan to Korea on short notice, under orders to go to Korea. I doubt they went to any USAF aircraft guide to find out exact distances of USSR flight times or what USSR aircraft types were in use. Regretably they all perished in an accident, while IN uniform, doing their duty as soldiers and signalmen.

>More important, you don't show much respect towards other veterans who
>served if those veterans disagree with you on other issues.
>Interesting.

Normally, if still in the US military, I'd use military language to tell you GO FUCK OFF! and follow that with appropriate physical action. However, being as you've never served in the US military and, as a morseman, probably don't know much about sex either, I would simply flip you the bird and go on to other things.

You are ignorant due to non-exposure to such things, probably never left the continental United States. You will NEVER understand any brotherhood of being in a military branch of any kind.

>Here's a classic example.

I snipped a posting that is over 3 years old.

Miccolis seems to live in the past, constantly referring to old public postings as if they are recent or applicable. The past is past. This is NOW, not yesterday.

>Gee, Len, you really showed another veteran some respect, huh? And
>that was in a thread where you weren't even being addressed.

Miccolis isn't in any position to "judge" the contents. All he has is a little temper tantrum and some kind of need to "get" another that displeases His Greatness. Bird. Flip. Enjoy.

>Why is it OK for you to tell the FCC to disregard another's comments,
>but not OK for someone to tell the FCC to disregard yours?

Feel free to post the ENTIRETY of my 14-page Reply to Comments on FCC NPRM 98-143. You can then ask "the

jury" for their "decision" and then pronounce me "guilty."

No problem with me. Carry on, judge. Bird. Flip. Enjoy.

>You sent your 14 pages to the FCC so late that there was no way anyone
>could reply before the January 15 deadline.

The FCC postponed deadline was established as 15 January 1999.

My document, all required paper copies AND floppy disk with
the identical text were sent via USPS registered mail over a
week prior to deadline. The return receipt through USPS arrived
before the FCC time-stamping of 13 January 1999 as indicated
in the FCC archive copy on their ECFS.

I complied with both the law and the requested format given by
the FCC in a voluntary expression of one US citizen towards his
government as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United
States of America.

Many others filing comments were marked as received on the
same date period. You do not mention those yet those are
also on the public record. For your snide, petty little displeasure
in that tiny tantrum I give you this: Bird. Flip. Enjoy.

>BULLSHIT.
>
>There's just no other word for it, Len.

Of course there are "other words" for it, Pedantic Parson of
the newsgroup. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Uncouth language of ruffians in the pristine purity of this
newsgroup!

Bird. Flip. Enjoy.

>C'mon, Len, you made the claim, you back it up. Show us the actual
>postings.

You are wasting all our time, Pedantic Parson.

Here: Bird. Flip. Enjoy.

>You may find a "Lennie" or "LHA" back a few years, but that's about
>it. As for "false accusations", you won't find any of those.

There are dozens, perhaps hundreds.

"Putz." "Coward." "Lier [sic]." "Horse's Ass." Just recently,
in this year. :-)

>Find 'em and show 'em, Len. Can you? I think not.

I won't bother. I'm not the one demanding over and over to
dredge up OLD postings. You are. Go to the past. Stay

there and quit wasting everyone's time.

Jimmie boy, you must learn to live in the here and now.
I don't credit you with any ability to live for the future. You
have to continue to beat those old, dead horses and I can't
understand any motivation for that except some perverse
pique on your part for not Getting Your Way in the beginning.

I give you this: Bird. Flip.

Enjoy wasting our time.

715. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 00:20:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509202048.18771.00000526@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 66864

In article <3EBC1A49.E7B75240@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> >This would require some sort of international convention on what "citizens
>> >band" should be. There ae countless users of "land mobile" radio, and
trying
>> >to define each and every one of them would be a never-ending task.
>>
>> >CB has rules on power and distances authorized, but the FCC thinks it can
>> >dictate physics...It was foolish in the 1950s, and even more foolish today!
>>
>> In the 1950s, the FCC's experience with "mass radio operators"
>> was primarily with amateur radio, and they expected the new
>> "CB" operators to be as respectful of rules and limitations as
>> the hams were at that time. The enforcement resources were
>> large enough then to take care of the small amount of violators
>> that did emerge in the 1960s. They could not foresee or
>> plan for the the roguishness of the violations and violators
>> (the "10-4 good buddy" crowd) which emerged in the 1970s.
>>
>
>The 55 MPH speed limit probably made CB popular. Truckers
>talking to each other to identify speed traps. With their managers
>pushing for higher "productivity", i.e., stuff delivered faster, they
>had little choice. And nobody wanted to be easily traced, so
>nobody bothered with licenses. Then the song "Convoy" came
>out the fall of 1975, and many people got on CB. Then people
>noticed DX (when the sunspots were in) and found it fun to
>do the DX. This essentially exploded overnight and the FCC
>was overwhelmed, and eventually said screw it and didn't worry
>about violations not involving non type accepted equipment.

Class D CB was created in 1958. That's the "CB" that all
of today refer to in comments. Class A and B CB disappeared
with radio service restructuring. Class C CB (radio control)
was lumped in with Radio Control Radio Service in Part 95.
R/C Radio Service later got many new frequencies in a
72 MHz band.

Class D CB transceiver sales in the USA had begun to
slump prior to the importation of off-shore manufactured units
about 1965. A few years later almost all CB transceivers were
built off-shore and most also designed off-shore. The lowering
of costs to under $100 over the counter was probably a greater
impetus for the boom in sales and user popularity.

A song and movie featuring CB owe more to the CB users
already being numerous enough to permit identification of the
public with CB use. Songs, movies, and TV shows probably
ADDED to the popularity after they appeared.

>I had a CB license KAAR5167 back in 1976, then "upgraded"
>to ham radio in August 76 "WA2ISE".

That's nice. My first CB license had the callsign "11W8893."
That was in 1959. :-)

>People who say 2m or some other band is just like CB ought to
>listen to the 27MHz CB band sometime....

Living as I do within a mile of Interstate 5, all I hear on CB is
heterodynes, all channels. Can't remember hearing any
heterodynes on the amateur 2m band. I'd say you are right.

It's very difficult to discern any foul language amidst all the
heterodynes on CB. It's like trying to hear ANY voice while
listening to commercial SSB with 6 KHz of TTY tones. :-)

716. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 00:48:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509204858.15260.00000110@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66866

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/9/2003 6:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509194511.03151.00000125@mb-m07.aol.com>

>> My assertion still stands. Your lack of experience is glaring, Vippy.
>
>Ham radio SHOULD be interesting. What about those who have not been to so
>many
>events, perhaps just one?
>If they are bored there after seeing contests, they would not want to join
>Ham
>radio.

Basing ANY decision to participate in ANY sport, hobby or other organized
event based on ONE exposure is foolhearty.

People must exercise thier perogative to get off thier collective duf's
and find out for themselves what the "real deal" is. If they don't, and they
are "disappointed", then boo-freakin'-hoo for them, Vippy...It's thier fault.

Steve, K4YZ

717. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 00:54:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509205404.15260.00000111@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66867

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: "Jim" jim801@altaolnewsposter.org
>Date: 5/9/2003 7:13 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b9g62imkp0@pita.alt.net>

>Actually, one can meet some pretty hot babes at places like
>roller rinks, not that you would take them home to meet mommy,
>but...

True...especially since the local rink here doesn't have an "adult night",
and I am 47!

>I find most hams, like the self-appointed "experts" found
>in this forum, would be scared off by the likes of strong willed
>women who join roller skating teams.

True. I did almost the same. She wasn't a team skater, but like me, was
a free style dancer.

>Hmmm, maybe I'll give Angie a call tonight...(SNIP)

DICKENSON...?!?! I spent a good part of my Junior High School years hoping
to get arrested and frisked by her!

>It'd be fun to watch pee will hams make passes at her, only to
>get a left to the chops, just above the pencil protector and to the
>right of the clip-on microphone.

Not here...the most important four letter word I learned in the USMC
was....

D U C K

73

Steve, K4YZ

718. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 00:55:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509205544.15260.00000112@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66868

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/9/2003 6:37 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509193751.03151.00000124@mb-m07.aol.com>

>UR right, fewer fems in Ham radio than even EE field

With people like you calling ladies "fems", who WOULD?

Steve, K4YZ

719. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 01:02:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509210213.15260.00000113@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66869

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509172858.18771.00000510@mb-m18.aol.com>

>Further, "K4YZ" never worked one day in his life IN any electric
> or elecronic engineering department anywhere, never got any
> engineering degree. [again, no record anywhere on that]

But LENNIE! You're living proof that one doesn't need to be an EE to work in electronics!

>>That's simply an untruth. Do you know what a person who tells untruths
>>is called?
>
> Dave Heil...Steve Robeson...as two examples

You can call me a lot of things, Lennie (and already have...), but liar is not one of them. That's your baliwick.

>Heil should seek some mental therapy. If not for himself,
> then for all the readers in here..

Why? Please state your credentials in psychiatry or psychology that qualify you to say this.

Please do not make reference to sleeping with a correspondence course wannabe shrink as "qualification". Her "credentials" are even more dubious than yours.

Steve, K4YZ

720. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 01:11:33 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509211133.18769.00000510@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66870

In article <bcWua.7469$3f7.5126536@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Avery Fineman" <averyfineman@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030508234639.04525.00000452@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> In article <GzBua.6299$3f7.4728386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the
>> >rules.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...another newsgroup neophyte trying to use the
>> "reducto ad absurdum" non-argument.
>
>No just pointing out the absurdity of what Vshah101 was saying. If we let
>his definition stand that ham radio is a cult because contestor's follow the
>rules, then we buy into his beliefs and to be consistent would need to apply
>that same definition to other activities.

You are still reducing things to the absurd.

Vipul Shah has clearly indicated his opinion of the olde-tymers
in ham radio as "cultists." See all of his postings prior to
mentioning radio contests...[on-off keying] CW as the best
mode as a cult belief...mythical symbols (whouff-hong and
rettysnitch) that originated in Newington...the concentration
on HF bands and DXing...many other cultist trappings and
traditions.

>By the way your snipping choice is so poor that others cannot tell what led
>up to my comment or determine whether my comment is or is not a "reducto ad
>absurdum."

Tsk, tsk, tsk, OG. Instead of chiding Shah on some faulty
expressions of his opinion in English, you did the "reduction to
the absurd" by claiming that his mention of contesting was
equivalent to cultism.

>> Amateur radio DX contesting is called "radiosport."
>>
>> "Sport" involves athletic activity.
>>
>> A number of older men sitting alone at their radios for hours on
>> end doing nothing but listening and twitching fingers of one
>> hand is NOT any sort of athletic activity.

>
>I never referred to contesting as radio sport. I never said anything about
>sport or athletic activity. I was discussing competition.

The Pedantic Parson, K2EY, has often referred to contesting
as "radiosport." Since he imagines himself a "leader" in this
forum, I thought all morsepersons bowed to that terminology.

I apologize to another pedant.

>Competition
>exists in many realms not just the realm of sports. The jam and jelly
>competition at the local fair is a competition even though it is not a
>sport.

When jam, jelly, and local fairs are directly a part of amateur
radio policy discussion topics I will bow to your wisdom.

>In other words competition is NOT a synonym for sport or athletic activity.

I never claimed you said the opposite. :-)

>> Amateur radio DX contesting is nothing but a GAME.
>
>I never said otherwise. Besides games have rules in order to determine
>winners and rankings. Games are also a form of competition although it may
>be just against oneself as in solitaire.

Some radio amateurs in here imply that contesting is the equal
to emergency communications operations. That isn't done in
solitude.

But, I will drop that since you will object to the introduction of a
new direction, etc., etc., etc. Strike what I wrote on that.

>> I don't think you can stand the open competition of newsgroup
>> discussion, Dee. I would suggest that you give serious
>> thought to stopping access this newsgroup. It isn't a woman's
>> syncophantic ARRL auxilliary site.
>
>And how did you come with this non-sequiter? Since I am a duly licensed
>Extra class operator (from before the latest restructuring for those to whom
>it matters), why would I have any interest in an ARRL auxiliary.

Please forgive my choice of words. I was under the assumption
that most people would think the word "auxiliary" meant "helping"
or "subsidiary" or "supplementary" as the dictionaries define it.

Since dictionaries do not associate the word "auxiliary" with any
gender...contrary to some colloquial uses as in "women's
auxiliary" meaning a group of women...I intended to have the word
"auxiliary" refer to a secondary role of this forum being a free
supplementary outlet for ARRL olde-tyme ham Beliefs.

I can understand your gender displeasure since US amateur radio
is overwhelmingly an activity of middle-aged white males.

>Why should I stop? I'm having fun and some people agree with me.

Indeed, why should anyone "stop?"

ARRL olde-tyme ham Beliefs are not of the divinity nor are they
some form of Universal Truths however self-evident to Believers.

There is no consensus that your statements are agreeable.

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

721. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 01:29:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBC5633.6090508@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66872
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ole King Cat wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> quoted in message
> news:b9h8ucbdc1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>>SB QST @ ARL $ARLB033
>>ARLB033 FCC Declares General Communications Emergency for Oklahoma
>>Area
>>
>>The Federal Communications Commission has declared a general
>>communications emergency for the Oklahoma area. Effective
>>immediately, amateurs are required to refrain from using 3900 kHz,
>>plus or minus 3 kHz, unless they are taking part in the handling of
>>emergency traffic.
>
>
> While I have *no problems whatsoever* in FCC declaring
> a "communications emergency frequency" in a situation
> such as this, I think it will be VERY curious to see what
> happens tonight as both the 3.898 Group and the "3.903"
> Century Club both operate on, and seem to be "quite
> possessive" of these freqs.
>
> It would have been much better IMHO if the FCC had
> declared 3.990 to 4.000 as the declared emergency
> channel(s) in the 75M band.

Who the heck scheduled a disaster at the same time the Century club
holds their net? Sheesh!

- Mike KB3EIA -

722. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 01:33:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBC5715.4060309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66873

Vshah101 wrote:
> From K4YZ:
>
>
>>My assertion still stands. Your lack of experience is glaring, Vippy.
>
>
> Ham radio SHOULD be interesting. What about those who have not been to so many
> events, perhaps just one?
> If they are bored there after seeing contests, they would not want to join Ham
> radio.

Question?

You have left absolutely no doubt that there is an almost bottomless
hatred you have for Ham radio.

That being the case, what is your motivation for continuing to post here?

- Mike KB3EIA -

723. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 01:40:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBC58BF.40906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66874

Phil Kane wrote:
> On Fri, 09 May 2003 15:02:17 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>oooh, did you get to roll? The boat that is, not Larry! 8^) Just once,
>>I would like to at least see that.
>
>
> And pitch and yaw. "Keeping station" by radar means a LOT of
> three dimensional movement in a tidal bay, and I found out the
> difference between a seafarer and a landlubber (I fall into
> the latter catgeory). My wife, OTOH, was a co-partner in a
> trimaran during her first marriage. Neither lasted very long....

Ahh, I'm one of those who love the motion of the ship. Relaxes me. The only time I've had a problem was on a huge boat that ends up being pretty regular in response to the wave action. After I went on a cruise last fall, I found out the ship ended up with about a 15 second period. But I only found out after the cruise was over and I had sea legs for a week. But on the ship I slept like a baby.

- Mike KB3EIA -

724. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 02:25:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JqZua.7586$3f7.5184260@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66871

"Avery Fineman" <averyfineman@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030509211133.18769.00000510@mb-m21.aol.com...
> Len Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

I should have known it had to be you under a new identity. Oh well another
one for the kill file.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

725. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 02:27:30 UTC
From: paulfriedman@attbi.com
Message-ID: <lsZua.789233$3D1.437019@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 66875

Chris:

You have to take and pass the three written tests in order (Tech, then General, then Extra. You can do them all in the same session, though.

The code test can be taken at the same time or later. I took all four elements at once to get them over with. <grin>.

The code was tough for me due to a mild learning disability..but it was still quite doable. There are several freebie Code learning tools available on the web and several ones that cost money. What worked for me (and, I must admit that my objective was to pas the test, not to really learn Morse code) was the standard method of learning a character, then adding a second.. recognizing the difference between the two then adding a third, etc. The code exam is one message from a pseudo-QSO . Knowing the format and what to expect helps quite a bit..so get some software that sends a similar QSO type message.

Good luck

Paul ab0si

"Chris" <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> wrote in message news:df510dbe.0305090601.78480fe5@posting.google.com...
> Hello,
>
> I have a couple questions.
>
> Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without having
> to take any of the subsequent examination elements?
>
> I've looked at the theory part of the exam, and everything looks
> straightforward. However I need to learn Morse code. I was wondering,
> perhaps, if people can tell me how they went about learning Morse
> mode.
>
> Thank you,
>
> -Chris

726. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 03:25:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBC71BA.CB65BEF9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66876

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EBB2EDC.9351084C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Wittle Wennie has a vewy active imagination. Wennie's pompous
> >condescent is wegend. By the way, Wennie--resistance is quite common in
> >ewectwonics. Now cwick your heels together while saying, "There's no
> >pwace wike ohm".
>
> Heil has definitely gone into mind rot. Poor baby.

I'm happy that you see it that way, Leonard. My comments were posted in
your style.

> >> Hmmm...the Borg are back...
> >
> >Nope. They were bought out by a motion picture studio and are now known
> >as Borg-Warner.
>
> Incorrect.
>
> Warner Brothers studio facilities (and Warner "Ranch Facilities"
> outdoor location) are south down Hollywood Way from my house,
> in Burbank. Hollywood Way is a major north-south thoroughfare
> in the east end of San Fernando Valley.
>
> Paramount Pictures owns the rights to "Star Trek" (and the
> alien characters known as "the Borg"). Paramount Pictures
> is farther south, over the Santa Monica Mountains, in the Los
> Angeles area known as Hollywood.
>
> "Borg-Warner" is a separate entity not involved with either show
> business or fictitious aliens or amateur radio or attempts at
> humor by baby-talking old men with control-freak obsessions.

You'd think that by age 70, a sense of humor would have emerged.

Dave K8MN

727. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 03:29:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509232913.18759.00000778@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 66877

In article <20030509210213.15260.00000113@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, Extra Amateur Schmuck) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030509172858.18771.00000510@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>>Further, "K4YZ" never worked one day in his life IN any electric
>> or elecronic engineering department anywhere, never got any
>> engineering degree. [again, no record anywhere on that]
>
> But LENNIE! You're living proof that one doesn't need to be an EE to
>work in electronics!

Not "living proof," schmuck...my "work in electronics" involved design engineering responsibility and that included final approval signature on engineering drawings and reports.

Robeson's sole "engineering work" involved a short time as a purchasing agent for a single electronics firm. All purchasing agents "sign off" are purchase orders. Paperwork shufflers.

> Why? Please state your credentials in psychiatry or psychology that
>qualify you to say this.
>
> Please do not make reference to sleeping with a correspondence course
>wannabe shrink as "qualification". Her "credentials" are even more dubious
>than yours.

I do not "sleep with any correspondence course wannabe shrink," schmuck. I sleep with my legal wife, my wife under God since we were married in church by a pastor. That marriage is part of publicly available documentation at the County of Los Angeles..

My wife has a Bachelors degree from Beloit College, Beloit, WI, a Masters degree in Education from University of Illinois and a Masters degree in Social Work also from U of I. The University of Illinois is NOT some "correspondence course" place, neither is Beloit College, a smaller and older academic institution at the southern border of Wisconsin. The curricula for both college and university will confirm what courses were required to complete those degrees. The Masters in Social Work requires considerable psychology.

The "dubious credentials" as you spitefully put it wrongly, are verifiable through registrar's archives and also with the states of Illinois and Washington, both of which licensed her for private practice in Social Work counseling. She was in private practice for over a decade in Washington state and has dealt much with disturbed individuals who were in the military service, were spouses or family of servicemen, were military veterans, or workers at Bremerton Navy Yards, Fort Lewis, and McChord AFB. My wife has you typed, categorized, indexed, identified in a typical set of syndromes of mental disturbance. Almost a "no brainer" to identify either with formal training in psychology or how I obtained it from the College of H. Knox.

Let's talk about the schmuck's favorite subject, himself. Robeson has NO degree in any engineering discipline, not even any formal college class training in electronics, yet he claims to be a qualified judge of anyone already IN or having been IN engineering. Robeson has NO claims of ever having done any military radio communications, has never identified any piece of radio equipment by name, formal or common, has no knowledge of the most common small unit land-air radio in the US military of the last 14 years (a quarter million of those in nearly all branches of the US military now). He has said he wont name the equipment because of "security reasons" despite US electronics industry trade publications having publicly identified those, their nomenclature, contract money amounts, and the entity awarded the contract. In short, he has continually lied by omission, giving false reasons why information "cannot be discussed."

Schmuck Robeson's "radio experience" is almost entirely obtained from amateur radio and his "radio knowledge" comes from the popular newsstand amateur radio publications. Yet he insists he has some sort of "qualifications" in which to "judge" others who are or were in regular professional engineering work, have been active in HF radio communications before he was born, or know more about the rest of the radio communications world than he will ever learn on memorizing the advertisements in QST. He is corrupt in qualifications, corrupt in judgement, beneath contempt as a human being for his behavior in this forum.

A counter to the schmuck's mentioning of wives would be to turn around and talk about his, of indeterminate number, and THEIR qualifications. Fair is fair, isn't it? However, that is not "good form" as the Brits might say, ungentlemanly conduct.

None of this message is about "saving any Novice Class license." Robeson stayed away from that. Instead, he went into his disturbed mental state mode and railed at his pet "enemies" for replying to another member of the Gang of Four. It would seem the thread Subject line should be "saving of the old-time Amateur Extra Class" since Robeson is a high-magnitude negative representative of US amateur radio humans. He may be beyond

saving, but I have hopes for others with better mental health.

728. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 03:46:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.henb4s2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66878

On 09 May 2003 23:37:51 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>UR right, fewer fems in Ham radio than even EE field.

Our local club - the biggest in the state - has a membership
of about 40% "fems". Some of them are even "preety" and
single. None of them would be interested in someone with your
attitude.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

729. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 03:46:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.henbdq3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66879

On 09 May 2003 23:22:01 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>I won't cite the event I went to recently, the clubs I've been
>to for obvious reasons- I will run into these people again,
>perhaps at Field Day.

Perhaps in a dark alley......

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

730. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 03:51:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509235102.18772.00000467@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66880

In article <JqZua.7586$3f7.5184260@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Avery Fineman" <averyfineman@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030509211133.18769.00000510@mb-m21.aol.com...
>> Len Anderson
>> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person
>
>I should have known it had to be you under a new identity. Oh well another
>one for the kill file.

That's not a "new identity." I had that as a handle back on BBSs
as a co-sysop of one system...and is the first additional screen
name I used on AOL years ago. I've posted with that screen
name in here before.

I would suggest you put ALL the individuals who disagree with
you in those "kill files." Such ostrich-like behavior will preserve
your Belief systems in US amateur radio as pure, pristine, and
ordained by ARRL. New thoughts and concepts might still
arise, but not nearly as many as being brave enough to view
ALL who don't agree with olde-tyme ham radio ideas.

Bye. Beep, beep.

731. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 03:51:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030509235104.18772.00000468@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66881

In article <20030509210213.15260.00000113@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, Extra Amateur Schmuck) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030509172858.18771.00000510@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>>Further, "K4YZ" never worked one day in his life IN any electric
>> or elecronic engineering department anywhere, never got any
>> engineering degree. [again, no record anywhere on that]
>
> But LENNIE! You're living proof that one doesn't need to be an EE to
>work in electronics!

Not "living proof," schmuck...my "work in electronics" involved design engineering responsibility and that included final approval signature on engineering drawings and reports.

Robeson's sole "engineering work" involved a short time as a purchasing agent for a single electronics firm. All purchasing agents "sign off" are purchase orders. Paperwork shufflers.

> Why? Please state your credentials in psychiatry or psychology that
>qualify you to say this.
>
> Please do not make reference to sleeping with a correspondence course
>wannabe shrink as "qualification". Her "credentials" are even more dubious
>than yours.

I do not "sleep with any correspondence course wannabe shrink," schmuck. I sleep with my legal wife, my wife under God since we were married in church by a pastor. That marriage is part of publicly available documentation at the County of Los Angeles..

My wife has a Bachelors degree from Beloit College, Beloit, WI, a Masters degree in Education from University of Illinois and a Masters degree in Social Work also from U of I. The University of Illinois is NOT some "correspondence course" place, neither is Beloit College, a smaller and older academic institution at the southern border of Wisconsin. The curricula for both college and university will confirm what courses were required to complete those degrees. The Masters in Social Work requires considerable psychology.

The "dubious credentials" as you spitefully put it wrongly, are verifiable through registrar's archives and also with the states of Illinois and Washington, both of which licensed her for private practice in Social Work counseling. She was in private practice for over a decade in Washington state and has dealt much with disturbed individuals who were in the military service, were spouses or family of servicemen, were military veterans, or workers at Bremerton Navy Yards, Fort Lewis, and McChord AFB. My wife has you typed, categorized, indexed, identified in a typical set of syndromes of mental disturbance. Almost a "no brainer" to identify either with formal training in psychology or how I obtained it from the College of H. Knox.

Let's talk about the schmuck's favorite subject, himself. Robeson has NO degree in any engineering discipline, not even any formal college class training in electronics, yet he claims to be a qualified judge of anyone already IN or having been IN engineering. Robeson has NO claims of ever having done any military radio communications, has never identified any piece of radio equipment by name, formal or common, has no knowledge of the most common small unit land-air radio in the US military of the last 14 years (a quarter million of those in nearly all branches of the US military now). He has said he wont name the equipment because of "security reasons" despite US electronics industry trade publications having publicly identified those, their nomenclature, contract money amounts, and the entity awarded the contract. In short, he has continually lied by omission, giving false reasons why information "cannot be discussed."

Schmuck Robeson's "radio experience" is almost entirely obtained from amateur radio and his "radio knowledge" comes from the popular newsstand amateur radio publications. Yet he insists he has some sort of "qualifications" in which to "judge" others who are or were in regular professional engineering work, have been active in HF radio communications before he was born, or know more about the rest of the radio communications world than he will ever learn on memorizing the advertisements in QST. He is corrupt in qualifications, corrupt in judgement, beneath contempt as a human being for his behavior in this forum.

A counter to the schmuck's mentioning of wives would be to turn around and talk about his, of indeterminate number, and THEIR qualifications. Fair is fair, isn't it? However, that is not "good form" as the Brits might say, ungentlemanly conduct.

None of this message is about "saving any Novice Class license." Robeson stayed away from that. Instead, he went into his disturbed mental state mode and railed at his pet "enemies" for replying to another member of the Gang of Four. It would seem the thread Subject line should be "saving of the old-time Amateur Extra Class" since Robeson is a high-magnitude negative representative of US amateur radio humans. He may be beyond

saving, but I have hopes for others with better mental health.

732. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 03:56:37 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0305091956.3176ce17@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66882

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

> The only one who comes to mind is Hans Brakob,
> a USN Master Chief (Retired) who has been absent
> here for many months.

Absent? Hardly! A Google-search on "K0HB" will reveal my regular
presence here in recent months.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

733. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 04:06:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510000618.18770.00000491@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66883

In article <3EBC5715.4060309@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> Ham radio SHOULD be interesting. What about those who have not been to so
>many
>> events, perhaps just one?
>> If they are bored there after seeing contests, they would not want to join
>> Ham radio.
>
> Question?
>
> You have left absolutely no doubt that there is an almost bottomless
>hatred you have for Ham radio.
>
> That being the case, what is your motivation for continuing to post
here?

Bad troll posting, Mike.

Back under the bridge for you until you think of a better one.

734. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 05:30:47 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0305092130.4ac629ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66884
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ole King Cat" <bovordde333@yahoo.com> wrote in message I think it will be VERY curious to see what
> happens tonight as both the 3.898 Group and the "3.903"
> Century Club both operate on, and seem to be "quite
> possessive" of these freqs.

It should be the 3905 century club, unless they changed names and freq, but anyway 3.903 is 3 kc away from the wx net. They have no problem. The ones on 3.898 will have to scram for a while or drop to 3.897. It's that simple. Possessive won't mean too much with Riley lurking over their shoulders. And I bet he will be just to see what is happening. The FCC takes that wx net stuff dead serious. Anyone that interferes with it, and the fcc hears them, can expect a serious letter coming in the mail. :(Why would they need 10 kc? It's only one net. Not three. MK

735. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 05:37:28 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93771087ADA04elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66885

<paulfriedman@attbi.com> wrote in news:lsZua.789233$3D1.437019@sccrnsc01:

> Chris:
>
> You have to take and pass the three written tests in order (Tech, then
> General, then Extra. You can do them all in the same session, though.
>
> The code test can be taken at the same time or later. I took all four
> elements at once to get them over with. <grin>.
>
> The code was tough for me due to a mild learning disability..but it was
> still quite doable. There are several freebie Code learning tools
> available on the web and several ones that cost money. What worked for
> me (and, I must admit that my objective was to pas the test, not to
> really learn Morse code) was the standard method of learning a
> character, then adding a second.. recognizing the difference between
> the two then adding a third, etc. The code exam is one message from a
> pseudo-QSO . Knowing the format and what to expect helps quite a
> bit..so get some software that sends a similar QSO type message.
>
> Good luck
>
> Paul ab0si
>
>
> "Chris" <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> wrote in message
> news:df510dbe.0305090601.78480fe5@posting.google.com...
>> Hello,
>>
>> I have a couple questions.
>>
>> Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without having
>> to take any of the subsequent examination elements?
>>
>> I've looked at the theory part of the exam, and everything looks
>> straightforward. However I need to learn Morse code. I was wondering,
>> perhaps, if people can tell me how they went about learning Morse
>> mode.
>>
>> Thank you,
>>
>> -Chris
>
>

>

You can take the elements in any order, but if you had elements 3 and 4 without 2, for example, it wouldn't get you a licence, or if you had 2 and 4 without 3 you would only be a Tech. I say this as a Volunteer Examiner (expired).

736. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 07:15:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305100709330.1307@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66886

On Fri, 9 May 2003, Chris wrote:
> I have a couple questions.
>
> Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without having
> to take any of the subsequent examination elements?

Yes, because there are no SUBSEQUENT elements to the extra class element.
There are PREVIOUS elements, ALL of which must be taken or a demonstration of
credit via a previous license (for element 1, an expired license may be
acceptable depending on its class).

> I've looked at the theory part of the exam, and everything looks
> straightforward. However I need to learn Morse code. I was wondering,
> perhaps, if people can tell me how they went about learning Morse
> mode.

I'm certain they can. I can only speak for myself here..... I used a computer
program sending random characters at a speed 15% faster than the test speed I
planned to take (back during the 5, 13, and 20 WPM structure).

737. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 07:18:54 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305100717290.1307@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66887

On Fri, 9 May 2003, Jack Twilley wrote:
> >>>>> "Chris" == Chris <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> writes:
> Chris> Hello, I have a couple questions.
> Chris> Is it possible to directly take the extra examination without
> Chris> having to take any of the subsequent examination elements?
>
> You have to have taken and passed the technician and general theory
> exams and the 5wpm exam before taking the extra theory exam, if I
> recall correctly.

No, you don't recall correctly. Although the lower classed written elements must be passed first, the code element does not need to be. However, without it, all one will have is a no-code Technician license (and element credit good for 365 days).

> Chris> ...
I've looked at the theory part of the exam, and everything
> Chris> looks straightforward. However I need to learn Morse code. I
> Chris> was wondering, perhaps, if people can tell me how they went
> Chris> about learning Morse mode.
>
> I'm comfortable with writing small computer programs, so my approach
> was to build a tool to help me.
>
> First, I did some research and determined that the Koch method was the
> one most likely to work for me. I then found an old old C program on
> the net called "tomorse" which converted text strings to an audio
> file. I rewrote tomorse to use libsndfile and to sound a little
> better, then wrote a perl script to feed tomorse characters in the
> Koch method, then wrote a shell script to build multiple audio files
> (2-a.wav, 2-b.wav, 3-a.wav, 3-b.wav, 4-a.wav, 4-b.wav -- two files
> each for two, three, and four characters) and corresponding text
> files.
>
> I burn those .wav files to a CDRW and stick it in my portable CD
> player so I can listen while I'm on the commute or when work gets
> slow. I compare my notes to the corresponding text files. When I get
> 90% accuracy or more, I move up a level.
>
> I'm actually doing very well with this system. I'm currently doing it
> the lame and easy way with 20wpm characters and 5wpm spacing, but once
> I get all the characters, I'll tighten the spacing up to 13wpm spacing
> and start again.
>
> One of these days I will make a web page with my stuff for people to

> download. However, I've supplied enough information for you to be
> able to solve the problem yourself if you're inclined. If you want
> the programs and scripts, send me email.
>
> Chris> Thank you,
>
> Best of luck!
>
> Chris> -Chris
>
> Jack.
> - --
> Jack Twilley
> jmt at twilley dot org
> http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)
>
> iD8DBQE+u+FqGPFSfAB/ezgRAjeuAKDs3sGV2SQKoTSbkdWWZ505PKMKfwCdGgmv
> BhMPOBslDl7/njQbN+yxrZE=
> =Ag/+
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>

738. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 07:23:48 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305100721200.1307@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66888

On Sat, 10 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> ...
> You can take the elements in any order, but if you had elements 3 and 4
> without 2, for example, it wouldn't get you a licence, or if you had 2 and
> 4 without 3 you would only be a Tech. I say this as a Volunteer Examiner
> (expired).

Taking elements out of order is generally at the discretion of the examination team, and most if not all won't normally let someone do that. I say that as a VE, having operated at least one test session per month since January 1994, and still doing so. Only the written elements have an order to them.

739. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 12:07:57 UTC
From: Bob <netman@newersplacenet.com>
Message-ID: <b9iq2q$mo2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lots of long haul truckers use 3898 at night in my part of
the country. This will not set well with them. In fact, I just
checked 3898, and the truckers, many not licensed, said,
"Screw the FCC." Riley has a fair record of nailing people
who use call signs but a dismal record of doing anything
about unidentified stations. Just heard chatter on 3898 telling
everyone to make sure they do not use call signs.

Bob
3898 Observer

740. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 12:35:12 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <b9irjb$j8$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 66990
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote

> The ones on 3.898 will have to scram for a while or drop to
> 3.897. It's that simple. Possessive won't mean too much with Riley
> lurking over their shoulders.

I dropped in on that area last night just out of curiosity. Plenty
of chit-chat around 3.898, 3.903 was ghostly quiet.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/2003

741. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 14:49:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66890

In article <20030509202046.18771.00000525@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>In article <c2356669.0305090934.77e630ce@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>>
>>> What about those former electronic technicians who actually
>>> ARE electronic engineers, have the demonstrated capability
>>> and the experience and the accreditation and continue in that
>>> endeavor? That is my category.
>>
>>It is? Where did you get your EE degree(s), Len? What date(s) are on
>>the diploma(s)?
>
> I have it. For details, you don't have any right to know.

So you won't answer the question. Typical.

>>Why? Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>
> I know enough radio technology to have corporations pay me for
> the responsibility of radio design...and many have done so.

Nobody disputes that. But it has nothing to do with the question I asked.
>
> I don't have much information on US amateur radio of the 1930s.

Yet you pontificate about pre-WW2 and even pre-WW1 radio as if you do. Tell us
about how to build a 600,000 RPM Alexanderson alternator....;-)
>
> The 1930s' standards and practices of amateur radio continue
> today, 70 years later, complete with the "necessity" to test for
> morse code skills in a hobby-recreational radio activity.

That's just not true, Len. The written tests of today are completely different.
The code test of today is much simpler and easier than that of the 1930s. The
application process is different, too.

The tests are still given in English, though. English is a pretty old language.
>
> I have one textbook on 1930s radio, "Communications
> Engineering," by Everitt, copyrighted and published 1932.

> Interesting book, contains radio technology information that
> was considered "up-to-date" in my 1978 ARRL Handbook.

Like what? Ohm's Law? Dipole antennas?

> I traded another textbook for that with a radio amateur in
> New York state; we were both authors of different articles on
> the same technology in Ham Radio Magazine.

A defunct publication.
>
>>So we should ask your friends about you? What would that prove?
>
> It would prove you can dare venture outside Google and
> the past.

Why? You don't venture outside the past much. You keep talking about the 1930s and your military experience of a half century ago, and on and on. The only new idea in amateur radio regulations I've ever seen you come up with is wanting the FCC to enact a minimum age requirement so that young people under the age of 14 would be banned from getting amateur radio licenses.

> I don't think you have the courage to do that.

Why should I call up your alleged friends and ask them about you? Do you think it would somehow justify your years of hostile, abusive, belligerent behavior here?

Here's a clue: It won't.

"Courage" has nothing to do with it.

You cannot talk your way out of a situation you behaved your way into.
>
>>You won't take the testimony of my friends about me....
>
> What "friends?" In here there are only Heil who calls me a
> "horse's ass," Kellie who tries to emulate Steamy Stalker
> by calling me "putz."

And you never called THEM any names, did you? Never insulted or ridiculed their education, work experience, or service to their country. huh?
>
There's also folks like K0HB, K2UNK, K2ASP, W5NET, WA2SI, W4NTI, N8UZE, WA2ISE and others here whom I count as friends. We do not agree on all things, including code testing. Yet all of the above manage to behave in a civil manner here.
>
>>I think you also sent that unsolicited junk email to me. Why?
>
> Why not?

"You cannot answer a question with another question". Those are your words, Len.

And all of your misdirection above is a blatant attempt to avoid answering this question: Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

You avoid answering that question, for some reason.

>>Has anyone doubted that you held a commercial FCC license?
>
> Yes. [didn't you look hard enough in Google?]

Who? Not me.
>
>>Does your
>>holding such a license somehow prove that you know more about how
>>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>
> That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
> radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
> deliberate public information on any answers.

Tougher test? I don't think so. I have heard from those who took both tests that the tests required for the Amateur Extra at that time were tougher than those required for the First 'Phone.

You cannot know it was "a tougher test" when you did not take the tests you compare it to. Your logic fails.

What you're trying to sell us is the idea that your passing a single test for a COMMERCIAL license many years ago somehow proves that you know more about how AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else. No sale.

> It was taken once
> and passed before most of the participants in this din of inequity
> were either alive or had taken ANY tests of ANY kind.

There you go, living in the past and its standards and requirements.

How does your passing such a license test so long ago somehow prove that you know more about how AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

Does the following sound familiar, Len?

'That's all very nice and dramatic but wasn't it the United States Army where you learned all that? The same US Army that gave you food, lodging, shelter, and free clothes, medical care, and training as needed? The same US Army that taught you radio electronics theory and practice? It wasn't amateur radio, was it?

Len, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in
the US Army is past for you. That was not amateur radio, it was
PROFESSIONAL radio. You were paid for what you did (in
several ways). It was your JOB. I'm sure that the US Army did
not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it. I don't see how
all that makes you some Number One Ichiban HAM Honcho
NOW.'

It's simply YOUR words to Jeff Herman, with a few changes from his name to yours and the US Coast Guard to the US Army. Original source is dated March 28, 2000. (Can't be called "plagiarism" if the original source is credited.)

Practice what you preach, Len.

And btw, I passed the Amateur Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Much, much younger than when you passed that First Phone. And "at a time when there was no deliberate public information on any answers", too. I was self-trained in radio, at my own expense, not taxpayer dollars.

> Neither the staff nor the commissioners of the FCC need to have
> passed any amateur radio test in order to determine whether any
> VEC QPC question-answer is suitable for any FCC-approved test
> for radio amateurs.

So? They have made mistakes in those questions, requiring a few embarrassing recalls of defective questions AFTER they were approved for use.

However, those FCC folks completely ignored your idea about an age requirement. That PROVES you WRONG, huh?

btw, the members of Congress, and the White House staff right up to the President don't need to have military experience in order to be in charge of the US military. Vice President Dick Cheney, former Secretary of Defense, used several student deferments and avoided military service during the Vietnam era. (Source: biography of Colin Powell)

> The FCC regulates US amateur radio as well
> as all other US civil radio services.
>
You don't work for the FCC. I don't think you ever have. So that doesn't apply to you.

> In case you haven't read the rather simple law on the subject, the
> FCC is obliged to accept ALL US citizen input insofar as US radio
> regulations on ANY US radio service they regulate.

Of course! Has anyone tried to stop you from submitting comments to the FCC?
>
> The grant of an amateur radio license, regardless of date of issue,
> does NOT give you or any other radio amateur licensee any sort
> of power or control over who should be allowed to comment on US
> law of any kind.

Who said it does? Not me.

> Neither does it yield any special knowledge of law
> over and above anyone not licensed in amateur radio.

Who said it does? Not me.

The grant of a commercial radio operator license, regardless of date of issue, does NOT give you or any other licensee any sort of power or control over who should be allowed to comment on US law of any kind. Neither does it yield any

special knowledge of law over and above anyone else.

> Neither does
> it impart some significant knowledge of amateur radio on amateur
> radio matters other than the licensee's experience in amateur
> radio.

But the amateur radio experience of an active radio amateur DOES exceed the experience of any unlicensed person. In other words, us licensed, active hams have experience, knowledge and skills about AMATEUR RADIO that you do not, Len. That's a plain, simple fact.

>>> 4. The Stalker then made up a libelous "homepage" on AOL
>>> which was a prima facie bit of personal insult easily
>>> evidenciary of libelous behavior in any civil court. AOL
>>> removed that immediately as well as his equally-libelous
>>> new screen name when notified.
>>
>>Sounds like you can dish it out but you can't take it, Len ;-)
>
> I've "taken it" in here for years.

Dished out far more, too. You don't have to be here, nor behave the way you do. You choose to do those things.

> But, I've never been so obsessed
> with any particular message arguement to carry sore losing to
> such great lengths as:
>
> 1. Creating a special Home Page on an ISP deliberately
> designed to libel one individual so severely as did Robeson.
> That was an outrageous, sick act on his part.

In your OPINION. Someone else would think it was funny. Me, I think it was in bad taste.

Besides, that was over FOUR YEARS AGO, wasn't it? You live in the past too much.
>
> 2. Send a specific one-paragraph Comment to the FCC 10 days
> after comment cut-off period with the sole subject being his
> objection to my commenting to my government plus his
> demand that my comment be disregarded.

What was wrong with that? He filed a late Reply Comment, that's all. Why does that bother you so much. And that was over FOUR YEARS AGO, wasn't it? You live in the past too much.
>
> I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
> court lawsuit on grounds of libel. I can afford such things as
> attorney fees for a protacted period. Such a lawsuit would be
> almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
> clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are

> (and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
> lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
> such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
> money.
>
Sounds like you are threatening him.

Do you think that filing a late Reply Comment is libelous?

> Rather than "take it" to court, I simply contacted AOL and pointed
> out the clear evidence of libel. AOL removed that Home Page
> and the newly-created defamatory screen name he created. That
> was the honorable course of action on my part and AOL's part.
> Robeson remains vengeful, foul-mouthed in an obvious condition
> of sociopathic behavior in this newsgroup.

Here's a hint, Len: I'm not him.

You might note that I have repeatedly pointed out that his name-calling and
other antics simply lower him to your level.

Your foul-mouthed behavior is evident, too. Pot-kettle.
>
>>Do you think your behavior here causes others to respect you? Here's a
>>hint: IT DOESN'T.
>
> Irrelevant.

It's relevant when you want to be taken seriously. Nobody here takes you
seriously, Len.

>>> 5. The Stalker tried to manufacture some kind of "case" of
>>> "cowardice" about my US Army Signal Corps duties and
>>> location, repeatedly refering to my military occupation
>>> specialty as "rear area radio clerk."
>>
>>Did he use the word cowardice?
>
> Yes.

Where? Show us.
>
> He has never proven that at any time other than mouthing off in
> many and varied postings made in here.
>
>>We all know what you did in Japan, Len. You've told us many, many,
>>MANY times.
>
> That disturbs you?

No, it's just boring. It was over FORTY YEARS AGO, wasn't it? You live in the
past too much.

> Too bad. You've never done anything
> similar so your apparent anguish over others having done so
> seems to indicate jealousy on your part.

No anguish, no jealousy at all on my part. I'm happy for ya. But it does get boring when you repeat it so many times.

> Not my problem.
> I did my military duties as ordered, where ordered, received
> an Honorable Discharge from the US Army.

That was over...no, wait, I'm starting to repeat myself, just like you do.

'That's all very nice and dramatic but wasn't it the United States Army where you learned all that? The same US Army that gave you food, lodging, shelter, and free clothes, medical care, and training as needed? The same US Army that taught you radio electronics theory and practice? It wasn't amateur radio, was it?

Len, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in the US Army is past for you. That was not amateur radio, it was PROFESSIONAL radio. You were paid for what you did (in several ways). It was your JOB. I'm sure that the US Army did not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it. I don't see how all that makes you some Number One Ichiban HAM Honcho NOW.'
>
> Some of you have a great deal of trouble with anyone serving
> in the US military including yourself being highly critical of what
> I did.

Who is "some of you"?

> Is that because you've never served in the US military?

No, it's because of the way you show no respect for others' service. Including Vietnam veterans and career State Department employees.
>
>>I do remember you mentioning the message totals for ADA in a way that
>>could be mistaken to imply that you did it all by yourself. Shall I
>>get that one from Google? ;-)
>
> Feel free to post the entirety of what I've ever posted in this
> newsgroup. Do it as many times as you wish. You have the
> freedom to do that. What will that "gain" you?

It shows how wrong you are.
>
> It gains you only the irritation of others tired of your sore-loser
> attitude attempting to "get" another correspondent. Such wastes
> everyone's time, including your own.

No, it shows how wrong you are. It also shows the reputation you've earned yourself over the years.

>
>>> The Stalker has not made any explicit details of his own
>>> military service and "battle experience/heroism" other than
>>> the vague generality of "seven hostile actions."
>>
>>Some folks do, some folks don't.
>
> That is a NULL comment. The Stalker has given NO details of
> where or when those took place. It remains vague, undefined.
> In other venues it would be called a "fish story." A LIE.

How can a null comment be a lie?
>
>>The way you have described your military service could give some
>>people the wrong impression, Len. I recall a bunch of postings about
>>being Bear bombers and how close you were to Korea, etc.
>
> I was IN Korea on one short TDY. Irrelevant.

Yes, it is irrelevant.

>>More important, you don't show much respect towards other veterans who
>>served if those veterans disagree with you on other issues.
>>Interesting.
>
> Normally, if still in the US military, I'd use military language
> to tell you GO

[expletive deleted]

> and follow that with appropriate
> physical action.

Sounds like a threat. Is that how you resolve conflicts - cuss at the person
and attack them physically? If you met me in person, would you do that in
response to my words of disagreement?

Do you think that might makes right?

> However, being as you've never served in
> the US military and, as a morseman, probably don't know
> much about sex either, I would simply flip you the bird and
> go on to other things.

Obvious attempt to get me to reply in kind. Typical.
>
> You are ignorant due to non-exposure to such things,
> probably never left the continental United States. You will
> NEVER understand any brotherhood of being in a military
> branch of any kind.

Apply that same logic to the amateur radio service.

Is it "brotherhood" that is evidenced in your posts here to other veterans,
many of whom served our country much longer than you did?
>
>>Here's a classic example.
>
> I snipped a posting that is over 3 years old.

Your beefs with K4YZ detailed above are even older. You live in the past too
much.

Because it embarrasses you. But those were your words, and they prove my point.
>
(N2EY)

> seems to live in the past, constantly referring to old
> public postings as if they are recent or applicable. The past is
> past. This is NOW, not yesterday.

Then why do you refer to the past so much?
>
>>Gee, Len, you really showed another veteran some respect, huh? And
>>that was in a thread where you weren't even being addressed.
>
(N2EY)

>isn't in any position to "judge" the contents.

Yes, I am.
>
>>Why is it OK for you to tell the FCC to disregard another's comments,
>>but not OK for someone to tell the FCC to disregard yours?
>
> Feel free to post the ENTIRETY of my 14-page Reply to
> Comments on FCC NPRM 98-143. You can then ask "the
> jury" for their "decision" and then pronounce me "guilty."

Doesn't answer the question. Your double standards keep getting exposed. Too
bad.
>
> No problem with me. Carry on, judge. Bird. Flip. Enjoy.
>
I see that I have over estimated you, Len

>>You sent your 14 pages to the FCC so late that there was no way anyone
>>could reply before the January 15 deadline.
>
> The FCC postponed deadline was established as 15 January 1999.

So?
>
> My document, all required paper copies AND floppy disk with
> the identical text were sent via USPS registered mail over a
> week prior to deadline. The return receipt through USPS arrived
> before the FCC time-stamping of 13 January 1999 as indicated

> in the FCC archive copy on their ECFS.

That's when they got it, not when it showed up on ECFS.
>
> I complied with both the law and the requested format given by
> the FCC in a voluntary expression of one US citizen towards his
> government as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United
> States of America.

And it got there so close to deadline that nobody could reply before January
15.

> Many others filing comments were marked as received on the
> same date period. You do not mention those yet those are
> also on the public record.

Because the disagreement is with you and your age requirement nonsense.

Besides, this is old stuff. You live in the past too much.

>
>>C'mon, Len, you made the claim, you back it up. Show us the actual
>>postings.
>
> You are wasting all our time, Pedantic Parson.

In other words, you can't.

>>You may find a "Lennie" or "LHA" back a few years, but that's about
>>it. As for "false accusations", you won't find any of those.
>
> There are dozens, perhaps hundreds.
>
> "Putz." "Coward." "Lier [sic]." "Horse's Ass." Just recently,
> in this year. :-)

Not by me.
>
>>Find 'em and show 'em, Len. Can you? I think not.
>
> I won't bother.

You can't.

I really did overestimate you.

742. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 14:51:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510105158.13331.00000127@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66891

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509172856.18771.00000508@mb-m18.aol.com>

>In article <20030509073013.13850.00000048@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steamy
>Stalker, the Foul Mouthed Extra Terrific writes:

Post snipped.

Example of "civil debate" by a "professional engineer" noted.

Actually, just the rantings of one Leonard H. Anderson, a known
pathological liar. No loss...

Steve, K4YZ

743. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 14:53:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510105318.13331.00000128@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66892

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/9/2003 6:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509193410.03151.00000123@mb-m07.aol.com>
>

>Satellite dish installation tech may involve some EE stuff. I am no longer in
>EE field at all.

You never were "in the EE field" to begin with, Vipul.

Care to tell us the truth, or shall I snoop that out too?

Steve, K4YZ

744. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 14:58:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510105848.13331.00000129@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66893

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/9/2003 6:31 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509193110.03151.00000120@mb-m07.aol.com>

>>>Contesting is both more boring, and requires less physical activity.
>>
>> Oh...?!?! The Let's see you try to do it, Vipul.
>
>I've participated in contests.

Really? Which ones? On which teams and with whom? Most team and club activities have a list of participating licensees. I do NOT find "KB1HMW" in any of the popular contests.

>> Like chasing preety fems...?!?!
>
>K4YZ seems to have something against pretty females.

Nope. Not at all. But you refer to them as "females"...Objects for the sole purpose of mating and procreation. Non-equals.

I call them ladies. Persons who happen to be female. Your intent is not so subtle or covert. You just want to get lucky. That's stupid AND sloppy.

Try waiting for puperty and wiping your nose before addressing women in public, Vippy. You might do better.

Steve, K4YZ

745. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 15:03:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510110310.13331.00000130@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66894

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509172857.18771.00000509@mb-m18.aol.com>

>In article <20030509072233.13850.00000045@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steamy
>Stalker, keeper of the Magic Mirror) writes:

More example of how "professional engineers" debate civvily.

Steve, K4YZ

746. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 15:12:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510111223.13331.00000131@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66895

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/9/2003 6:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509192201.03151.00000118@mb-m07.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>
>> Just HOW do you suggest that those "rules" be set up in order to allow
>>points to be obtained, Vipidiot? By seeing who can get the lowest SWR?
>
>Thats a good award. Instead of Worked All States...(SNIP)

"Worked All States" is NOT a contest, Vippy. It's an operating award.
Please learn the difference.

>...there should be awards for
>station setup time, Worked All Bands (with homebrew bonus), distance awards,
>low power, radio direction finding.

"Set up time"...??? In what? How? I pull a K2 out of my back pack,
throw a wire in the tree, plug in the tuner and the battery and I am QRV in 2
minutes.

For "Worked All Bands", refer to 5BWAS, 5BDXCC, 5BWAZ, etc etc etc...There
are already a plethora of multiband awards out there.

Again, your inexperience is glaring.

>In other words, awards for real skills and real competition. Instead of
>turning
>the dial and calling CQ.

Again, your ignorance and lack of experience is G L A R I N G ! ! !

If you think that "turning the dial and calling CQ" is all there is to
contesting, you're just plain stupid.

>I won't cite the event I went to recently, the clubs I've been to for obvious
>reasons- I will run into these people again, perhaps at Field Day.

In other words you don't want the word to get out to these people about
how you talk about them in a public forum. You "want your cake and to eat it
too".

>>What you are doing is lying.
>
>No, these are true accounts of the events I've been to, from my point of
>view.

Then ignorance, inexperience and narrowmindedness are your milestones.

Steve, K4YZ

747. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 15:19:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510111910.13331.00000132@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66896

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/9/2003 4:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509172901.18771.00000511@mb-m18.aol.com>

>>You ever read any of the stuff posted here?
>
> Yes. Quite amusing sometimes...all the militay [sic] heroes
> knowing all about military communications when they've not
> stated anything about such...all the militay [sic] heroes
> bragging about how they were "in" a country at war, therefore
> connecting them to "fighting action."

Or like yours, Lennie? A sickly perverted attempt to embellish your own service "career" based upon having served in a unit that had KIA's three years and 500 miles away?

Creep. Just a slovenly, cowardly creep.

Steve, K4YZ

748. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 15:20:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510112025.13331.00000133@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66897

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/9/2003 10:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id:

>In article <20030509210213.15260.00000113@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steamy
>Stalker, Extra Amateur Schmuck) writes:

More examples of "civil debate" by an alleged radio professional.

More putzism at it's best.

Steve, K4YZ

749. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 15:37:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBD1D00.278E2E5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66898

Avery Fineman wrote:
>
> In article <bcWua.7469$3f7.5126536@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"Avery Fineman" <averyfineman@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030508234639.04525.00000452@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> In article <GzBua.6299$3f7.4728386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >Flint"
> >> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >So competition means cult if they require the participants to follow the
> >> >rules.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk...another newsgroup neophyte trying to use the
> >> "reducto ad absurdum" non-argument.
> >
> >No just pointing out the absurdity of what Vshah101 was saying. If we let
> >his definition stand that ham radio is a cult because contestor's follow the
> >rules, then we buy into his beliefs and to be consistent would need to apply
> >that same definition to other activities.
>
> You are still reducing things to the absurd.
>
> Vipul Shah has clearly indicated his opinion of the olde-tymers
> in ham radio as "cultists." See all of his postings prior to
> mentioning radio contests...[on-off keying] CW as the best
> mode as a cult belief...mythical symbols (whouff-hong and
> rettysnitch) that originated in Newington...the concentration
> on HF bands and DXing...many other cultist trappings and
> traditions.

Vipul Shah finds anything he doesn't understand "cultlike". Vipul Shah
is one peculiar individual.

You misspelled wouff-hong. You made a mistake.

> >By the way your snipping choice is so poor that others cannot tell what led
> >up to my comment or determine whether my comment is or is not a "reducto ad
> >absurdum."
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, OG. Instead of chiding Shah on some faulty
> expressions of his opinion in English, you did the "reduction to
> the absurd" by claiming that his mention of contesting was
> equivalent to cultism.

...and you dodge the comment totally with your usual "Tsk, tsk, tsk".
You snip material in an effort to ensure that your comments don't come
back to haunt you.

> The Pedantic Parson, K2EY, has often referred to contesting
> as "radiosport." Since he imagines himself a "leader" in this
> forum, I thought all morsepersons bowed to that terminology.

The Relic Retiree made another mistake. Jim is N2EY. No K2EY is known
to have posted here. N2EY has never claimed leadership here. You
manufactured your facts.

> I apologize to another pedant.

Anyone who corrects your inaccuracies automatically becomes a pedant in
your view.

> >Competition
> >exists in many realms not just the realm of sports. The jam and jelly
> >competition at the local fair is a competition even though it is not a
> >sport.
>
> When jam, jelly, and local fairs are directly a part of amateur
> radio policy discussion topics I will bow to your wisdom.

When you are directly a part of amateur radio, I will bow to your
wisdom.

> Some radio amateurs in here imply that contesting is the equal
> to emergency communications operations. That isn't done in
> solitude.

Not true. Some radio amateurs in here have stated that skills developed
in contesting are the same skills desired in emergency communications.
Contesting is not done in solitude. Communicating with several thousand
stations over the course of a weekend can't be done without the several
thousand stations operated by other individuals. Amateur radio
operating is a very social activity.

> >> I don't think you can stand the open competition of newsgroup
> >> discussion, Dee. I would suggest that you give serious
> >> thought to stopping access this newsgroup. It isn't a woman's
> >> syncophantic ARRL auxilliary site.
> >
> >And how did you come with this non-sequiter? Since I am a duly licensed
> >Extra class operator (from before the latest restructuring for those to whom
> >it matters), why would I have any interest in an ARRL auxiliary.
>
> Please forgive my choice of words. I was under the assumption
> that most people would think the word "auxiliary" meant "helping"
> or "subsidiary" or "supplementary" as the dictionaries define it.
>
> Since dictionaries do not associate the word "auxiliary" with any
> gender...contrary to some colloquial uses as in "women's

> auxiliary" meaning a group of women...I intended to have the word
> "auxiliary" refer to a secondary role of this forum being a free
> supplementary outlet for ARRL olde-tyme ham Beliefs.

If you intend to use "auxiliary", why do you keep writing "auxilliary"?
I'll bet you made another mistake. Odd that you chastise others for a
spelling error when your own posts are rife with them.

> I can understand your gender displeasure since US amateur radio
> is overwhelmingly an activity of middle-aged white males.

Can you establish a pattern of an organized effort to keep out women and
minorities? If not, you're simply blowing smoke.

> >Why should I stop? I'm having fun and some people agree with me.
>
> Indeed, why should anyone "stop?"

Just a few paragraphs earlier, you were suggesting that Dee stop access
to this newsgroup.

> ARRL olde-tyme ham Beliefs are not of the divinity nor are they
> some form of Universal Truths however self-evident to Believers.
>
> There is no consensus that your statements are agreeable.

I agree with Dee. Do you really want to see this put to a vote?

Dave K8MN

750. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 16:15:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510121512.18769.00000481@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66899

In article <3EBC5715.4060309@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From K4YZ:
>>
>>
>>>My assertion still stands. Your lack of experience is glaring, Vippy.

>> Ham radio SHOULD be interesting.

I find it interesting. If others don't, I'm not going to try to force it on
them.

>>What about those who have not been to so many
>> events, perhaps just one?

>> If they are bored there after seeing contests, they would not want to join
>> Ham radio.

If they cannot understand that ham radio is a whole bunch of activities, then
it's not for them. Contesting is just one of those activities.

> Question?
>
> You have left absolutely no doubt that there is an almost bottomless
>hatred you have for Ham radio.
>
> That being the case, what is your motivation for continuing to post
here?
>
Isn't it obvious, Mike?

73 de Jim, N2EY

751. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 16:20:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510122046.13740.00000180@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66900

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 5/9/2003 12:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0305090934.77e630ce@posting.google.com>

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>...

>> 1. I've given a very short listing of past employers in here.

Yet another lie by a person for whom lying comes naturally...

The LAST time he published his "CV" in this forum, it ran over 22,000
bytes. By contrast, the average RRAP post is 1500-3000 bytes.

And THAT was just about whom he claimed to have worked for and alleged
accomplishments.

I poked holes in it with just one phone call to Pennsylvania.

>Why? Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

Well if COURSE it does, Jim! He has nothing else to lean on.

>> 2. I've given references to living US radio amateurs who know me
>> personally (one was Best Man at my wedding). No one,
>> certainly not the Stalker, seems to have contacted them for
>> any confirmation. In essence, he simply ignored such
>> references.
>
>So we should ask your friends about you? What would that prove? You
>won't take the testimony of my friends about me.

In contrast, I HAVE spoken with people who knew Lennie from a
"professional" relationship. While not driven to the use of profanities or
vulgarites, they didn't have anything GOOD to say about him either.

>> 5. The Stalker tried to manufacture some kind of "case" of
>> "cowardice" about my US Army Signal Corps duties and
>> location, repeatedly refering to my military occupation
>> specialty as "rear area radio clerk."
>
>Did he use the word cowardice?

To be factual, Jim, I used the word "cowardly" in respect to his attempts
to embellish his military "career" by associating himself with Army KIA's that
died 3 years before he got there and hundreds of miles away.

I did NOT say his duties in the Army were "cowardly". That's a
LennieSpin.

>
>> 4. The Stalker then made up a libelous "homepage" on AOL
>> which was a prima facie bit of personal insult easily
>> evidenciary of libelous behavior in any civil court. AOL
>> removed that immediately as well as his equally-libelous
>> new screen name when notified.
>
>Sounds like you can dish it out but you can't take it, Len ;-)
>
>Do you think your behavior here causes others to respect you? Here's a
>hint: IT DOESN'T.
>>
>> 5. The Stalker tried to manufacture some kind of "case" of
>> "cowardice" about my US Army Signal Corps duties and
>> location, repeatedly refering to my military occupation
>> specialty as "rear area radio clerk."
>
>Did he use the word cowardice?

>> He continued to do so
>> despite my pointing out what they really were, explicit
>> details of duties and responsibility which were not only
>> referencible through government archives but were witnessed
>> by a still-living radio amateur who was assigned to the same
>> unit and military radio station and who did the same duty.
>
>We all know what you did in Japan, Len. You've told us many, many,
>MANY times.
>
>I do remember you mentioning the message totals for ADA in a way that
>could be mistaken to imply that you did it all by yourself. Shall I
>get that one from Google?

Yes...1.2 million mesages that HE passed. That was his ORIGINAL message.

Of course once everyone with a 7th grade reading comprehension smacked him
around for it, he recanted THAT version and started in on the "we were part of
a TEAM" spin.

>Sounds like you can dish it out but you can't take it, Len.

I don't think that "sounds" like it...That IS it!

>Do you think your behavior here causes others to respect you? Here's a
>hint: IT DOESN'T.

Lennie's (and now Vippy's) conduct does for professional electrical
engineering what Lennie claims we do to Amateur Radio...Only he does it with
profanity, name calling, etc.

>> Only after those same individuals used similar nicknames, false
>> accusations, and personal insults to me FIRST.
>
>Really? OK, show me where I have called you nicknames, made false
>accusations or made personal insults to you FIRST.

Now Jim...you wouldn't expect Lennie to be able to produce anything
FACTUAL, would you?

>C'mon, Len, you made the claim, you back it up. Show us the actual
>postings.

Like I said...! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

752. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 16:26:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBD2883.453E8FC7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66901

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0305090934.77e630ce@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>...

>
> >Why? Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
> >AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>
> I know enough radio technology to have corporations pay me for
> the responsibility of radio design...and many have done so.

You were asked about being paid for radio design. You were asked
whether your past employment qualified you to know more about how
AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else.

> >So we should ask your friends about you? What would that prove?
>
> It would prove you can dare venture outside Google and
> the past. I don't think you have the courage to do that.

Courage? You sound awfully silly.

> >You won't take the testimony of my friends about me....
>
> What "friends?" In here there are only Heil who calls me a
> "horse's ass," Kellie who tries to emulate Steamy Stalker
> by calling me "putz."

I've only called you a horse's ass because you are a horse's ass. I
recognized that from the road apples you keep dropping here and there in
the newsgroup. Did you ever catch up with the front end of that horse
you're supposed to be following?

> With "friends" like that YOU don't need enemies. :-)

It'd be just as easy to dimiss any of your friends, Leonard. I figure
that the opinions of anyone who claims you as a friend can't be worth
that much.

> >Does your
> >holding such a license somehow prove that you know more about how
> >AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>

> That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
> radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
> deliberate public information on any answers.

How does it "prove" that, Leonard?

> It was taken once
> and passed before most of the participants in this din of inequity
> were either alive or had taken ANY tests of ANY kind.

What is that claim supposed to prove?

> Neither the staff nor the commissioners of the FCC need to have
> passed any amateur radio test in order to determine whether any
> VEC QPC question-answer is suitable for any FCC-approved test
> for radio amateurs. The FCC regulates US amateur radio as well
> as all other US civil radio services.

Since you don't work for the FCC, I fail to see what bearing that has on
anything. FCC staffers are paid to regulate amateur radio.

> In case you haven't read the rather simple law on the subject, the
> FCC is obliged to accept ALL US citizen input insofar as US radio
> regulations on ANY US radio service they regulate.

Accepting it isn't the same as acting positively on it. You wrote. The
FCC accepted. You aren't writing your material here for the FCC. I
don't have to accept it. I don't have to take it seriously.

> The grant of an amateur radio license, regardless of date of issue,
> does NOT give you or any other radio amateur licensee any sort
> of power or control over who should be allowed to comment on US
> law of any kind. Neither does it yield any special knowledge of law
> over and above anyone not licensed in amateur radio. Neither does
> it impart some significant knowledge of amateur radio on amateur
> radio matters other than the licensee's experience in amateur
> radio.

My forty years experience in amateur radio certainly qualifies me to
know more of amateur radio matters than an individual who has no
experience in amateur radio. You'd be a fool to argue the point.

> >> 4. The Stalker then made up a libelous "homepage" on AOL
> >> which was a prima facie bit of personal insult easily
> >> evidenciary of libelous behavior in any civil court. AOL
> >> removed that immediately as well as his equally-libelous
> >> new screen name when notified.
> >
> >Sounds like you can dish it out but you can't take it, Len ;-)
>
> I've "taken it" in here for years.

It's probably about time that you ask yourself "why?".

> But, I've never been so obsessed
> with any particular message arguement to carry sore losing to
> such great lengths as:
>
> 1. Creating a special Home Page on an ISP deliberately
> designed to libel one individual so severely as did Robeson.
> That was an outrageous, sick act on his part.

Maybe it was libelous; maybe not.

> 2. Send a specific one-paragraph Comment to the FCC 10 days
> after comment cut-off period with the sole subject being his
> objection to my commenting to my government plus his
> demand that my comment be disregarded.

Was there something illegal about that act?

> I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
> court lawsuit on grounds of libel. I can afford such things as
> attorney fees for a protacted period. Such a lawsuit would be
> almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
> clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are
> (and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
> lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
> such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
> money.

You're simply blowing smoke. You're blowing smoke about your ability to pay an attorney for a "protracted period". You're blowing smoke about cakewalks, prima facia evidence, about AOL and "Robeson" losing "without doubt". Did you forget about the existence of all of your past posts at Google? A smart guy would load up on all of that material.

> Rather than "take it" to court, I simply contacted AOL and pointed
> out the clear evidence of libel. AOL removed that Home Page
> and the newly-created defamatory screen name he created. That
> was the honorable course of action on my part and AOL's part.

...and we all know you to be a man of honor (stifled laughter).

> Robeson remains vengeful, foul-mouthed in an obvious condition
> of sociopathic behavior in this newsgroup.

Are you going to do your "bird. flip." material for us?

> >Do you think your behavior here causes others to respect you? Here's a
> >hint: IT DOESN'T.
>
> Irrelevant. All unmoderated newsgroups are free-for-alls where
> anyone can post at any time on any subject with freedom to
> say whatever they wish to say.

...but not without consequence.

> This medium isn't the printed page which remains intact in
> thousands of identical copies in many places.

This medium is archived. Those archives remain intact. Thousands of individuals may easily access those archives and print as many copies of each post as they desire. Those printed copies may remain intact.

> This medium
> isn't a court of law presided over by a judge...even though some,
> like yourself, presume to BE a judge and RULE over those
> whom you wish to rule.

More of your transference.

> This newsgroup is a "24/7" street fight arena subject only to the
> vagaries of computer hardware reliability.

Are you going to claim that you personally participate 24/7?
If this is a street fight, you've suffered more cuts than Chuck Wepner.

> "Respect" is not earned by mouthing platitudes and beliefs
> espoused by some membership organization for years and then
> attempting to demean those who do not accept such beliefs.
> "Respect" is a very objective condition, very individual in nature
> and you have no, repeat NO, lock on who has or has no "respect."

Len, ever since I began reading this group, you've been rude and uncivil. You've been doing the demeaning and the insulting and you've gotten back what you've dished out. You're an unpleasant man.

> >We all know what you did in Japan, Len. You've told us many, many,
> >MANY times.
>
> That disturbs you? Too bad. You've never done anything
> similar so your apparent anguish over others having done so
> seems to indicate jealousy on your part. Not my problem.
> I did my military duties as ordered, where ordered, received
> an Honorable Discharge from the US Army.
>
> Some of you have a great deal of trouble with anyone serving
> in the US military including yourself being highly critical of what
> I did. Is that because you've never served in the US military?

The laughter wasn't stifled this time. No one was critical of what you did in the military. A number were critical of the way you attempted to puff your activities. Remember your post to Jeff about being under fire?

> >I do remember you mentioning the message totals for ADA in a way that
> >could be mistaken to imply that you did it all by yourself. Shall I
> >get that one from Google? ;-)
>
> Feel free to post the entirety of what I've ever posted in this
> newsgroup. Do it as many times as you wish. You have the

> freedom to do that. What will that "gain" you?

...the upper hand in the fact department for one thing.

> It gains you only the irritation of others tired of your sore-loser
> attitude attempting to "get" another correspondent. Such wastes
> everyone's time, including your own.

Remember, Len. You've described this medium as a 2/47 street fight
where anyone may post whatever he wants. You don't suppose anyone is
being forced to read Jim's material do you? Are you being forced to
read it or forced to respond to it?

> >> The Stalker has not made any explicit details of his own
> >> military service and "battle experience/heroism" other than
> >> the vague generality of "seven hostile actions."
> >
> >Some folks do, some folks don't.
>
> That is a NULL comment. The Stalker has given NO details of
> where or when those took place. It remains vague, undefined.
> In other venues it would be called a "fish story." A LIE.

So no comment is a lie? How does this transformation take place?

> >The way you have described your military service could give some
> >people the wrong impression, Len. I recall a bunch of postings about
> >being Bear bombers and how close you were to Korea, etc.
>
> I was IN Korea on one short TDY. Irrelevant.

Oh, it is relevant, Leonard. You puffed yourself up in your tales.

> I don't have any power to command others how they are supposed
> to read what I write.

You can make your writing clear and concise. You could leave out
anything which isn't fact.

> I can't control your little temper tantrums,
> either. Not my problem. Yours.

Seems to be your problem. I didn't note a temper tantrum on Jim's part.

> >More important, you don't show much respect towards other veterans who
> >served if those veterans disagree with you on other issues.
> >Interesting.
>
> Normally, if still in the US military, I'd use military language
> to tell you GO FUCK OFF! and follow that with appropriate
> physical action.

You mean running like hell after you uttered the words in caps?

> However, being as you've never served in
> the US military and, as a morseman, probably don't know
> much about sex either, I would simply flip you the bird and
> go on to other things.

So that we're clear on this, you don't believe that anyone who never served in the military and who knows morse code doesn't know much about sex?

> You are ignorant due to non-exposure to such things,
> probably never left the continental United States.

There's a claim which is full of more than holes.

> You will
> NEVER understand any brotherhood of being in a military
> branch of any kind.

Apparently you were in the military during a special period. There were drunks, drug addicts, psycopaths, liars and thieves in every outfit in which I served in the military. I didn't hang out with them. I disapproved of their behavior. I don't consider myself to be part of brotherhood with all of those with whom I served.

> >Here's a classic example.
>
> I snipped a posting that is over 3 years old.
>
> Miccolis seems to live in the past, constantly referring to old
> public postings as if they are recent or applicable. The past is
> past. This is NOW, not yesterday.

...but "NOW" includes your tales from the Korean War and "NOW" includes your commercial FCC license? Were you so embarrassed over being quoted that you needed to snip the material?

> >Gee, Len, you really showed another veteran some respect, huh? And
> >that was in a thread where you weren't even being addressed.
>
> Miccolis isn't in any position to "judge" the contents. All he has
> is a little temper tantrum and some kind of need to "get"
> another that displeases His Greatness. Bird. Flip. Enjoy.

Sure he is in a position to judge. I read it and judged it too. It makes you look rather foolish.

>
> >C'mon, Len, you made the claim, you back it up. Show us the actual
> >postings.
>
> You are wasting all our time, Pedantic Parson.

He's not wasting my time, Leonard. I'm rather enjoying seeing you on the hook.

>
> Jimmie boy, you must learn to live in the here and now.
> I don't credit you with any ability to live for the future. You
> have to continue to beat those old, dead horses and I can't
> understand any motivation for that except some perverse
> pique on your part for not Getting Your Way in the beginning.

Lennie boy, are you Getting Your Way in amateur radio regulation? Is
that the reason for your vitriolic posts?

> I give you this: Bird. Flip.
>
> Enjoy wasting our time.

It is obvious that you have nothing better to do.

Dave K8MN

753. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 16:43:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBD2C54.4040808@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66902

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3EBC5715.4060309@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>>>From K4YZ:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>My assertion still stands. Your lack of experience is glaring, Vippy.
>>>
>
>
>>>Ham radio SHOULD be interesting.
>>
>
> I find it interesting. If others don't, I'm not going to try to force it on
> them.
>
>
>>>What about those who have not been to so many
>>>events, perhaps just one?
>>
>
>>>If they are bored there after seeing contests, they would not want to join
>>>Ham radio.
>>
>
> If they cannot understand that ham radio is a whole bunch of activities, then
> it's not for them. Contesting is just one of those activities.
>
>
>> Question?
>>
>> You have left absolutely no doubt that there is an almost bottomless
>>hatred you have for Ham radio.
>>
>> That being the case, what is your motivation for continuing to post
>
> here?
>
> Isn't it obvious, Mike?

True enough. I guess he IS a little more fun than to argue with than most of the trolls. At least the retorts are unpredictable.

- Mike KB3EIA -

754. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 16:50:53 UTC
From: Ken Harris <k5kdi@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <vbqbfs54jrsv92@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 66903
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

this is what we are here for guys, if we make an ass of ourselves in a declared emergency, then why the hell should the fcc keep letting us have these frequencies.....get over it guy, my vfo moves up and down from the emergency frequencies, and i bet yours does too!!!!

come on guys , dont let a few ruin it for the rest of us.... even if we are just swl's at this point....

Later guys!
Ken.
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:b9h8ucbdc1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB033
> ARLB033 FCC Declares General Communications Emergency for Oklahoma
> Area
>
> ZCZC AG33
> QST de W1AW
> ARRL Bulletin 33 ARLB033
> From ARRL Headquarters
> Newington CT May 9, 2003
> To all radio amateurs
>
> SB QST ARL ARLB033
> ARLB033 FCC Declares General Communications Emergency for Oklahoma
> Area
>
> The Federal Communications Commission has declared a general
> communications emergency for the Oklahoma area. Effective
> immediately, amateurs are required to refrain from using 3900 kHz,
> plus or minus 3 kHz, unless they are taking part in the handling of
> emergency traffic.
>
> The declaration was announced May 9, 2003, in cooperation with ARRL
> Oklahoma Section leadership and under the authority of Section
> 97.401 of the FCC's Amateur Radio Service rules and regulations [47
> CFR Part 97].
>
> The FCC said the declaration is to support amateur communications on
> behalf of The Salvation Army's tornado relief efforts. The order,
> signed by Technical and Public Safety Division Chief Joseph P. Casey
> of the FCC's Enforcement Bureau, remains in effect until rescinded.
> NNNN
> /EX

>
>

755. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 17:02:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510130226.13740.00000181@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66904

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/9/2003 7:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509202046.18771.00000525@mb-m18.aol.com>

>>It is? Where did you get your EE degree(s), Len? What date(s) are on
>>the diploma(s)?
>
> I have it. For details, you don't have any right to know.

Ahhhhhh...yet you DEMAND to know intimate details of Jim's employment and education, and of mine and my service duties.

Uh huh...riiiiiiiiiight.

>I know enough radio technology to have corporations pay me for
> the responsibility of radio design...and many have done so.

And some decided you weren't worht the expense and let you go.

Abruptly.

>I don't have much information on US amateur radio of the 1930s.

Nor do you on Amateur Radio of the 21st Century.

>>So we should ask your friends about you? What would that prove?
>
> It would prove you can dare venture outside Google and
> the past. I don't think you have the courage to do that.

I did. The results for you were not good. Humiliating, even.

>>I think you also sent that unsolicited junk email to me. Why?
>
> Why not?

Uh huh...Lennie thinks it's OK to SPAM e mail, however when he get's HIS feather ruffled (the result of which was to an item he initiated) he goes whining to AOL about "libelous" web pages.

Two faced cowardly putz.

Excuse me..that wasn't correct...Tow faced cowardly LYING putz.

There...that's better.

>>Does your
>>holding such a license somehow prove that you know more about how

>>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>
> That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
> radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
> deliberate public information on any answers.

Whoopie doo...My Amateur Extra and 2nd Phone were prior to open pools too.

Who cares?

You ahve NOT taken Amateur test. You ahve NO Amateur privileges. You do
not have a station license in ANY radio service, ergo your First Phone
(...excuse me...Your EXPIRED GROL...) allows you NO "operating" privileges.

>It was taken once
> and passed before most of the participants in this din of inequity
> were either alive or had taken ANY tests of ANY kind.

But...but...but...LENNIE! YOU have stated in occassions too frequent to
list that "tenure" doesn't count for anything...yet right here you exert your
"right" to it...So what's the real deal?

>In case you haven't read the rather simple law on the subject, the
> FCC is obliged to accept ALL US citizen input insofar as US radio
> regulations on ANY US radio service they regulate.

Yep...ALL Citizens. Including ones who think YOU are a lying, cold
hearted, irresponsible PUTZ.

>I've "taken it" in here for years. But, I've never been so obsessed
> with any particular message arguement to carry sore losing to
> such great lengths as:
>
> 1. Creating a special Home Page on an ISP deliberately
> designed to libel one individual so severely as did Robeson.
> That was an outrageous, sick act on his part.

You alleged in this forum that you did NOT send a photo with an unknown
person exposing himself. That was a lie. I "exposed" you for what you were.

You sent that e mail uder the guise of a copy of your FCC license. It was
a ruse...a Trojan Horse...then you claimed it was a "mistake".

Of course you ALSO allege to being an electronics "professional", having
been paid for your engineering and consulting skills.

Those were lies too, methinks. If you can't send a simple e mail and get
it right, how are we to accept that anythig ELSE you allege is accurate?

>2. Send a specific one-paragraph Comment to the FCC 10 days
> after comment cut-off period with the sole subject being his
> objection to my commenting to my government plus his
> demand that my comment be disregarded.

As you attempted to "blunt" Mike Deignan's?

>I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
> court lawsuit on grounds of libel.

And then that attorney gets to see all the "libellous" posts YOU have made over the past few years.

Go ahead, Your Putziness...make my bankroll...

>Such a lawsuit would be
> almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
> clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are
> (and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
> lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
> such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
> money.

I still have your offer of an e mail copy of the "license" and the actual received "document". So, as I said, Lennie, go ahead...Make My Bankroll. Let's just see how far that retirement of yours will support your ego...AND your mouth.

>Rather than "take it" to court, I simply contacted AOL and pointed
> out the clear evidence of libel. AOL removed that Home Page
> and the newly-created defamatory screen name he created

I dare say your results in court would be far less satisfactory than what AOL allowed you.

>That
> was the honorable course of action on my part and AOL's part.
> Robeson remains vengeful, foul-mouthed in an obvious condition
> of sociopathic behavior in this newsgroup.

For "foul mouthed" we'll defer to Lennie's recent use of "BS" over twenty times in one post.

>>Do you think your behavior here causes others to respect you? Here's a
>>hint: IT DOESN'T.
>
> Irrelevant. All unmoderated newsgroups are free-for-alls where
> anyone can post at any time on any subject with freedom to
> say whatever they wish to say.

VERY relevent. You insist on trying to "moderate" thread direction and content all the time. Why is it OK for you and not for others?

>"Respect" is not earned by mouthing platitudes and beliefs
> espoused by some membership organization for years and then
> attempting to demean those who do not accept such beliefs.
> "Respect" is a very objective condition, very individual in nature
> and you have no, repeat NO, lock on who has or has no "respect."

In THIS case, the object is YOU, and in THIS case, he's right on. You (and now your padawan learner, Vippy the Voiciferous) are the court jesters of Amateur Radio.

>>Some folks do, some folks don't.
>
> That is a NULL comment. The Stalker has given NO details of
> where or when those took place. It remains vague, undefined.
> In other venues it would be called a "fish story." A LIE.

Not a lie. Intentionally vague. With good reason. That YOU think it a
"lie" or a "fish story" is irrelevent. Too bad for you.

>I was IN Korea on one short TDY. Irrelevant.

So was I. On SEVERAL "short" TAD's. None of those operations gave me the
right to claim some embellishment of my real service career based on having
been in the same enviroment where combat Marines were killed.

>I don't have any power to command others how they are supposed
> to read what I write.

Sure you do. WHAT you write and HOW you write it make all the difference.
You are interpreted EXACTLY how you intend to be "interpreted".

>I can't control your little temper tantrums, either.

No one except you and Markie have had any...

>Do you wish extreme accuracy in ALL military-oriented
> comments as to plan, position, strategy, and tactics?

Do you have a reason to lie?

>Normally, if still in the US military, I'd use military language
> to tell you GO FUCK OFF!...(SNIP)

Whew! Temper tantrum AND "obscene" all in one sentence.

>and follow that with appropriate
> physical action. However, being as you've never served in
> the US military and, as a morseman, probably don't know
> much about sex either, I would simply flip you the bird and
> go on to other things.

Hmmm...a NOT SO veiled theat, use of verbal and visual obscenities and
attempts to embellish YOUR "sexual prowess" at the expense of another man...

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

GO AHEAD LENNIE, TAKE >>US<< TO COURT FOR LIBEL! ! ! !

>Miccolis isn't in any position to "judge" the contents. All he has
> is a little temper tantrum and some kind of need to "get"
> another that displeases His Greatness. Bird. Flip. Enjoy.

Temper tantrum and expression of profanity vs "civil debate" noted.

BBBWWWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

756. Re: Q's in regards to testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 17:29:19 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9377893812318elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 66905

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305100721200.1307@kd6lvw.ampr.org:

> On Sat, 10 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
>> ...
>> You can take the elements in any order, but if you had elements 3 and
>> 4 without 2, for example, it wouldn't get you a licence, or if you had
>> 2 and 4 without 3 you would only be a Tech. I say this as a Volunteer
>> Examiner (expired).
>
> Taking elements out of order is generally at the discretion of the
> examination team, and most if not all won't normally let someone do
> that. I say that as a VE, having operated at least one test session
> per month since January 1994, and still doing so. Only the written
> elements have an order to them.
>

Certainly not all. We would let someone do that in our VE group. I don't see what the big deal is. The only actual examples I can think of were engineers or technicians (that is real technicians with a small 't', not people with a Technician ham licence) who took multiple theory elements in the wrong order in a single session. We're pretty relaxed, but keep strictly within the rules, of course.

We don't care if people write down dots and dashes either, as there's no rule to say you can't. Yes, I know I'm on record as opposing code testing, but our other VEs aren't particularly opposed to it. They just beleive that there's no sense in adding additional requirements that aren't asked for by the FCC, although I know many do.

I haven't personally done a VE session for a while, so long that my status has lapsed. I must get around to renewing my VE status so I can get back into it. We only have a test session every 2-3 months anyway, and attendance is often pretty thin even then. This may have something to do with the fact that we don't teach classes, and the next club North of us does, so anyone who takes classes will most likely test at one of their sessions at the end of the course. Technically, our VE group is not part of the club we all belong to, as it was formed first before we had a club in this county. We all used to be members of that other club that runs the classes.

You do things your way ...

73 de Alun, N3KIP

757. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 17:41:52 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0305100941.3f88104@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66906
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bob" <netman@newersplacenet.com> wrote in message news:<b9iq2q$mo2$0@pita.alt.net>...
> Lots of long haul truckers use 3898 at night in my part of
> the country. This will not set well with them. In fact, I just
> checked 3898, and the truckers, many not licensed, said,
> "Screw the FCC." Riley has a fair record of nailing people
> who use call signs but a dismal record of doing anything
> about unidentified stations. Just heard chatter on 3898 telling
> everyone to make sure they do not use call signs.
>
> Bob
> 3898 Observer

I wasn't aware there was a group of unlicensed truckers using 3.898. A
new one on me...But no matter. They are "sick-bird" ops, IE:
ill-eagle, and their views don't count. No one cares what they think.
I hope Riley takes a big dump on them. And yes, they generally don't
have time to go after unlicensed ops's unless they start causing a
noticable ruckus. But getting 2 kc away from a wx net will bring the
heat down on them mucho fast. The FCC has the ability to easily find
these guys IF they really want to. MK

758. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 18:25:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510142541.26673.00000152@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 66907

>Subject: Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030509172855.18771.00000507@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>In article <rRDua.5574$Gy.4219@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
><aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
>>Back in the '50s, radios that operated much over 30 MHz...(SNIP)

> Citizens Band Radio Service in the USA started in UHF in the 1950s...(SNIP)

Off to a nice start...On topic...interesting...relevent...

But then...

>Some radio amateurs who
> know what is good for everyone demand that all amateurs test
> to the standards and practices of the 1930s in radio.

Lennie screws up yet another opportunity to be perceived as a "nice
guy"...Right back into the scumbag role.

Predictable.

Steve, K4YZ

759. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 20:07:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510160710.09447.00000125@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66908

From: Mike Coslo

>You have left absolutely no doubt that there is an almost bottomless
>hatred you have for Ham radio.

I don't hate Ham radio. I believe Hams are generally nice people who have
different interests.

Hams seem to be interested in certain aspects - antennas, contests, CW, DX,
collecting wallpaper, ragchewing.

>That being the case, what is your motivation for continuing to post here?

To show that there are other possible activities in the radio hobby.

760. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 20:26:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510162636.09447.00000126@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66909

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>If they cannot understand that ham radio is a whole bunch of activities, then
>it's not for them. Contesting is just one of those activities.

Ham radio is also a set of traditions. This is a required part of Ham radio.
Without that you are not a "true" Ham.

761. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 20:27:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510162720.18775.00000559@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66910

In article <20030509235102.18772.00000467@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>That's not a "new identity." I had that as a handle back on BBSs
> as a co-sysop of one system...and is the first additional screen
> name I used on AOL years ago. I've posted with that screen
> name in here before.

Also under the screen names "nocwtest@aol.com", "lenof21@aol.com", "averyfine@aol.com". Len has probably used other screen names here without being recognized.

Now it's understandable that a person might change screen names when changing ISPs, moving, etc. But one has to wonder why Len has used so many different screen names to post to the same newsgroup from the same location using the same ISP.

762. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 20:27:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510162721.18775.00000560@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66911

In article <3EBD2C54.4040808@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <3EBC5715.4060309@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:

>>>Vshah101 wrote:
>>>
>>>>From K4YZ:

>>>>>My assertion still stands. Your lack of experience is glaring, Vippy.

>>>>Ham radio SHOULD be interesting.

>> I find it interesting. If others don't, I'm not going to try to force it on
>> them.

>>>>What about those who have not been to so many
>>>>events, perhaps just one?

>>>>If they are bored there after seeing contests, they would not want to join
>>>>Ham radio.

>> If they cannot understand that ham radio is a whole bunch of activities,
>> then it's not for them. Contesting is just one of those activities.

>>> Question?

>>> You have left absolutely no doubt that there is an almost bottomless
>>>hatred you have for Ham radio.

>>> That being the case, what is your motivation for continuing to post
>>> here?

>> Isn't it obvious, Mike?

> True enough. I guess he IS a little more fun than to argue with than
>most of the trolls. At least the retorts are unpredictable.
>
I don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
completely different thought process than we're used to.

73 de Jim, N2EY

763. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 20:44:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510164401.09447.00000127@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66913

From: Dave Heil

>Vipul Shah finds anything he doesn't understand "cultlike".

I DO understand contesting. I don't understand why the fanatical following of certain traditions. 10-10 numbers are "not allowed". A child that doesn't know CW is "not good enough". The use of codewords as some kind of agreed upon tradition. Plus many more examples.

>Not true. Some radio amateurs in here have stated that skills developed
>in contesting are the same skills desired in emergency communications.

Searching bands and CQ for contests is not emergency communications. Some skills, like the initial setup of the station, is useful. But these are side effects. Not as effective as doing emergency communication practice drills.

>Amateur radio
>operating is a very social activity.

Wrong. They work DX at a remote location, while others are vacation'g. They contact others by radio at the same time others are there in person (at the beach, for example). Not a social activity. Anti-social.

>> ARRL olde-tyme ham Beliefs are not of the divinity nor are they
>> some form of Universal Truths however self-evident to Believers.

Hams do not understand thier anti-social nature and that others may see them as a cult.

764. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 21:12:55 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <b9jpuccbd1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 66992

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030510142541.26673.00000152@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030509172855.18771.00000507@mb-m18.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <rRDua.5574$Gy.4219@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim
Hampton"
> ><aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
> >
> >>Back in the '50s, radios that operated much over 30 MHz...(SNIP)
>
> > Citizens Band Radio Service in the USA started in UHF in the
1950s...(SNIP)
>
> Off to a nice start...On topic...interesting...relevent...
>
> But then...
>
> >Some radio amateurs who
> > know what is good for everyone demand that all amateurs test
> > to the standards and practices of the 1930s in radio.
>
> Lennie screws up yet another opportunity to be perceived as a "nice
> guy"...Right back into the scumbag role.
>
> Predictable.

Seems spot-on to me. Any lurker in the rec.radio.* heirarcy is going
to figure it out quickly enough.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/2003

765. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 21:32:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBD7045.E8902950@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66914

Len Over 21 paragraphs wrote:
>
> In article <3EBB3293.7758565D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3EB9EB82.26D4CD9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <E.T. of
> >> the Borg?> writes:

> >Who is E.T.? Is that your attempt at another dodge of your screwup?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are the one bragging of YOUR galaxy.

I was? Tsk, tsk, tsk. You are in error.

> >> >Actually, as is your norm, you've drifted very far afield from the
> >> >thread's subject in an effort to impress someone (an unwitting
> >> >individual may step forward at any time) with your vast knowledge of
> >> >things military. My response to you mentioned nothing about my "brave
> >> >valorous military service life", Little Leonid. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor
> >> >baby.
> >>
> >> You did not move boxes?
> >
> >You ever read any of the stuff posted here?
>
> Yes. Quite amusing sometimes...all the militay [sic] heroes
> knowing all about military communications when they've not
> stated anything about such...all the militay [sic] heroes
> bragging about how they were "in" a country at war, therefore
> connecting them to "fighting action."

Were you part of the auxilliary (sic) forces during the Korean War?
At which point did I describe myself as a military hero? At which point
did I write of anything connecting myself to fighting action? Looks
like you manufactured some spare "facts".

> The famous claim of another comes to mind..."seven hostile
> actions" [sick] without a single one identified as to either time
> or place or military unit.

What about it?

> Then there's this "communications expert" serving with the
> State Department who revolutionized HF operations in a tiny

> country in the middle of Africa back in the 1980s.

At which point have I described myself as a communications expert?
At which point did I write anything about revolutionizing HF operations?
At which point did you move Guinea-Bissau to the middle of Africa?

> >Do they? I know some Spanish and French speaking individuals who give
> >feminine names to some objects and masculine names to others. Maybe
> >they've not heard of your theory.
>
> Is that anything like calling another "Leona" or "Leonid?" :-)

It is much like your having referred to Steve as "she" and to me as
"Dame Heil". Surely you know the drill by now.

> Perhaps you should restrict your socializing to those Spanish
> and French speaking individuals who exhibit gender confusion.

The earliest example of such confusion appears to have been yours and I
wouldn't care to socialize with you.

> >> >> It's all in Google. If you need a refresher, go there and look for
> >> >> a month or so.
> >> >
> >> >T'aint there. You fabricate.
> >>
> >> Impossible.
> >
> >It is not only possible, you do it frequently.
>
> I cannot change or "fabricate" anything on the Google archives.

That's right. You can't.

> Are you another one of the Archair Radiotelegraphy Society
> who lives in past postings archived in Google?

What's an "Archair"?

> >> I can't change contents of the Google site.
> >
> >Yeah, that's one of the best things about it.
>
> Make up your mind. First you say I "fabricated" things on
> Google then you say "one of the best things about it" being
> an inability to change anything on Google.

Your end of the horse has apparently dropped another load of road
apples. I wrote nothing of you fabricating things on Google. You have
fabricated "facts" and those now reside in the Google archives. You
have no choice but to live with it.

> Your differing personalities are arguing among themselves.

> >Who is E.T.? I wasn't in the Army. That's why I asked you the
> >question.
>
> You are, Galactic Traveler.

No, I'm not in the Army.

> Don't misdirect with meaningless questions.

It is the only way to deal with your meaningless comments.

> >> He doesn't know much about the Navy.
> >
> >He knew enough to tell you that the Navy uses the term "rates".
>
> If you were never in the USN, how can you be such an expert
> on USN terminology? :-)

There's a point for you to ponder: I wasn't in the Navy but I knew
about rates.

> >> One wonders if E.T. knows anything about the US Air Force.
> >
> >Who is E.T.? I knew enough to tell you that the Air Force uses the term
> >"AFSC". That's only a couple of things which I knew about the military
> >that you didn't know. There are others.
>
> You may be suffering from battle fatigue after being IN a country
> at war 30 years ago. Or just plain mind rot. Hard to tell...

It must be your mind that has gone to seed, ancient one. I knew about
Navy ratings and Air Force AFSC's. It is obvious from your silly
comments that you did not.

> >> >> Could he do morse code?
> >> >
> >> >Could you?
> >>
> >> Yes.
> >
> >It has not been demonstrated.
>
> Neither has your heroic military action IN a country at war.

At which point did I write of my heroic military action? I didn't sit
out the war so far in the rear that I was in a completely different
country. Your odds of obtaining more information are very slim.

> >> Did E.T. know General George Patton?
> >
> >Who is E.T.? I knew Patton about as well as you. I've seen the movie,
> >viewed documentaries, read books.
>
> You failed to answer questions such as "did Patton have a ham

> license."

You failed to get real.

> Why do you misdirect with all those MILITAY [sic] questions?

Why, Leonard. You've spent days discussing the military. To hear you
tell it, you're the only guy here with any military or any "PROFESSIONAL
RADIO" experience.

> The Subject line in the message header says "Novice Class
> license." It isn't about MILITAY or military history.

Then why are you still discussing the military?

> >> Where and when? Patton died well before the Southeast Asia
> >> Live Fire Exercise.
> >
> >...and well before Korea. He wouldn't have directed his operations from
> >Japan so you still wouldn't have run into him.
>
> I was assigned to do military radio communications while on US Army
> duty in Japan, 1953 to 1956.

Bully for you.

> Extra Terrific hasn't said squat about doing any radio communications
> while he was IN Vietnam. Nothing.

That's right, I haven't.

> >> >> Tell us about your Novice Class amateur radio experiences in
> >> >> Vietnam, mighty morse warrior. Did you "hone your skills" there?
> >> >
> >> >I was a Novice seven years before my arrival in Viet Nam at age 21.
> >>
> >> Practiced box moving in snack bars, did you?
> >
> >Are you literate?
>
> Straight A grades in all college English courses, professional
> writer since 1968 with a 97% acceptance rate on submitted
> manuscripts to national periodicals, Associate Editor with Ham
> Radio Magazine for two years.

You don't seem to retain facts you've read. That probably came with
age.

> Do you need more? :-)

You're lagging. My acceptance rate is 100% on material submitted to
national periodicals.

> >> >Unlike your rear area service during the Korean War, I was
> >> >actually stationed in the country where the conflict was taking place.

> >>
> >> Yes. Moving boxes in a snack bar.
> >
> >Are you literate?
>
> Straight A grades in all college English courses, professional
> writer since 1968 with a 97% acceptance rate on submitted
> manuscripts to national periodicals, Associate Editor with Ham
> Radio Magazine for two years.
>
> Do you have short-term memory loss problems?

That's what I was about to ask you. I've recently provided the answers
to the questions you posed. It looks as if you forgot.

> >> >I love it when a fellow like you starts telling someone who didn't serve
> >> >in the military about your having put your life on the line.
> >>
> >> All US Army soldiers do that the minute they enlist...
> >> regardless of where they are stationed as assigned.
> >
> >They do? That's assinine. Obviously you participated and have yet to
> >stop.
>
> You DO exhibit mental problems on comprehension of what
> the US military does today as well as centuries past.

I've not tried to lord it over civilians who did not serve in the
military. The only clowns I've ever heard talk the way you do were
sitting at the bar in the local Legion post.

> What is NOT "obvious" to anyone in here on what EXACTLY
> Mr. Extra Terrific did in Vietnam.

Well, Mr. Leonard H. Noticket, I can feel your angst. I have, however,
no desire to have you write of my military service what you've attempted
to do with my Department of State career. I guess you'll be left in the
dark.

> >> How are we supposed to treat the vaporous implications
> >> of meritorious service done by snack bar box pushers?
> >
> >I didn't know any snack bar box pushers. Must have been some rear area
> >slang from the days when you won the Korean War from Tokyo.
>
> The Korean War NEVER ENDED. There was no "winning" or
> "losing," no "victory" or "defeat." The 38th Parallel remains as a
> dividing line between North and South Koreas, as it has been
> for over half a century.
>
> I am shocked that a former employee of the US Department of
> State is so ignorant of past history of United States and United

> Nations involvement in Asia. It was in all the newspapers...

Hate to burst your bubble, Leonard. The fighting ended a half century back. If you feel that things aren't over, suit up and hop back over to finish things up.

> Such total ignorance is not any sort of virtue.

Didn't they bother to tell you that the fighting had stopped?

> Combined with vague, ambiguous claims of being IN a country
> at war yet never detailing anything in that regard, that makes
> such claims appear false.

Leonard, all you need to know is that I served in Viet Nam in the Air Force in '70-'71. I drew combat pay for my time there. If that appears false to you, I can live with it.

> It seems that nothing of Mr. Extra Terrific's confused postings
> has anything to do with amateur radio and certainly not about any
> Novice Class amateur license.

Why do you keep asking me questions about the military?

> I put Mr. Extra Terrific into the mind rot victim category.

To do so, you'd first have to be able to tell the difference. I don't think you're up to it.

Dave K8MN

766. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 21:34:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xfeva.8512$3f7.5455031@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66912

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030510160710.09447.00000125@mb-m21.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo
>
> >You have left absolutely no doubt that there is an almost bottomless
> >hatred you have for Ham radio.
>
> I don't hate Ham radio. I believe Hams are generally nice people who have
> different interests.
>
> Hams seem to be interested in certain aspects - antennas, contests, CW,
DX,
> collecting wallpaper, ragchewing.
>
> >That being the case, what is your motivation for continuing to post here?
>
> To show that there are other possible activities in the radio hobby.
>

We are already well aware of the multiplicity of other activities in our
hobby. So why are you trying to teach us what we already know far better
than you do?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

767. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 21:44:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBD72FF.2846DAE8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66915

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EBB35B2.49DB3336@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Vshah101 wrote:
> >>
> >> From K4YZ:
> >>
> >> >Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
> >> >Communications Commission.
> >>
> >> Contests, while not FCC rules, should be followed exactly. The thing that
> makes
> >> it a cult is the arbitrary rules to "work" certain segments to collect
> points.
> >
> >You find the contest rules arbitrary? Don't operate in the contest.
> >You must not tire of being one of the newsgroup buffoons.
>
> That has not tired you.

I'm not the individual hung up on giving amateur radio cult-like status
and I'm not the individual posting here who is totally irrelevant to
amateur radio.

> >> I honestly feel an EE would be frustrated with the hobby, like I was.
> >
> >N2EY is a EE. He isn't frustrated with amateur radio. Jim Jaeger K8RQ
> >is a EE who founded Cincinnati Microwave. He isn't frustrated with
> >amateur radio.
>
> There is no one in any records of electronic engineering graduates
> with the surname of "N2EY." Absolutely none.

To the best of your knowlege...

> "Jim Jaeger K8RQ" is not a participant in this newsgroup.

To the best of your knowledge...

> "Cincinnati Microwave" was not mentioned previously in any
> posting.

Congrats! For being the very first to recognize first time use of the
name "Cincinnati Microwave", you win a case of morse code study tapes.

> Further, "K4YZ" never worked one day in his life IN any electric
> or elecronic engineering department anywhere, never got any
> engineering degree. [again, no record anywhere on that]

To the best of your knowledge...

> >> >>Changing the hobby for the better is a hopeless idea.
> >> > That's only because you are hopelessly narrowminded.
> >>
> >> Hams only want to do their activities. They will pose for a homebrewing
> photo,
> >> but never want to homebrew.
> >
> >That's simply an untruth. Do you know what a person who tells untruths
> >is called?
>
> Dave Heil...Steve Robeson...as two examples...

Len, don't sell yourself short. You're the CHAMP.

> >So everything you don't understand has no apparent reason for being.
> >Anything you don't understand becomes "cult like". Take my advice,
> >Vipul: Stay away from VFW and Shriners conventions.
>
> What do "VFW and Shriners conventions" have to do with
> amateur radio or saving the Novice Class license?

Let's be honest here. What do YOU have to do with amateur radio or the
Novice Class license?

> Heil's continuing confusion adds more credence to mounting
> evidence of his mind rot.

MY confusion? You're the guy who thinks he has something to do with
amateur radio.

> He goes into more such confusion on mentions of "Whitbread
> Cup entrants" (whatever they are)

Remember that crack you fed to Jim about doubting that he'd ever left
the continent? You're making yourself look very provincial.

> and "marathon runners,"
> neither of which have anything to do with radio per se, let
> alone amateur radio or the Novice Class license for same in
> the USA.

No one else seemed to have any difficulty in understanding. That leaves
you as odd man (appropriate term) out.

Dave K8MN

768. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 22:31:15 UTC
From: Richard W <Sigs@nononnetanon.net>
Message-ID: <b9jujr$gf8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66916
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> I wasn't aware there was a group of unlicensed truckers using 3.898. A
> new one on me...But no matter. They are "sick-bird" ops, IE:
> ill-eagle, and their views don't count. No one cares what they think.
> I hope Riley takes a big dump on them. And yes, they generally don't
> have time to go after unlicensed ops's unless they start causing a
> noticable ruckus. But getting 2 kc away from a wx net will bring the
> heat down on them mucho fast. The FCC has the ability to easily find
> these guys IF they really want to. MK

Not really. The commission cannot "easily" find someone, even
when they want to. Example. We had some nut case get on
air traffic control frequencies here for weeks! Yes weeks. FCC
had several people in town and could not locate the guy. The
nut case's radio signals were finally tracked down by another agency,
using techniques the commission does not possess. Sorry, I know
I am being vague on purpose. I don't want some nut to read details
here in a public forum and make it that much more difficult for the
authorities to locate him next time. Bottom line, the commission
tried for weeks to locate the guy and failed. No FCC news release
this time. They were just as glad to sweep the whole thing under
the carpet. And the outfit that found the guy is not in the habit
of putting out news releases for any reason.

Rich W
(Scanner enthusiast since 1955)

769. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 23:27:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510192717.09520.00000128@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66917

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/10/2003 3:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030510160710.09447.00000125@mb-m21.aol.com>

>To show that there are other possible activities in the radio hobby.

What have you presented here that "we" didn't already know about?

Steve, K4YZ

770. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 23:29:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510192915.09520.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66918

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/10/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030510162721.18775.00000560@mb-m11.aol.com>

> don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
>completely different thought process than we're used to.
>

Would that be the "Ostrich Vision" mode?

73

Steve, K4YZ

771. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-10 23:40:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510194037.09520.00000130@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66919

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/10/2003 3:44 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030510164401.09447.00000127@mb-m21.aol.com>

>From: Dave Heil
>
>>Vipul Shah finds anything he doesn't understand "cultlike".
>
>I DO understand contesting.

Not from what you've presented here, you don't.

>I don't understand why the fanatical following of
>certain traditions.

"Fanatical following"...?!?!

What "fanatical following"...???

>10-10 numbers are "not allowed".

Unless the contest is SPONSORED by the 10-10 International, 10-10 numbers
are inappropraite in a contest exchange.

They are even MORE inapproapriate on any band OTHER than 10 meters.

>A child that doesn't know
>CW is "not good enough". The use of codewords as some kind of agreed upon
>tradition. Plus many more examples.

There are no "codewords" in Amateur Radio, Vippy.

>>Not true. Some radio amateurs in here have stated that skills developed
>>in contesting are the same skills desired in emergency communications.
>
>Searching bands and CQ for contests is not emergency communications

Being able to accuarately copy a contest exchange in weak, noisy or
crowded conditions IS developing skills for emergency communicaitons, Vippy.

Not evey contact is in "full quieting" and "arm chair copy", especially on
HF, and especially when the distant station may be operating with low power and
an emergency antennas.

>Some
>skills, like the initial setup of the station, is useful. But these are side
>effects. Not as effective as doing emergency communication practice drills.

You mean like being able to accurately copy a message from a weak station through less-than-optimal conditions, Vippy?

>Wrong. They work DX at a remote location, while others are vacation'g. They >contact others by radio at the same time others are there in person (at the >beach, for example). Not a social activity. Anti-social.

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAAHHA ! ! !

WHAT AN IDIOT ! ! !

Are you the only one in your blood line that is this IDIOTIC, Vippy, or is it a family tradition?

>Hams do not understand thier anti-social nature and that others may see them >as
>a cult.

If Amateur Radio is a cult, Vippy, YOU are an al-Quaeda terrorist with a penchant for child molestation and spousal abuse.

Steve, K4YZ

772. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 00:21:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510202116.18775.00000684@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66921

In article <3EBC71BA.CB65BEF9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3EBB2EDC.9351084C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <poorbaby@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >Wittle Wennie has a vewy active imagination. Wennie's pompous
>> >condescent is wegend. By the way, Wennie--resistance is quite common in
>> >ewectwonics. Now cwick your heels together while saying, "There's no
>> >pwace wike ohm".

On reflection, I think I can understand why this poor baby has
been so upset by any suggestions of controls on a minimum
age for US radio amateurs. :-)

No wonder he champions on-off keying codes. Those hide a
very pronounced lisp. :-)

Beep, beep.

773. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 00:21:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510202124.18775.00000685@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66922

In article <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030509202046.18771.00000525@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>In article <c2356669.0305090934.77e630ce@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>news:<20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>>>
>>>> What about those former electronic technicians who actually
>>>> ARE electronic engineers, have the demonstrated capability
>>>> and the experience and the accreditation and continue in that
>>>> endeavor? That is my category.
>>>
>>>It is? Where did you get your EE degree(s), Len? What date(s) are on
>>>the diploma(s)?
>>
>> I have it. For details, you don't have any right to know.
>
>So you won't answer the question. Typical.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. A Grande Inquisitor getting his own treatment of
others shoved right back at him. :-)

>>>Why? Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>>>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>>
>> I know enough radio technology to have corporations pay me for
>> the responsibility of radio design...and many have done so.
>
>Nobody disputes that. But it has nothing to do with the question I asked.

What "questions" did you ask? :-)

Do you understand that radio physics is the same for any radio
regardless of the man-made "service" designation applied?

Obviously you don't understand that and you claim a Masters
degree in electrical engineering!

>> I don't have much information on US amateur radio of the 1930s.
>
>Yet you pontificate about pre-WW2 and even pre-WW1 radio as if you do. Tell

>us about how to build a 600,000 RPM Alexanderson alternator....;-)

I've never described "how to build" any alternators. Certainly
not at such a rate.

There is much information available on OLD radio HISTORY,
senior, and it is not found just in the archives of ARRL. You
need to get out more, see the world.

>> The 1930s' standards and practices of amateur radio continue
>> today, 70 years later, complete with the "necessity" to test for
>> morse code skills in a hobby-recreational radio activity.
>
>That's just not true, Len. The written tests of today are completely
>different.
>The code test of today is much simpler and easier than that of the 1930s. The
>application process is different, too.

Pedant. There you go, focussing on details, details, details in
order to misdirect away from the main subject.

Not only are the DETAILS different, so is the US government
agency that regulates all US civil radio different. Since 1934.
By law.

Of course the Pedantic Parson KNOWS all the intimate details
of code testing in the 1930s. He took them all then? [I don't
think so]

The running argument of the PCTA seems to be that one MUST
have direct participation in something in order to be considered
as qualified on a subject. In that context, the Pedantic Parson
would be disqualified for any history statements of 1955 or
before. Tsk, tsk.

>The tests are still given in English, though. English is a pretty old
>language.

By which US radio regulating agency in the 1930s, senior?

>> I have one textbook on 1930s radio, "Communications
>> Engineering," by Everitt, copyrighted and published 1932.
>> Interesting book, contains radio technology information that
>> was considered "up-to-date" in my 1978 ARRL Handbook.
>
>Like what? Ohm's Law? Dipole antennas?

Tsk, tsk, getting snarly and sarcastic, senior? :-)

Try Chapter 16 in William Little Everitt's text of 1932, all about
Modulation and Demodulation and the explanation of "SSSC"
(the old acryonym for SSB as used by hams). Figure 243 on
page 413 has a nice full-page block diagram of a 4-channel
common carrier communications system. Before and after

that diagram page is an explanation of relative phases of the
sideband products.

Elsewhere this 1932 text has photographs of waveforms taken
on an "oscillogram scope," now commonly called an
oscilloscope by all in the electronics industry.

>> I traded another textbook for that with a radio amateur in
>> New York state; we were both authors of different articles on
>> the same technology in Ham Radio Magazine.
>
>A defunct publication.

Tsk, tsk. Publication envy? :-)

All 22 years of Ham Radio Magazine are available on a three
CD-ROM set for $149.95 (plus tax and SHIPPING charges).

Was "Electric Radio" ever available at national newsstands
or on CD-ROM? :-)

>>>So we should ask your friends about you? What would that prove?
>>
>> It would prove you can dare venture outside Google and
>> the past.
>
>Why? You don't venture outside the past much. You keep talking about the
>1930s and your military experience of a half century ago, and on and on.

Tsk, tsk, TSK. Senior, you really SHOULD try better search
words in Google. :-)

Besides getting off in front of your computer you should get off
of that computer, use your radio, and contact the hams whose
callsigns I mentioned in here. They are still alive and still have
radios, still operate.

You haven't done that...at least not to admit you've done that.
The latter is more likely. You are here to "get" all those who
disagree with you on the screen...your virtual life is all tied
up on your computer and searching Google for "evidence" to
fulfill your "vindication" through quotes of past messages,
selectively pulled from a large collection.

>The only new
>idea in amateur radio regulations I've ever seen you come up with is wanting
>the FCC to enact a minimum age requirement so that young people under the age
>of 14 would be banned from getting amateur radio licenses.

Tsk, tsk. You totally ignored 13 pages of text submitted to the
FCC in 1999 (and public record) to focus solely on the last page
to attempt some depreciatory comment.

Bad, bad puppy. Sit in the corner.

>> I don't think you have the courage to do that.
>
>Why should I call up your alleged friends and ask them about you? Do you think
>it would somehow justify your years of hostile, abusive, belligerent behavior
>here?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You have no social skills in interacting with strangers?
That would account for your reluctance. It's so much easier to live
a virtual life on the screen, pretend all that sage wisdom, and be
arrogant over others not subscribing to your divine opinions of How
Things Should Be.

You might try interacting with fellow gang member Heil. Heil seems
to have a pronounced lisp and could use some help in interactions
with others outside the gang.

>Here's a clue: It won't.

What won't?

>"Courage" has nothing to do with it.

No? Tsk, tsk. See the other gang member Robeson. He is
adamant about "courage" as being an almost supreme necessity.

>You cannot talk your way out of a situation you behaved your way into.

Check out your mirror positioning again, parson. The reflecting
surface is towards you. :-)

>>>You won't take the testimony of my friends about me....
>>
>> What "friends?" In here there are only Heil who calls me a
>> "horse's ass," Kellie who tries to emulate Steamy Stalker
>> by calling me "putz."
>
>And you never called THEM any names, did you?

I've never called anyone a "horse's ass" in here. :-)

I've never called anyone a "dickhead" (putz) in here. :-)

[get busy in Google now, search mightily in old, past postings...
ALL of them to make sure...:-)]

>Never insulted or ridiculed
>their education, work experience, or service to their country. huh?

Only when they did it first. :-)

Robeson continues to insult my military service to their country.

Heil has lapsed into baby talk. Roll is strangely quiet but then
he spends so much time talking about himself that any
comment about others may be glossed over by readers. :-)

>There's also folks like K0HB, K2UNK, K2ASP, W5NET, WA2SI, W4NTI, N8UZE,
>WA2ISE
>and others here whom I count as friends. We do not agree on all things,
>including code testing. Yet all of the above manage to behave in a civil
>manner here.

I'm sure you consider them close, personal friends of the deepest kind, probably for life, all united in some common purpose of brotherhood and kinship forever and ever, standing firm against oppression and the least negative comment by outsiders of your glorious service to your nation, community, and tribe.

[...did I get it all in one sentence? :-)]

"Behaving in a civil manner" applies to all. Such doesn't exempt those who ask biased, loaded questions and demand strict on-the-pedantic-subject answers. You do that as a regular thing in here, Jimmie.

"Behaving in a civil manner" doesn't mean that all ARRL words, ethics and moral statements are the ONLY correct ones while uncivil behavior is anything said against ARRL, however slight. You are guilty of that behavior and definition too, Jimmie.

You have to understand that this is a very open forum, doesn't cater to your whims, desires, or anything you favor. You aren't moderator, aren't "leader" no matter how much you post in almost constant attendance daily. You've got to accept that.

You've got to accept that not everyone is going to be strictly formal and that responses to your words of wisdom may be of a very different kind and format than you imagine they "should be." Robert's Rules of Order don't apply here.

This venue is unmoderated, open to any that have access. You can't dictate who can say what and when...the best you can do is try to wear down opposition with long, Long, LONG postings to make them go away out of irritation. You've found out that such a tactic isn't reliable, yet you keep on in the same manner. It just doesn't work for you, Jimmie. Give up on that tactic.

Expect the unexpected, roll with the punches. If you get wounded, lick the wounds and don't cry about it with crocodile tears...as you want to do from time to time.

774. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 00:21:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510202130.18775.00000686@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66924

In article <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>And all of your misdirection above is a blatant attempt to avoid answering this
>question: Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

I don't recall any previous professional work in radio-electronics requiring ANY serious consideration of amateur radio activities. None of my work experience was with any professional amateur radio companies. :-)

I have worked WITH several who also held amateur radio license grants. Some of those were given in here.

Amateur radios work with the same physics as all other radios. There's no distinction except in the minds of certain people who think that human beaurocracy redefines the laws of physics.

Some of my work experience has required communications by radio in various modes. That was never any problem on land, on the water, or in the air. I've done that since February 1953. I've done communications by radio in non-work related activities. No problem with that at all...all legal, too. :-)

I've had both formal and informal training and education about radio and electronics since about 1947 and that continues today. Electronics keeps increasing the state of the art in all such sub-disciplines, including HF radio where some amateur hearts and minds dwell constantly.

I've been required to study many kinds of specifications, regulations of law, industry standards, federal standards all my working life. Part 97 of Title 47 CFR is one of the smallest Parts of all US civil radio regulations, no real problem in understanding that...including the byzantine six-class structure that existed before restructuring.

At no time since 1953 was I ever required or forced to use any sort of on-off keyed morse code mode for radio communications work or recreation, on HF or any other part of the spectrum.

So, in the loaded context of Miccolis' "question," since US amateur radio still requires morse code TESTING to obtain a license class having HF operating privileges, neither my work experience nor recreational experience "fits" the OLD US

radio amateur regulations in the strict sense of the word. :-)

That really isn't the point, is it? :-)

>You avoid answering that question, for some reason.

Is my answer here "avoiding" anything? :-)

My argument was that the morse code test is old, outmoded, of
no practical value for civil radio regulation purposes, and serves
no one except a minority group of elitists in a recreational/hobby
radio activity who seem to think they are Rulers of Radio just by
passing a high-rate on-off keying code test. :-)

["Give a man an inch and he will think he is a ruler." - Anon.]

Miccolis asked a very loaded question but did not get the
answer he wished. TS. :-)

>> That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
>> radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
>> deliberate public information on any answers.
>
>Tougher test? I don't think so. I have heard from those who took both tests
>that the tests required for the Amateur Extra at that time were tougher than
>those required for the First 'Phone.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...without taking such a test yourself in 1956, you have
NO basis for judgement. Your "logic" fails.

>You cannot know it was "a tougher test" when you did not take the tests you
>compare it to. Your logic fails.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...without taking such a test yourself in 1956, you have
NO basis for judgement. YOUR "logic" fails, flounders, and is
"stuck on zero" (prompt from early automated digital logic testers).

>What you're trying to sell us is the idea that your passing a single test for
a
>COMMERCIAL license many years ago somehow proves that you know more about how
>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else. No sale.

That wasn't offered for "sale." :-)

What you are attempting to prove in here is that any commercial radio
license test is inferior to any amateur radio license test. No sale.

What you are implying is that "tests" represent a summation of
knowledge of the examinee AFTER the test was taken. That is most
assuredly false, ludicrous, and a bit insane. "Tests" represent only
the knowledge of test subjects by examinees BEFORE the test was
taken.

Absolutely NO "test" is required to see the arrogance and self-
righteous indignation of certain individuals who insist that Their

testing in anything showed their "superiority" to any who did not
take the test. Their "superiority" is a definite NO SALE.

>There you go, living in the past and its standards and requirements.

I'm in an arena of amateur radio policy arguments where the
standards and practices of 1930s amateur radio represents the
norm for the 2000s according to some olde-tyme hams. There's
no avoiding those, such as yourself, who demand living in the
standards and practices of 70 years ago. :-)

>How does your passing such a license test so long ago somehow prove that you
>know more about how AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

How does your passing an AMATEUR radio test so long ago
prove you are judge, jury, and executioner qualified to speak
of policy in amateur radio TODAY? :-)

You will claim something like a long tenure as a licensee and
being "active on the air" as your qualifier. :-)

You ARE, therefore you Rule. :-)

No sale.

<snip of long-ago public posting in here omitted>

>But the amateur radio experience of an active radio amateur DOES exceed the
>experience of any unlicensed person. In other words, us licensed, active hams
>have experience, knowledge and skills about AMATEUR RADIO that you do not,
>Len. That's a plain, simple fact.

No, that's just a self-righteous, self-important CLAIM.

If your CLAIM had any merit to the FCC, or even to the government
elsewhere, you should be the supreme arbiter of all who may
exercise their First Amendment Rights on US federal law.
You aren't. You do NOT Rule.

Your CLAIM only has merit in the closed-loop inbreeding of
fraternal groups whose members think alike on their own
self-importance. ARRL is such an organization.

Despite your CLAIMS of "experience, knowledge, and skills
about amateur radio," YOU are not sitting in policy-making
in the FCC nor in any enforcement office of the US
government. YOU are just venting a cloud of frustration and
pique for not being able to Rule and are unrecognized for
the greatness and glory of your words of wisdom.

What's worse, the FCC's opinion on morse code testing for
US amateur radio license examination is not in agreement
with all your claimed "superiority" in amateur radio.

All the other PCTAs seem to feel the same way and are
whining about it through attempts at insulting all those who
aren't PCTAs.

>> But, I've never been so obsessed
>> with any particular message arguement to carry sore losing to
>> such great lengths as:
>>
>> 1. Creating a special Home Page on an ISP deliberately
>> designed to libel one individual so severely as did Robeson.
>> That was an outrageous, sick act on his part.
>
>In your OPINION. Someone else would think it was funny. Me, I think it was in
>bad taste.

Awwww...really? I'll bet you were hopping up and down with
happiness on seeing it...vicariously enjoying "vindication"
for non-agreement on morse code testing in the newsgroup!

:-)

>Besides, that was over FOUR YEARS AGO, wasn't it? You live in the past too
>much.

I'm not the one touting B&W products of the 1950s.

I'm not the one touting morse code "superiority" after it
began in commercial service in 1844.

I'm not the one demanding all amateurs to adhere to
the standards and practices in amateur radio as it
was in the 1930s.

I'm not the one constantly going back to dear old
GOOGLE to pull out old messages and try to beat
dead horses of past arguments.

You have your mirror reversed still...

>> I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
>> court lawsuit on grounds of libel. I can afford such things as
>> attorney fees for a protacted period. Such a lawsuit would be
>> almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
>> clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are
>> (and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
>> lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
>> such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
>> money.
>>
>Sounds like you are threatening him.

Awwww...gosh, I didn't let a "superior" ham run amuck with
his petty libel!

How "threatening" of me! Terrible!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the grant of an AMATEUR license does not
exempt anyone from statutes on libel or slander. Why do
you think it does?

>Here's a hint, Len: I'm not him.

No? Aren't you a Band of Brothers or something?

Is the Gang of Four having a falling-out in here?

Quick, someone call Newsline! There's a STORY
brewing! Paging Pasternak...paging Pasternack...

>You might note that I have repeatedly pointed out that his name-calling and
>other antics simply lower him to your level.

Oooooo! :-) :-) :-)

Are you changing from the Pedantic Parson to "Buffy,
the Vampire Slayer?" :-)

Can this be a lead-in to another Sermon on the Antenna
Mount?

Stay tuned everyone...Parson will return in 3 or 4 years with
all these words cut-and-pasted from Google! Bank on it. :-)

775. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 00:21:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510202133.18775.00000687@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66923

In article <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>'That's all very nice and dramatic but wasn't it the United States Army where
>you learned all that? The same US Army that gave you food, lodging, shelter,
>and free clothes, medical care, and training as needed? The same US Army
>that taught you radio electronics theory and practice? It wasn't amateur radio,
>was it?

You are mostly WRONG, senior.

Military radio communications is definitely NOT amateur radio.

But, you can't know that in any way from personal experience, can you?

The US Army taught me the BEGINNING of radio and electronics knowledge I've acquired, despite already knowing the basics before joining the Army voluntarily.

>Len, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in
>the US Army is past for you.

I got my Good Conduct Ribbon in 1955. That was good enough for me at that time. :-)

I got an Honorable Discharge in 1960. No preceding "medical discharge" that later became "honorable." :-)

>That was not amateur radio, it was PROFESSIONAL radio.

I'd call it MILITARY radio.

The job also required being able to "close with and destroy the enemy."

I was many years in regular hours of employment in professional electronics and never heard of anyone killing competitors. :-)

>I'm sure that the US Army did
>not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it.

How can you possibly be "sure?" You've never served.

Are you on some advisory panel on US Army doctrine and training as a civilian?

How can you be so "sure?"

>I don't see how
>all that makes you some Number One Ichiban HAM Honcho NOW.'

I don't claim to be that, never have. :-)

I'm just advocating the elimination of morse code testing for
any US amateur radio license examination.

Somehow you've worked yourself up into some mighty morse
lather and want to damn anyone for even suggesting that
the morse code test be eliminated.

>No, it's because of the way you show no respect for others' service.
>Including Vietnam veterans and career State Department employees.

Heh...it's true I don't have a lot of respect for the ENTIRETY
of the US Department of State and US foreign policy.

If ANY veteran of ANY branch of ANY military tries a snow
job in here or makes a lot of vapid vague generalities of any
sort of mighty military "experience," they should be a target
for veteran to practice some live fire.

Try to firm up the when and where of "seven hostile actions"
claimed by the character assassin in the Gang of Four.
He hasn't done it yet.

Talk some baby-talk to Heil and ask him which unit and what
duties were performed while IN Vietnam when that country
was at war. He hasn't done that yet.

Go back to Google and find the identity of the "colonel whose
son was behind enemy lines sending intel by CW" in the
first Gulf War. Snow job, bullshit, fish-story stuff. I could
care less whether that braggart and storyteller was a Real
veteran or not. Such nonsense posted in public doesn't
deserve a single atom of "respect."

We could get to YOU and all your "respect" for my service to
my country, but that wouldn't look good on you, would it?

Go live in Google among all the OLD newsgroup messages.
You love that stuff, apparently. Continue to beat the dead
horses. It seems to be a catharsis for your frustrations.

You are a veteran of amateur radio and fought the code
wars. Demand "respect" for all that fighting. In that
virtual reality you can be as mighty as anyone. Who
knows, you might even earn a morse medal for valiant
service and gallantry in battle! :-)

776. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 00:21:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030510202136.18775.00000688@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66920

In article <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Sounds like a threat. Is that how you resolve conflicts - cuss at the person
>and attack them physically? If you met me in person, would you do that in
>response to my words of disagreement?

Why, are you worried? :-)

Why do you feel "threatened?"

>Is it "brotherhood" that is evidenced in your posts here to other veterans,
>many of whom served our country much longer than you did?

They aren't worthy of brotherhood if they lie and make up
fish-stories about that "service."

Here's two examples:

"You are a horse's ass" stated by a veteran whose only
given information about miltary service was that he was
"in a country [Vietnam] at war." Written just recently by
someone who lapsed into lisping baby-talk.

"Putz," said many, many times by a foul-mouthed veteran
who claimed "seven hostile actions" in his life experience.
No when or where or any other clue, just "seven hostile
actions."

>Your beefs with K4YZ detailed above are even older. You live in the past too
>much.

I don't have any "beef" with that mental case. He is a US
amateur extra class ham. He is representative of US
amateur radio of today.

If you bother to look at subject headers you will see his
on-going insult postings continuing as of 10 May 03.

>Doesn't answer the question. Your double standards keep getting exposed. Too
>bad.

What "question?"

Did you ask me if I still beat my wife or something like that?

>I see that I have over estimated you, Len.

Here: Bird. Flip.

Enjoy.

>And it got there so close to deadline that nobody could reply before January
>15.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...your arm must get very tired beating that dead
horse. :-)

So...did that deadline date stop anyone from commenting about
anything in regards to NPRM 98-143? :-)

I don't think so. :-)

>> Many others filing comments were marked as received on the
>> same date period. You do not mention those yet those are
>> also on the public record.
>
>Because the disagreement is with you and your age requirement nonsense.

Poor baby. YOUR disagreement nonsense is showing. :-)

>Besides, this is old stuff. You live in the past too much.

I'm not the one living in Google trying to rehash old
newsgroup arguments. :-)

You cannot win old arguments that you lost, Jimmie. No
matter how hard you try.

>I really did overestimate you.

Awwwww...here: Bird. Flip.

Enjoy. :-)

777. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 00:47:44 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <qt1rbv4p5hv16l3ncajodavfci07r1q8kh@4ax.com>
Source record: 66925

On Sat, 10 May 2003 01:29:42 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Ole King Cat wrote:
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> quoted in message
>> news:b9h8ucbdc1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>>

>> possessive" of these freqs.
>>
>> It would have been much better IMHO if the FCC had
>> declared 3.990 to 4.000 as the declared emergency
>> channel(s) in the 75M band.
>
>
> Who the heck scheduled a disaster at the same time the Century club
>holds their net? Sheesh!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Damned inconsiderate of those Oklahomians!

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

778. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 00:47:44 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <h02rbvgvqk5hdgmtelagb1spb906t0o32n@4ax.com>
Source record: 66926

On Fri, 9 May 2003 18:25:09 -0400, "Ole King Cat"
<bovordde333@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> quoted in message
>news:b9h8ucbdc1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB033
>> ARLB033 FCC Declares General Communications Emergency for Oklahoma
>> Area
>>
>> The Federal Communications Commission has declared a general
>> communications emergency for the Oklahoma area. Effective
>> immediately, amateurs are required to refrain from using 3900 kHz,
>> plus or minus 3 kHz, unless they are taking part in the handling of
>> emergency traffic.
>
>While I have *no problems whatsoever* in FCC declaring
>a "communications emergency frequency" in a situation
>such as this, I think it will be VERY curious to see what
>happens tonight as both the 3.898 Group and the "3.903"
>Century Club both operate on, and seem to be "quite
>possessive" of these freqs.
>
>It would have been much better IMHO if the FCC had
>declared 3.990 to 4.000 as the declared emergency
>channel(s) in the 75M band.
>

Seems to me that it's the FCC that dictates the use of the
frequencies, not the the various elitist net groups that figure they
hold claim to a given frequency and tend to camp out and monopolize
the use of said frequency.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

779. Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 01:29:02 UTC
From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu
Message-ID: <df510dbe.0305101729.7171a861@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66927

Thank all of you who replied to my previous message about the amateur radio exam. I have couple more questions if you don't mind.

1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse code. I was wondering if someone could give me the name of the station so that I can get more information about it. I would like to build/buy a radio that picks this frequency up. Ideally I would like to find some schematics on the web for a receiver.

2. Reading through the ham news groups, I noticed that SSB is used very often. I was wondering what type of filters are typically used for signal detection for these modes. Granted, the noise would be similar to that of both the sidebands lumped together, I still am confused about how the transmitter and receiver are synchronizing. When operating on SSB, do you notice a sound quality difference in comparison to regular AM operation?

Thank you!

-Chris

780. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 01:44:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030510214429.16173.00000399@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66928

In article <b9gg1k$ii3su$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I haven't seen whatever is at the link, but in regards to the car listed
>below, I would almost consider getting something like that as well, merely
>from a miles-per-gallon standpoint. Criminy sakes..... my stupid truck gets
>15mpg if I am lucky and a good tail wind behind me!
>
>
>--
>Ryan, KC8PMX
>FF/MFR

Ryan:

If you're looking for a high quality, reliable, durable, and long-lasting
compact automobile with peppy acceleration and excellent fuel economy,
then look no further than the Toyota Corolla! My 2003 Toyota Corolla LE
gets 32 MPG in combined city/highway driving, and that's with an
automatic transmission! My previous '01 Corolla with a 5-speed used to
get a couple MPG more.

Read more about Corollas at www.corolland.com. Click the link to the
Owners Forum where you'll find the musings of yours truly, among others.

73 de Larry, K3LT

781. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 01:44:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030510214430.16173.00000400@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 66929

In article <3EBB1C24.2020902@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>
> Ahh, yes the old obesity as a moral/mental defect. Lots more to it than

>that. I have to (willingly) participate in strenuous sports activities
>and watch every calorie I eat just to stay somewhere on the heavy end of
>normalcy -large frame Muscular- but a months lapse pushes me over the
>edge.

Mike:

The term "obese" means that you are more than 30 lbs. above "normal"
weight for your height and physical characteristics. Obese people know
who they are -- they look fat. They are not the least bit athletic. Moreover,
they have dangerously high cholesterol, blood lipids, and blood pressure.
If you are quite active, it is hardly likely that you would even be close to
the definition of "obese."

>Yet my wife, who lives on a diet of Nachos with the works, has
>never carried over 115 lbs on her 6 foot frame.

Now, your XYL is another story altogether. An adult woman who is
6 ft. tall and only weighs 115 lbs. should definitely consider a much
more nutritious diet than "nachos with the works." I'll bet I could suggest
a diet that would 20 lbs. on her without even trying.

> People should not be obese. But sanctimony only provees the prejudice
>of the sanctimonious.

Whatever. If my opposition to the behavioral patterns which lead to dangerous
obesity is being "sanctimonious," than so be it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

782. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 02:32:25 UTC
From: Anon73 <anon73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <PFiva.5377$Pc5.3687@fed1read01>
Source record: 66930

Chris -- W1AW, the ARRL station in Newington, CT sends Morse code practice and Bulletins -- see URL:
http://www.arrl.org/w1aw.html#w1awsked

Any modern SWL receiver with a good antenna will pick up W1AW. Frequencies are: Frequencies are 1.818, 3.5815, 7.0475, 14.0475, 18.0975, 21.0675, 28.0675 and 147.555 MHz.

SSB detection usually employs a product detector. Filters narrow or pass a bandwidth not detection. For how SSB works -- see URL:
http://www.williamson-labs.com/480_ssb.htm

Ham transmissions on the HF bands are usually half duplex. One station transmits (can not hear the other station while transmitting) and vice versa. Not like a telephone which is full duplex. Thus the "Over To You" protocol.

By circuit design, the same circuits that receive are used to transmit up to a point. So a modern transceiver is always on frequency for receive and transmit. Or as you asked (how the transmitter and receiver are synchronizing).
A very simplified block diagram showing the common receiver and transmitter circuits can be seen at URL:
http://www.flashwebhost.com/tcvr/block.php

The product detector follows the 2nd mixer and uses the BFO to re-insert a carrier for demodulation. SSB is Single SideBand Suppressed Carrier, so we have to re-insert the carrier at the receiver.

The quality can be better than AM due to the narrower bandwidth -- thus better signal to noise ratio. But the signal audio is usually in the range of 300 to 3kHz -- not hi fi by any means --- merely "good communications quality".

For some good books on all this see URL:
http://www.arrl.org/catalog/
Search for ARRL Handbook

--

73 From AC6V
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm
FM Beginners Book http://ac6v.com/FM101.htm
"Chris" <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> wrote in message

news:df510dbe.0305101729.7171a861@posting.google.com...
> Thank all of you who replied to my previous message about the amateur
> radio exam. I have couple more questions if you don't mind.
>
> 1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
> code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
> code. I was wondering if someone could give me the name of the station
> so that I can get more information about it. I would like to build/buy
> a radio that picks this frequency up. Ideally I would like to find
> some schematics on the web for a receiver.
>
> 2. Reading through the ham news groups, I noticed that SSB is used
> very often. I was wondering what type of filters are typically used
> for signal detection for these modes. Granted, the noise would be
> similar to that of both the sidebands lumped together, I still am
> confused about how the transmitter and receiver are synchronizing.
> When operating on SSB, do you notice a sound quality difference in
> comparison to regular AM operation?
>
> Thank you!
>
> -Chris

783. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 02:42:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hep34w7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66931

On 11 May 2003 01:44:29 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>If you're looking for a high quality, reliable, durable, and long-lasting
>compact automobile with peppy acceleration and excellent fuel economy,
>then look no further than the Toyota Corolla! My 2003 Toyota Corolla LE
>gets 32 MPG in combined city/highway driving, and that's with an
>automatic transmission! My previous '01 Corolla with a 5-speed used to
>get a couple MPG more.

For once I have to agree with you. In '86 I got an '85 Corolla
with 20K miles on it (lease return) and drove it for 9 years,
putting 170K of my own on it. Got 30+ mpg and even had a GOOD
recessed place on the dash above the heater controls where the
clock was 'sposed to go which just fit the control head for my
ICOM2730 dual-band mobile rig. No major repairs other than the
normal brakes, shocks, tuneups, battery, and tires.

I'd still be driving that car today if some yo-yo truck hadn't
rear-ended me while I was stopped at a traffic signal. None of
my subsequent cars ('90 Plymouth, '96 Chev Caprice) measured up
to that (nor had a good place to mount that control head).

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

784. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 03:08:29 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <b9kfci$8na@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 66932

Did you hear the NPR interview with the author of a new book, "The Iron Triangle" and then the interview with the public spokesperson for the Carlisle Group?

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message news:c2356669.0305090855.36d66cd8@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:<b9ehsu$71r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030507202523.08129.00000574@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > > In article
> > <636F898C60D8A3C5.AEB8600495885770.8FB2E087AA0A0ACC@lp.airnews.net>,
> > > "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >I didn't hear or, at least, don't remember the item you mention. But,
> > NPR
> > > >is my choice of listening!
> > >
> > > Didja hear the latest, Kim?
> > >
> > > Almost all of the US troops, and all of the US aircraft and other major
> > assets,
> > > are being pulled out of Saudi Arabia. Something like 100 military advisers
> > and
> > > training consultants will stay to help the Saudi military learn to use the
> > > hardware they bought from us.
> > >
> > > One of OBL's biggest beefs with the West was the presence of "infidel
> > > Crusader/Zionist armies" in the holy land of Arabia. Big recruiting tool -
> > note
> > > how many of the Sept 11 hijackers were Saudis. (I don't think any were
> > Iraqis).
> > > Soon all but a few of those "crusaders" will be gone. OBL gets his way?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >

> > Nice to see someone else noticed.
>
> I'm glad I wasn't the only one.
>
> Of course with SH gone from power, most of the reason for those forces
> to be in SA vanishes.
>
> Which raises some interesting questions: Where is SH and where is OBL?
> If they were "in custody", do you think that info would be made
> public?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

785. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 03:09:40 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <b9kfcj$8na@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 66933

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hemj2y0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Fri, 09 May 2003 15:35:26 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >For the record, I'm not afraid of a woman who drinks beer from the
> >bottle, has tattoos and who fist fights men. I just wouldn't want to go
> >out with one.
>
> My wife does not drink beer from a bottle or otherwise, does
> not have tattoos, and does not fist fight men. She's a rather
> good looking "mild mannered" lady who takes pride in her 60
> year old's figure which many 30 year olds would die for. But
> she's held her own with the loudmouth louts while working in
> the heavy construction industry for over 30 years and I would
> advise anyone to never start anything unpleasant with her. I've
> seen her "in action" just once - "protecting me" she said - and
> it wasn't pleasant for the other guy.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

A woman after my own heart....

Kim W5TIT

786. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001040.18783.00000436@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66941

In article <20030510130226.13740.00000181@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Psychotic) writes:

>>I know enough radio technology to have corporations pay me for
>> the responsibility of radio design...and many have done so.
>
> And some decided you weren't worht the expense and let you go.
>
> Abruptly.

"Worht?" :-)

Which employer "let me go?" How "abruptly?" :-)

You have my resume posted in here. Feel free to contact their personnel departments to ascertain such stated charges.

RCA Corporation "let the whole EASD go" in Van Nuys prior to the corporate sale to General Electric. Wasn't "abrupt" but took place over a two-year period.

Sorry, poor boy, you won't find any firings or other "abrupt" dismissals on my work history.

Can we all say the same about yours? :-)

> Uh huh...Lennie thinks it's OK to SPAM e mail, however when he get's HIS
>feather ruffled (the result of which was to an item he initiated) he goes
>whining to AOL about "libelous" web pages.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. AOL agreed with me on the home page. :-)

What "spam," little boy? You wanted to see my phone license scan. I sent you several copies. You refused to look at them.

Strange behavior.

> Two faced cowardly putz.
>
> Excuse me..that wasn't correct...Tow faced cowardly LYING putz.
>
> There...that's better.

"Tow faced?" :-)

I just love the double standard of PCTA civility in here. :-)

> You alleged in this forum that you did NOT send a photo with an unknown
>person exposing himself. That was a lie. I "exposed" you for what you were.

The accidentally-sent image was a picture of a converted
B-26 water bomber in flight over a forest area. One of the
crewmembers is mooning the camera plane in the nose.

"Exposing himself?!?" :-) :-) :-)

It was funny to anyone with a sense of humor.

Poor boy...tried to do an "exposure" and nothing developed.

AOL didn't think Robeson's "exposure" was decent. They
tossed the home page, erased your new screen name, and
sent you a warning note.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...bad puppy, go sit in the corner.

> Of course you ALSO allege to being an electronics "professional", having
>been paid for your engineering and consulting skills.

I've been and still get paid for electronic design engineering skills
but I've not done any direct consulting in electronics. I've done
consulting work in another field. Money is money and some jobs
are fun to do. :-)

> Those were lies too, methinks. If you can't send a simple e mail and get
>it right, how are we to accept that anythig ELSE you allege is accurate?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...everything not to Stevie Psychosis' liking is a
"lie." Bad scene Stevie, you are unbalanced.

Try to get some mental help soon...from a real MD, not from the
contents of a hospital medication cabinet.

787. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001042.18783.00000437@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66943

In article <3EBD2883.453E8FC7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I've only called you a horse's ass because you are a horse's ass. I
>recognized that from the road apples you keep dropping here and there in
>the newsgroup. Did you ever catch up with the front end of that horse
>you're supposed to be following?

The above is what Miccolis condones as "civil behavior?" :-)

>It'd be just as easy to dimiss any of your friends, Leonard. I figure
>that the opinions of anyone who claims you as a friend can't be worth
>that much.

More PCTA "civility?" :-)

>Accepting it isn't the same as acting positively on it. You wrote. The
>FCC accepted. You aren't writing your material here for the FCC. I
>don't have to accept it. I don't have to take it seriously.

You don't take it. You can't take it. :-)

>My forty years experience in amateur radio certainly qualifies me to
>know more of amateur radio matters than an individual who has no
>experience in amateur radio. You'd be a fool to argue the point.

You are a god of ham radio.

Radio gods insist on keeping things to their divine liking.

>You're simply blowing smoke. You're blowing smoke about your ability to
>pay an attorney for a "protracted period". You're blowing smoke about
>cakewalks, prima facia evidence, about AOL and "Robeson" losing "without
>doubt". Did you forget about the existence of all of your past posts at
>Google? A smart guy would load up on all of that material.

Not a problem. AOL removed the libelous home page.

Honorable thing to do. I accepted that.

You can't accept honorable things...unless they honor you. :-)

>This medium is archived. Those archives remain intact. Thousands of
>individuals may easily access those archives and print as many copies of
>each post as they desire. Those printed copies may remain intact.

Wonderful. Stalk intentions? :-)

Blackmail? Some form of coersion to comply with radio gods?

>Len, ever since I began reading this group, you've been rude and
>uncivil. You've been doing the demeaning and the insulting and you've
>gotten back what you've dished out. You're an unpleasant man.

Tsk, tsk. Radio god holding his mirror wrong again, reflecting
himself. :-)

I do not worship false gods, nor respect them. You are one.

>The laughter wasn't stifled this time. No one was critical of what you
>did in the military.

Sure they were. Can't you navigate Google properly? :-)

>A number were critical of the way you attempted to
>puff your activities.

"Puff?" Nope. Straight stuff.

I gave all details of my assignment, unit, duties, dates.

Heil just said he was "IN vietnam." No other details of unit,
duties, etc.

Looks like Heil is doing the "puffery," revealing nothing of
substance. :-)

>Remember, Len. You've described this medium as a 2/47 street fight
>where anyone may post whatever he wants. You don't suppose anyone is
>being forced to read Jim's material do you? Are you being forced to
>read it or forced to respond to it?

Tsk. I wrote "24/7."

Nobody is forcing you to respond, are they? :-)

Is one of those noisy 4-wheeler drivers forcing you to post?

>So that we're clear on this, you don't believe that anyone who never
>served in the military and who knows morse code doesn't know much about
>sex?

Aren't you guilty of a slight exaggeration, god of radio? :-)

>Apparently you were in the military during a special period. There were
>drunks, drug addicts, psycopaths, liars and thieves in every outfit in
>which I served in the military.

Was that the United States military? You sure? :-)

>Sure he is in a position to judge. I read it and judged it too. It
>makes you look rather foolish.

To hang around in here with PCTAs who served with drunks,
liars, thieves, etc. IS rather foolish. I agree. :-)

>Lennie boy, are you Getting Your Way in amateur radio regulation? Is
>that the reason for your vitriolic posts?

Vitriol? Is the god of radio displeased? :-)

Does the god wish all to bow to his divine majesty? What?

>It is obvious that you have nothing better to do.

Have you seen a real MD about your condition...or psychosis?

Here, have something for your condition: Bird. Flip.

Enjoy.

788. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001043.18783.00000438@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66939

In article <20030510122046.13740.00000180@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 5/9/2003 12:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0305090934.77e630ce@posting.google.com>
>
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030503173638.18769.00000423@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>>> 1. I've given a very short listing of past employers in here.
>
> Yet another lie by a person for whom lying comes naturally...
>
> The LAST time he published his "CV" in this forum, it ran over 22,000
>bytes. By contrast, the average RRAP post is 1500-3000 bytes.

Poor baby. So difficult for you to read? Have you sought the help of an eye specialist?

50 years can accumulate a lot of experience. You only have 47 years. Tsk, tsk. Do we hear envy in there? :-)

> And THAT was just about whom he claimed to have worked for and alleged
>accomplishments.
>
> I poked holes in it with just one phone call to Pennsylvania.

Did you use a sharp-ended handset? :-)

Did you use the same bayonet you had for those "seven hostile actions?" :-)

> In contrast, I HAVE spoken with people who knew Lennie from a
>"professional" relationship. While not driven to the use of profanities or
>vulgarites, they didn't have anything GOOD to say about him either.

Of course you did...conversing with the voices in your head!

:-)

> To be factual, Jim, I used the word "cowardly" in respect to his attempts
>to embellish his military "career" by associating himself with Army KIA's that
>died 3 years before he got there and hundreds of miles away.

Didn't you forget "putz" and "creep" and some others? :-)

Yup, honoring some signalmen of the same signal battalion
is "cowardly" in Robeson's mighty warrior eyes.

Tsk, tsk...I don't fault the USMC from booting him before his
"twenty."

> I did NOT say his duties in the Army were "cowardly". That's a
>LennieSpin.

Sure you did...go back to the "rear area radio clerk" labels.

While you're at it, fill us in on the WHEN and WHERE of those
"seven hostile actions" you were in?

Or are those all so classifed that you can't talk about them in
public? :-)

> Yes...1.2 million mesages that HE passed. That was his ORIGINAL message.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are editing what was originally stated,
aren't you? No problem, your Gang buddy Miccolis is right
now cutting-pasting-and-editing from Google. Saves you the
effort. :-)

> Of course once everyone with a 7th grade reading comprehension smacked
him
>around for it, he recanted THAT version and started in on the "we were part of
>a TEAM" spin.

Never said otherwise. An entire signal company to keep just a
transmitter site working 24/7. Another signal company kept the
receiver site working 24/7. That's about 250 personnel in an
Army signal company at the time.

It's too bad your reading comprehension has not gone higher
than 7th grade. If your community has night school classes
in such subjects, it would be worthwhile to take an English
Reading and Comprehension course on your free time away
from all that hospital work.

> Lennie's (and now Vippy's) conduct does for professional electrical
>engineering what Lennie claims we do to Amateur Radio...Only he does it with
>profanity, name calling, etc.

When in the company of those shouting "horse's ass" or "putz, creep,"
etc., one has go with the flow. :-)

> Now Jim...you wouldn't expect Lennie to be able to produce anything
>FACTUAL, would you?

You two ought to make a pact and go live together in Google. :-)

789. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001044.18783.00000440@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66935

In article <xfeva.8512$3f7.5455031@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>We are already well aware of the multiplicity of other activities in our
>hobby. So why are you trying to teach us what we already know far better
>than you do?

How are you getting along on the microwave ham bands, Dee?

:-)

790. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001044.18783.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66940

In article <20030510192717.09520.00000128@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy "Alex Trebek" Stalker) writes:

>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/10/2003 3:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030510160710.09447.00000125@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>To show that there are other possible activities in the radio hobby.
>
> What have you presented here that "we" didn't already know about?

What have YOU presented in here that you DO know about?

:-)

791. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001045.18783.00000441@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66936

In article <3EBB2198.8B32E15F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3EB9DE8D.76690E65@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Oops! You engaged fingers in typing before actually reading "my drive".
>> >I don't have to tolerate 120+ db engine noise on my property on Sunday
>> >mornings.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Didn't you "hone your skills" in Vietnam?
>
>That has nothing to do with your misreading of what I write and nothing
>to do with 4-wheelers on my driveway.

Well, tsk, tsk on me. :-)

Since Heil has "honed skills" by his own admission and also was
IN a country at war 30 years ago, it seems a given that Heil's
"honed skills" could handle his problem locally.

>> Just go out there and apply those war-honed skills on getting
>> rid of the noise makers.
>
>I thought I'd invite you to visit and you could bore them to death.

Fine. Send two round-trip airline tickets to my Ham Radio
magainze byline address. :-)

>> Show them who's boss!
>
>On this particular hunk of West Virginia, I am. You may, of course,
>invite all the 4-wheelers in your neighborhood to run up and down the
>drive at either of your mortgage-free homes.

Mortgage free, all debt free, no liens, no problem.

No "4-wheelers" up at the Kitsap County house set in quite a
ways from the highway on 10 acres. None down here in the
22 feet of driveway in Los Angeles County.

Are those "4-wheelers" causing RFI? Call the FCC. Call
Ed Hare. ARRL is your friend. They are there to help. :-)

792. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001047.18783.00000442@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66938

In article <20030510142541.26673.00000152@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Psychosis) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/9/2003 4:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030509172855.18771.00000507@mb-m18.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <rRDua.5574$Gy.4219@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
>><aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>
>>>Back in the '50s, radios that operated much over 30 MHz...(SNIP)
>
>> Citizens Band Radio Service in the USA started in UHF in the
>1950s...(SNIP)
>
> Off to a nice start...On topic...interesting...relevent...

Why is it "interesting" to you? And why is something in the 1950s "relevant?"

You are the acknowledged expert on FAA registration, pathology, electronic engineering and so forth becues you know all about them and thereby qualify as judge about them.

> But then...
>
>>Some radio amateurs who
>> know what is good for everyone demand that all amateurs test
>> to the standards and practices of the 1930s in radio.
>
> Lennie screws up yet another opportunity to be perceived as a "nice
>guy"...Right back into the scumbag role.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Steamy Stalker needed another catalysis object for more gratuitous, foul-mouthed venting.

> Predictable.

True. Everyone can depend on Steamy's obsession with a few invidiuals in here. That's a given. Poor boy needs help...

793. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001048.18783.00000443@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66934

In article <20030510105848.13331.00000129@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy "Big Pupy" Stalker) writes:

> Try waiting for puperty and wiping your nose before addressing women in >public, Vippy. You might do better.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...been hanging around the dog pond have you?

Were you waiting for a "pupy" to pick up? :-)

Have you paid the "puperty" taxes on your house?

794. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001049.18783.00000444@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66942

In article <20030510105318.13331.00000128@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy EE Stalker) writes:

>>Satellite dish installation tech may involve some EE stuff. I am no longer
>in
>>EE field at all.
>
> You never were "in the EE field" to begin with, Vipul.

Tsk, tsk...Robeson was NEVER in any EE field except in his imagination. He wouldn't know snit about real engineering. :-)

> Care to tell us the truth, or shall I snoop that out too?

Care to tell us WHEN and WHERE of those "seven hostile actions," mighty warrior?

Were you "behind enemy lines sending enemy intelligence back via CW?" Or were you the one who "saved his entire brigade with a trusty PRC-25" in Vietnam? It's getting hard to tell all you mental morse heroes apart... :-)

795. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 04:10:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511001050.18783.00000445@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66937

In article <20030510105158.13331.00000127@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy "Purchasing Department" Stalker) writes:

> Post snipped.
>
> Example of "civil debate" by a "professional engineer" noted.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...how does Robeson know about "professional engineering?"

From a half-year's employment as a purchasing agent?

:-)

> Actually, just the rantings of one Leonard H. Anderson, a known >pathological liar. No loss...

Poor baby. Only a licensed nurse and he pretends to be an expert in psychiatrics.

:-)

796. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 05:35:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBDE0F6.9ACABCF7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66944

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil
>
> >Vipul Shah finds anything he doesn't understand "cultlike".
>
> I DO understand contesting.

From your comments to Steve, it is apparent that you do not understand.

> I don't understand why the fanatical following of
> certain traditions.

Why do you place the word "fanatical" before "following of certain traditions"?

> 10-10 numbers are "not allowed".

If one is operating Sweepstakes, for example, pausing to exchange 10-10 numbers is a complete waste of operating time. I find 10-10 number exchanges outside of a contest to be a complete waste of operating time. You might as well exchange zip codes.

> A child that doesn't know
> CW is "not good enough".

That'd be particularly true if the mode in use was CW.

> The use of codewords as some kind of agreed upon
> tradition. Plus many more examples.

You might use one of the many more examples. The one you've used is quite weak.

> >Not true. Some radio amateurs in here have stated that skills developed
> >in contesting are the same skills desired in emergency communications.
>
> Searching bands and CQ for contests is not emergency communications.

See, I told you that you don't understand contesting. If you think "searching bands" and "CQ" is what it's about, you have much to learn. Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency communications. The knowledge of which band is likely to be open to a given area at a given time of day or given season of the year is the type of skill useful in emergency communications.

> Some
> skills, like the initial setup of the station, is useful. But these > are side effects.

It is again obvious that you have no idea what you're talking about.

> Not as effective as doing emergency communication practice drills.

How would you know?

> >Amateur radio
> >operating is a very social activity.
>
> Wrong. They work DX at a remote location, while others are vacation'g. They
> contact others by radio at the same time others are there in person (at the
> beach, for example). Not a social activity. Anti-social.

Vipul, this is like trying to explain NFL football to a bushman.
Hams communicate with other humans, not with robots. Hams attend
hamfests, club meetings, engage in public service work which puts them
in contact with government officials and with the general public.

> >> ARRL olde-tyme ham Beliefs are not of the divinity nor are they
> >> some form of Universal Truths however self-evident to Believers.
>
> Hams do not understand thier anti-social nature and that others may
> see them as a cult.

Others? You mean you? I see you as a one man cult, Vipul.

Dave K8MN

797. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 05:42:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBDE30D.2415485@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66945

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/10/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030510162721.18775.00000560@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
> > don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
> >completely different thought process than we're used to.
> >
>
> Would that be the "Ostrich Vision" mode?

What hamdom sees What Vipul sees

operators enjoying radio contacts antisocial behavior

amateurs having a good time at a hamfest Fat, old people on parade

the comraderie of a Wouff-Hong ceremony A cult

a group participating in a club meeting no one designing circuits

680,000 U.S. hams doing what they like lack of a EE training camp

Dave K8MN

798. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 05:46:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBDE3FD.C35D2FAF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66946

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EBC71BA.CB65BEF9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3EBB2EDC.9351084C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> <poorbaby@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >Wittle Wennie has a vewy active imagination. Wennie's pompous
> >> >condescent is wegend. By the way, Wennie--resistance is quite common in
> >> >ewectwonics. Now cwick your heels together while saying, "There's no
> >> >pwace wike ohm".
>
> On reflection, I think I can understand why this poor baby has
> been so upset by any suggestions of controls on a minimum
> age for US radio amateurs. :-)

...and I think I can understand why you are in favor of a minimum age:
You could be bested at something by mere children. :-)

> No wonder he champions on-off keying codes. Those hide a
> very pronounced lisp. :-)

I operate several modes on a regular basis. I'll do so as I choose.
You may do what you can.

> Beep, beep.

Yak, yak.

Dave K8MN

799. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:25:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511082538.18769.00000497@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66948

In article <20030510202133.18775.00000687@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>'That's all very nice and dramatic but wasn't it the United States Army
>>where
>>you learned all that? The same US Army that gave you food, lodging, shelter,
>>and free clothes, medical care, and training as needed? The same US Army
>>that taught you radio electronics theory and practice? It wasn't amateur
>>radio, was it?
>
> You are mostly WRONG, senior.

How? Didn't the US Army give you food, lodging, shelter, and free clothes, medical care, and training as needed? Didn't the US Army teach you radio electronics theory and practice?

>
> Military radio communications is definitely NOT amateur radio.
>
Which agrees with what I wrote.

So where was I wrong?

> But, you can't know that in any way from personal experience,
> can you?

Don't need to. You've lectured us on it so many times. You're quite pedantic, Len....;-)

>
> The US Army taught me the BEGINNING of radio and electronics
> knowledge I've acquired, despite already knowing the basics
> before joining the Army voluntarily.

Which agrees with what I wrote. So where was I wrong?

>
>>Len, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in
>>the US Army is past for you.
>
> I got my Good Conduct Ribbon in 1955. That was good
> enough for me at that time. :-)
>
> I got an Honorable Discharge in 1960. No preceding "medical
> discharge" that later became "honorable." :-)

You live in the past too much. Get out more.
>
>>That was not amateur radio, it was PROFESSIONAL radio.
>
> I'd call it MILITARY radio.

Were you not paid? That's the definition of professional.
>
> The job also required being able to "close with and destroy
> the enemy."

How many of the enemy did you close with and destroy?
>
> I was many years in regular hours of employment in professional
> electronics and never heard of anyone killing competitors.
> :-)

A competitor is not an enemy.
>
>>I'm sure that the US Army did
>>not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it.
>
> How can you possibly be "sure?" You've never served.

True, true. You could have been unqualified to be in those watches.
>
> Are you on some advisory panel on US Army doctrine and
> training as a civilian?

Nope. Are you?

>>I don't see how
>>all that makes you some Number One Ichiban HAM Honcho NOW.'
>
> I don't claim to be that, never have. :-)

You sure act like it.
>
> I'm just advocating the elimination of morse code testing for
> any US amateur radio license examination.

And an age requirement for an amateur license, and a complete denial of the
role of amateurs in emergency and public service communication, etc., etc., ad
intinitum.
>
> Somehow you've worked yourself up into some mighty morse
> lather and want to damn anyone for even suggesting that
> the morse code test be eliminated.

Not me. Do you see me "damning" K2UNK?
>
>>No, it's because of the way you show no respect for others' service.
>>Including Vietnam veterans and career State Department employees.
>

> Heh...it's true I don't have a lot of respect for the ENTIRETY
> of the US Department of State and US foreign policy.

Nor for individulas.
>
> If ANY veteran of ANY branch of ANY military tries a snow
> job in here or makes a lot of vapid vague generalities of any
> sort of mighty military "experience," they should be a target
> for veteran to practice some live fire.

Sounds like a threat.

Were you ever in the State Department? Ever participate in State Department communications? How can you be SURE of "snow jobs"?
>
> Try to firm up the when and where of "seven hostile actions"
> claimed by the character assassin in the Gang of Four.
> He hasn't done it yet.

Who are you talking about? And how can anyone kill what does not exist? ;-)
>
> Talk some baby-talk to Heil and ask him which unit and what
> duties were performed while IN Vietnam when that country
> was at war. He hasn't done that yet.

Why should he? We all know that:

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general infantile behavior."

800. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:25:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511082539.18769.00000498@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66947

In article <b9kfci$8na@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Did you hear the NPR interview with the author of a new book, "The Iron
>Triangle" and then the interview with the public spokesperson for the
>Carlisle Group?

I think I missed that one, Kim. Can you summarize for us?

There was an excellent Terry Gross interview with the author of a book on the
1919 Treaty of Paris negotiations that formally ended WW1 - and alos carved up
the old Ottoman Empire.

73 de Jim, N2EY

801. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:26:37 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511082637.24849.00000123@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 66949

From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu (Chris)

>1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
>code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
>code.

Any broadcasting over Hamateur freqs is illegal, therefore such Morse code
transmissions are illegal.

802. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:27:32 UTC
From: Bill <billy@yahooeynet.org>
Message-ID: <b9lfm7$fh6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66950
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard W" <Sigs@nononnetanon.net> wrote in message
news:b9jujr$gf8$0@pita.alt.net...
> > I wasn't aware there was a group of unlicensed truckers using 3.898. A
> > new one on me...But no matter. They are "sick-bird" ops, IE:
> > ill-eagle, and their views don't count. No one cares what they think.
> > I hope Riley takes a big dump on them. And yes, they generally don't
> > have time to go after unlicensed ops's unless they start causing a
> > noticable ruckus. But getting 2 kc away from a wx net will bring the
> > heat down on them mucho fast. The FCC has the ability to easily find
> > these guys IF they really want to. MK
>
> Not really. The commission cannot "easily" find someone, even
> when they want to. Example. We had some nut case get on
> air traffic control frequencies here for weeks! Yes weeks. FCC
> had several people in town and could not locate the guy. The
> nut case's radio signals were finally tracked down by another agency,
> using techniques the commission does not possess. Sorry, I know
> I am being vague on purpose. I don't want some nut to read details
> here in a public forum and make it that much more difficult for the
> authorities to locate him next time. Bottom line, the commission
> tried for weeks to locate the guy and failed. No FCC news release
> this time. They were just as glad to sweep the whole thing under
> the carpet. And the outfit that found the guy is not in the habit
> of putting out news releases for any reason.
>
> Rich W
> (Scanner enthusiast since 1955)
>
>
>

Fcc came in town here looking for college students operating
an unlicensed FM station. Fcc's arrival was announced and
tracked on CB, ham repeaters, FRS, etc. for the entire time
they were here. How? The Fcc people wore hats and other
clothing with Fcc logo and used government credit cards while
they ate breakfast at local motels, gathered in motel lobby, local
restaurants, bars, etc. Fcc's own comms were monitored, both
their electronic comms and their conversations in local
businesses. Fcc vehicles were easily identified and tracked,
despite not having any markings. When Fcc returned to their
motel for the night, the FM station came on the air taunting
them. As one local said, it made you wonder if the Fcc was

here to do some serious hunting or just to collect perdiem
and overtime pay while having an out of town fling.

Bill Sorenson

803. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:35:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511083536.07824.00000074@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67051

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/10/2003 7:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030510202133.18775.00000687@mb-m02.aol.com>

>I got an Honorable Discharge in 1960. No preceding "medical
> discharge" that later became "honorable."

You keep repeating this, Lennie, but at no time was a "medical" discharge
anything LESS than Honorable.

You have been tasked to back this up, yet continue to resist doing so.

Again you've been caught lying. Why do you persist in lying?

>>That was not amateur radio, it was PROFESSIONAL radio.
>
> I'd call it MILITARY radio.

Congratulations. That's what we'd cal it too.

And other than the physics of radiowave propagation, it has nothing to do
with AMATEUR RADIO, a topic which you continue to try and link.

>The job also required being able to "close with and destroy
> the enemy."

Hmmmmm....Nothing in any era-specific radio clerk training manuals say
ANYTHING about "closing with the enemy".

>If ANY veteran of ANY branch of ANY military tries a snow
> job in here or makes a lot of vapid vague generalities of any
> sort of mighty military "experience," they should be a target
> for veteran to practice some live fire.

Too bad those of us with REAL military experience in REAL combat can't use
that live ammunition on cowardly liars such as you, Lennie, who misrepresent
their own military service by hiding behind KIA's they never knew or served
with.

You may try to spin the servie records of ANY of us, Lennie, but YOUR
misdeeds at the expense of KIAs is archived here.

You ARE a liar.

>Try to firm up the when and where of "seven hostile actions"
> claimed by the character assassin in the Gang of Four.
> He hasn't done it yet.

It's not necessary.

Steve, K4YZ

804. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:50:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511085036.07824.00000075@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67053

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/10/2003 11:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511001040.18783.00000436@mb-m27.aol.com>

>In article <20030510130226.13740.00000181@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Psychotic) writes:

Lennie's version of civil debate.

>What "spam," little boy? You wanted to see my phone license
> scan. I sent you several copies. You refused to look at them.

You may reiterate your assertion of "accident" all you care to, Lennie,
but you made the (additional) mistake of sending it to several addressees.

The harder you fight this, the more foolish you look. Not that it took
much.

You didn't have much going for you in the trust department before your
"letter", and you shot what you had left.

You're a liar AND a fool.

>I just love the double standard of PCTA civility in here

Oh there's no double standard here, Lennie. You're a liar. That's not in
contention or debate. You have proved it time and time again. You also make
assertions of honesty and "professionalism", yet you consistently prove
yourself anything but...

>> You alleged in this forum that you did NOT send a photo with an unknown
>>person exposing himself. That was a lie. I "exposed" you for what you
>were.
>
> The accidentally-sent image was a picture of a converted
> B-26 water bomber in flight over a forest area. One of the
> crewmembers is mooning the camera plane in the nose.

NOT "accidentally sent". You are a "professional" by your own claim.
This was intentional.

>"Exposing himself?!?"
>
> It was funny to anyone with a sense of humor.

It would have ben had you sent it AS a "Fwd:Funny". You didn't. You misrepresented yourself. You lied....Again.

>AOL didn't think Robeson's "exposure" was decent. They
> tossed the home page, erased your new screen name, and
> sent you a warning note.

They dropped the page, Lennie. They did not "erase" the screen name. Sorry.

>> Of course you ALSO allege to being an electronics "professional", having
>>been paid for your engineering and consulting skills.
>
> I've been and still get paid for electronic design engineering skills
> but I've not done any direct consulting in electronics. I've done
> consulting work in another field. Money is money and some jobs
> are fun to do.

Like being a documented pathological liar? That's fun?

>Try to get some mental help soon...from a real MD, not from the
> contents of a hospital medication cabinet.

A liar and a fiction writer. I guess one compliments the other.

Steve, K4YZ

805. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:55:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511085509.07824.00000076@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67054

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/10/2003 11:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511001043.18783.00000438@mb-m27.aol.com>

>50 years can accumulate a lot of experience. You only have
> 47 years. Tsk, tsk. Do we hear envy in there?

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

Do I ENVY not being a pathological liar...?!?!

I hardly think so!

WHAT A PUTZ!

>Yup, honoring some signalmen of the same signal battalion
> is "cowardly" in Robeson's mighty warrior eyes.

What you did was anything BUT "honor" them, Sir Liar. But I suppose in
that geriatric scumbag brain of yours, you thought it so.

Leonard H. Anderson...Pathological liar. Putz. Scumbag.

What a way to finish up life.

Steve, K4YZ

806. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 12:57:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511085711.07824.00000077@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67055

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/10/2003 11:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511001044.18783.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>

>What have YOU presented in here that you DO know about?

I know you are a pathological liar. Need more?

Steve, K4YZ

807. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 13:00:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511090003.07824.00000078@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67056

>Subject: Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/10/2003 11:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511001047.18783.00000442@mb-m27.aol.com>

>> Off to a nice start...On topic...interesting...relevent...
>
> Why is it "interesting" to you? And why is something in the
> 1950s "relevant?"

I enjoy radio history. And it's "relevent" since it pertained to the
"status" of CB as a "land mobile" service.

>You are the acknowledged expert on FAA registration,
> pathology, electronic engineering and so forth becues you
> know all about them and thereby qualify as judge about them

"Becuse"...?!?!

LENNIE MADE A TYPO! HE'S MAD!! HE'S MAD!!

Sheeeeesh. What a PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

808. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 13:39:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511093932.24849.00000155@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67057

From N2EY:

>I don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
>completely different thought process than we're used to.

Thanks. There is another point of view than most Hams are used to. I do this from the electronic hobbyist person's and social aspects view. I'm just trying to point out Ham radio how others may see it.

809. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 13:41:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511094141.24849.00000165@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67058

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>We are already well aware of the multiplicity of other activities in our
>hobby. So why are you trying to teach us what we already know far better
>than you do?

Hams also know better to eat their vegetables instead of fatty foods, but
apparently they don't follow that either.

810. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 13:45:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <7usva.8727$3f7.5670181@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67052

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030511082637.24849.00000123@mb-m06.aol.com...
> From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu (Chris)
>
> >1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
> >code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
> >code.
>
> Any broadcasting over Hamateur freqs is illegal, therefore such Morse code
> transmissions are illegal.

Go read the FCC rule book. Broadcasting for the purposes of training is
legal as is news specifically on the topic of amateur radio. But the
requirements are strict.

The ARRL does put out such broadcasts on the ARRL station W1AW. Here is the
URL for details and a schedule.

http://www.arrl.org/w1aw.html

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

811. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 13:47:34 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511094734.24849.00000167@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67059

From K4YZ:

> What have you presented here that "we" didn't already know about?

Hams do not know others view them as a cult, nerdy, anti-social, older person, overweight male hobby. Electronic hobbyists view them as non-technical (except for antennas).

Possible activities include radio direction finding, which Hams know about, but do not participate in. Also, Hams can use other skills besides CW.

812. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 14:06:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511100602.24849.00000173@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67060

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> A child that doesn't know
>> CW is "not good enough".
>
>That'd be particularly true if the mode in use was CW.

The child said that before the other child got to operate the station. The contest had both HF phone and HF CW modes. I operated HF phone mode.

>Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or
>QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency
>communications.

In the contest, you know someone will be there since it is a contest. Also, this is one skill that happens to overlap. Contesting is a game, not a drill. The focus is to collect contacts, not emergency communications. This is weak correlation and you know that.

>> Hams do not understand thier anti-social nature and that others may
>> see them as a cult.
>
>Others? You mean you? I see you as a one man cult, Vipul.

When I said that I was a Ham to a non-Ham, he asked me if Ham radio is some kind of cult, and if they still used Morse code. Seems like some non-Hams can see their cult-like nature.

813. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 14:07:38 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <b9llck$42p$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 66991
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard W" <Sigs@nononnetanon.net> wrote

> And the outfit that found the guy is not in the habit
> of putting out news releases for any reason.

I would've _thought_ that, in a situation like that, FCC would make
that call after less than 48 hours of failure; agency pride getting in the
way?
And why would FAA put up with it?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/2003

814. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 14:09:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511100922.24849.00000174@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67061

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>What hamdom sees What Vipul sees
>
>operators enjoying radio contacts antisocial behavior
>
>amateurs having a good time at a hamfest Fat, old people on parade
>
>the comraderie of a Wouff-Hong ceremony A cult
>
>a group participating in a club meeting no one designing circuits
>
>680,000 U.S. hams doing what they like lack of a EE training camp

Thats right.

815. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 14:25:51 UTC
From: AMHAM <amham@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <P3tva.6174$Pc5.2946@fed1read01>
Source record: 67062

The someone who told you this was misinformed -- see Part 97.111 of the FCC Rules which states:

b) In addition to one-way transmissions specifically authorized elsewhere in this Part, an amateur station may transmit the following types of one-way communications:

(1) Brief transmissions necessary to make adjustments to the station;
(2) Brief transmissions necessary to establishing two-way communications with other stations;

(3) Telecommand;

(4) Transmissions necessary to providing emergency communications;

(5) Transmissions necessary to assisting persons learning, or improving proficiency in, the international Morse code;

(6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins;

(7) Transmissions of telemetry.

All at URL: http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/

--

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030511082637.24849.00000123@mb-m06.aol.com...
> From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu (Chris)
>
> >1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
> >code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
> >code.
>
> Any broadcasting over Hamateur freqs is illegal, therefore such Morse code
> transmissions are illegal.

816. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 15:10:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9lp3u$81p$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67064

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:qt1rbv4p5hv16l3ncajodavfci07r1q8kh@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 10 May 2003 01:29:42 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Ole King Cat wrote:
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> quoted in message
> >> news:b9h8ucbdc1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> >>
>
> >> possessive" of these freqs.
> >>
> >> It would have been much better IMHO if the FCC had
> >> declared 3.990 to 4.000 as the declared emergency
> >> channel(s) in the 75M band.
> >>
> >>
> > Who the heck scheduled a disaster at the same time the Century club
> >holds their net? Sheesh!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Damned inconsiderate of those Oklahomians!
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

Sure was.....well its over now....According to the last ARRL bulletin
anyway. So now the malcontents and Wilky can get back to normal....whatever
that is.

Dan/W4NTI

817. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 15:16:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9lpku$i9l$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67065

"Chris" <cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu> wrote in message
news:df510dbe.0305101729.7171a861@posting.google.com...
> Thank all of you who replied to my previous message about the amateur
> radio exam. I have couple more questions if you don't mind.
>
> 1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
> code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
> code. I was wondering if someone could give me the name of the station
> so that I can get more information about it. I would like to build/buy
> a radio that picks this frequency up. Ideally I would like to find
> some schematics on the web for a receiver.

Go to www.arrl.org and look up W1AW operating schedule.
>
> 2. Reading through the ham news groups, I noticed that SSB is used
> very often.

Yes SSB , either Upper or Lower is used most of the time for voice.
Although in some area's of HF there are still AM stations quite active.

Again check on ARRL for the various 'bandplans' for the frequencies to
check.

I was wondering what type of filters are typically used
> for signal detection for these modes. Granted, the noise would be
> similar to that of both the sidebands lumped together, I still am
> confused about how the transmitter and receiver are synchronizing.

Depending on the technology/age of the receiver you will find crystal
filters and/or DSP used mostly.

> When operating on SSB, do you notice a sound quality difference in
> comparison to regular AM operation?

Yes. Unless 'enhanced' by dubious techniques a 'normal' sideband signal
will be a bit 'pinched' (higher pitched sound) than a AM signal. This is
mainly due to design of both rx and tx equipment and the reduction of
bandwidth when using ssb.
It is not unpleasant to listen to if properly adjusted both in rx and tx.

>
> Thank you!
>
> -Chris

Hope that is of some assistance Chris.

Dan/W4NTI

818. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 15:18:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9lpkv$i9l$2@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67066

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030511082637.24849.00000123@mb-m06.aol.com...
> From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu (Chris)
>
> >1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
> >code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
> >code.
>
> Any broadcasting over Hamateur freqs is illegal, therefore such Morse code
> transmissions are illegal.

Chris,

Don't worry about this goof. He is our local pet trool. Although 'Len over
21' is right up there too. Neither have any interest in ham radio....other
than badmouthing it.

Dan/W4NTI

819. One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 15:43:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511114321.07968.00000106@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67067

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/11/2003 8:47 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511094734.24849.00000167@mb-m06.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>
>> What have you presented here that "we" didn't already know about?
>
>Hams do not know others view them as a cult, nerdy, anti-social, older
>person,
>overweight male hobby.

You are the first and only person I have ever seen refer to ANY of Amateur Radio, in particular or in general, in that regard.

Amateur Radio is not a cult. You are the only person I have EVER seen refer to in that context. If you can provide a link or URL to some site that proves your asserion otherwise, please do so now. Otherwise, please accept my most unhumble opinion that you are a narrowminded idiot making this stuff up to be antagonistic.

And "nerdy? I guess that's why they invented the term "egghead" for Amateurs...OH! WAIT! That was for computer ENGINEERING types!

Excuuuuuuuuse me!

>Electronic hobbyists view them as non-technical
>(except
>for antennas).

Oh? I can name about a half dozen electronic and "science" related publications that contradict you, INCLUDING some "industry" periodicals. Again, please provide a link or URL, otherwise accept my unhumble opinion that you are making this up for the sole purpose of being antagonistic.

>Possible activities include radio direction finding, which Hams know about,
>but
>do not participate in.

Stupid, Vipul. Really stupid, in light of recent coverage of US participation in INTERNATIONAL RDF competition.

>Also, Hams can use other skills besides CW.

They do...In droves. Myself included. You've just been too wrapped up in your own rhetoric and storytelling to know where reality starts and YOUR fiction ends.

Again, you are asked...What is it you are trying to tell us about Amateur Radio that WE didn't already know about?

So far you've made yourself appear an even bigger fool than you already were by reciting your previously disproven assertioons about Amatuer Radio.

Now, do you have anything CONSTRUCTIVE or ENLIGHTENING to suggest or offer...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

820. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 15:48:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yhuva.8772$3f7.5701107@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67063

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030511100602.24849.00000173@mb-m06.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Hams do not understand thier anti-social nature and that others may
> >> see them as a cult.
> >
> >Others? You mean you? I see you as a one man cult, Vipul.
>
> When I said that I was a Ham to a non-Ham, he asked me if Ham radio is
some
> kind of cult, and if they still used Morse code. Seems like some non-Hams
can
> see their cult-like nature.

I have mentioned ham radio to many non-hams. NONE ever asked if it was some kind of cult. The commonest response that I've heard is "Is that like CB?". A few have asked me if they still used Morse code but not one ever made any comment or indication that they considered that cult-like or undesirable in any way or that it gave them a bad impression of amateur radio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

821. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 15:50:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511115006.07968.00000107@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67068

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/11/2003 9:06 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511100602.24849.00000173@mb-m06.aol.com>

>>Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or
>>QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency
>>communications.
>
>In the contest, you know someone will be there since it is a contest. Also,
>this is one skill that happens to overlap. Contesting is a game, not a drill.
>The focus is to collect contacts, not emergency communications. This is weak
>correlation and you know that.

The "weakness" is in your attempts to spin this your way.

It's not just a matter of making contacts. You are up against a deadline
to make a certain number of contact ACCURATELY. Inaccurate contacts mean
either no points, or worse yet, points deducted for logging improperly copied
or erroneous exchanges.

And what >>I<< know is that Dave Heil has over two decades of experience
in just those venues while you have, at the most, a couple years.

And so far your mouth has laid bare your glaring inexperience in
contesting, emergency communicaitons AND Public Service.

>When I said that I was a Ham to a non-Ham, he asked me if Ham radio is some
>kind of cult, and if they still used Morse code. Seems like some non-Hams can
>see their cult-like nature.

I think you are lying.

Steve, K4YZ

822. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:09:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511120914.07968.00000108@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67069

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/10/2003 7:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030510202130.18775.00000686@mb-m02.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>
>>And all of your misdirection above is a blatant attempt to avoid answering
>this
>>question: Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?

>I don't recall any previous professional work in radio-electronics
> requiring ANY serious consideration of amateur radio activities.
> None of my work experience was with any professional amateur
> radio companies.

You did not answer the question, Your Scumminess.

>I have worked WITH several who also held amateur radio license
> grants. Some of those were given in here.

You did not answer the question, Your Scumminess.

>Amateur radios work with the same physics as all other radios.
> There's no distinction except in the minds of certain people
> who think that human beaurocracy redefines the laws of physics.

You did not answer the question, Your Scumminess.

> Some of my work experience has required communications by
> radio in various modes. That was never any problem on land,
> on the water, or in the air. I've done that since February 1953.
> I've done communications by radio in non-work related activities.
> No problem with that at all...all legal, too

You did not answer the question, Your Scumminess.

>I've had both formal and informal training and education about
> radio and electronics since about 1947 and that continues
> today. Electronics keeps increasing the state of the art in all
> such sub-disciplines, including HF radio where some amateur
> hearts and minds dwell constantly.

You did not answer the question, Your Scumminess.

>I've been required to study many kinds of specifications,
> regulations of law, industry standards, federal standards all my
> working life. Part 97 of Title 47 CFR is one of the smallest
> Parts of all US civil radio regulations, no real problem in
> understanding that...including the byzantine six-class structure
> that existed before restructuring.

You did not answer the question, Your Scumminess.

>At no time since 1953 was I ever required or forced to use any
> sort of on-off keyed morse code mode for radio communications
> work or recreation, on HF or any other part of the spectrum.

(siiiiiigh) You did not answer the question, Your Scumminess.

>So, in the loaded context of Miccolis' "question," since US
> amateur radio still requires morse code TESTING to obtain a
> license class having HF operating privileges, neither my work
> experience nor recreational experience "fits" the OLD US
> radio amateur regulations in the strict sense of the word.

The "QUESTION" was "Does your employment somehow prove that you know more
about how AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?"

You have not answered it.

>That really isn't the point, is it?

The point was finding out if you think your employment in PROFESSIONAL
radio somehow made you more qualified to discuss AMATEUR RADIO regulations than
anyone else.

You've not answered the question. You ranted on about your professional
career without answering the one specific question put to you.

>>You avoid answering that question, for some reason.
>
> Is my answer here "avoiding" anything?

Yes. A direct answer to a direct question.

>My argument was that the morse code test is old, outmoded, of
> no practical value for civil radio regulation purposes, and serves
> no one except a minority group of elitists in a recreational/hobby
> radio activity who seem to think they are Rulers of Radio just by
> passing a high-rate on-off keying code test.

You STILL have not answered the question.

> ["Give a man an inch and he will think he is a ruler." - Anon.]

"Give Lennie An Inch And He Thinks He's A Man". Steve, K4YZ

>Miccolis asked a very loaded question but did not get the
> answer he wished. TS.

He asked you for your own honest, persoanl assessment. Are you more qualified by reason of employment to discuss Amateur Radio regulatory matters than any one else.

You ahe not answered this. It could have been answerd with a simple "YES" or "NO".

The "answer" here has been "spin" and obfuscation. Misdirection by Lennie the Cowardly to keep from looking like an evn bigger fool than what we already know him to be....

Leonard H. Anderson...Pathological liar and coward.

Steve, K4YZ

823. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:11:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511121109.07968.00000109@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67070

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/10/2003 7:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030510202124.18775.00000685@mb-m02.aol.com>

> Pedant. There you go, focussing on details, details, details in
> order to misdirect away from the main subject.

Whew! Lennie must be REALLY mad! Yet another mispelling of a word he's
had pointed out to him repetitively!

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

824. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:19:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511121925.28341.00000252@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67071

From: "AMHAM" amham@connectnet.net

>see Part 97.111 of the FCC
>Rules which states:
>
>b) In addition to one-way transmissions specifically authorized elsewhere in
>this Part, an amateur station may transmit the following types of one-way
>communications:
>
> (1) Brief transmissions necessary to make adjustments to the station;
> (2) Brief transmissions necessary to establishing two-way communications
>with other stations;
>
> (3) Telecommand;
>
> (4) Transmissions necessary to providing emergency communications;
>
> (5) Transmissions necessary to assisting persons learning, or improving
>proficiency in, the international Morse code;
>
> (6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins;
>
> (7) Transmissions of telemetry.
>
> All at URL: http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/

Okay, it seems I was mistaken about Morse code broadcasts not being allowed. My mistake. Sorry.

825. FYI, Vippy...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:20:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511122028.07785.00000169@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67072

Since Vippy the Vile (VShah101) insists that Amateurs only like to eat and conduct cult rituals, just thought I'd provide yet another reference that disproves his stupid rants.

The following is a lead story from the ARRL Web Page. Go to www.arrl.org "For the rest of the story..." (with apologies to Paul Harvey...)

BEGIN QUOTE

From Inspiration to Service

By Bernard L. Malone III, KC5RX
May 10, 2003

How one ham's thoughts on fox hunting helped kick off an industry-wide effort to save lives at the World Trade Center site.

On the morning of September 12, 2001, I woke up to television news reports that immediately made me recall events years earlier. Back around 1994, I was living in Shreveport, Louisiana and was an active member of the Shreveport Amateur Radio Association, SARA. I participated in many club activities including Civil Defense training and the disaster preparedness drills. Like many clubs, fox hunts (hunting for hidden transmitters) were conducted once or twice per year. As many hams know, these are a lot of fun and provide hands-on training in many subject areas.

END QUOTE

Remainder of the story is on the ARRL web page...

Steve, K4YZ

826. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:25:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511122522.18755.00000680@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67076

In article <20030511001042.18783.00000437@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <3EBD2883.453E8FC7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>I've only called you a horse's ass because you are a horse's ass. I
>>recognized that from the road apples you keep dropping here and there in
>>the newsgroup. Did you ever catch up with the front end of that horse
>>you're supposed to be following?
>
> The above is what

(N2EY)

> condones as "civil behavior?" :-)
>
Nope. I'm temprted to call it a fairly accurate description of how you behave here, Len, except that would be an insult to horses everywhere. ;-)

Dave, please don't insult the horses. Upsets them almost as much as saying "Frau Blucher".

>>It'd be just as easy to dimiss any of your friends, Leonard. I figure
>>that the opinions of anyone who claims you as a friend can't be worth
>>that much.
>
> More PCTA "civility?" :-)

Much more civil than a typical post by you, Len. ;-) ;-)

>>Len, ever since I began reading this group, you've been rude and
>>uncivil. You've been doing the demeaning and the insulting and you've
>>gotten back what you've dished out. You're an unpleasant man.

That's better, Dave. No reason to upset the horses ;-) ;-) ;-)

827. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:25:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511122523.18755.00000681@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67073

In article <20030511093932.24849.00000155@mb-m06.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>
>>I don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
>>completely different thought process than we're used to.
>
>Thanks.

You're welcome.

>There is another point of view than most Hams are used to.

There are as many points of view as there are viewers.

>I do this
>from the electronic hobbyist person's and social aspects view.

No, you're doing it from your point of view. Your point of view includes things like defining words differently from how almost everyone else defines them.

>I'm just trying to point out Ham radio how others may see it.

If so, you're doing it in a way that makes most of the people who read your stuff disagree with you. In fact, you're so skilled at it that some people are beginning to think the reason you post here is to stir up disagreement.

I could be wrong about that, of course. I'm no expert.

But if everyone else calls a cheese sandwich a cheese sandwich, and you call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, confusion is bound to happen.

Which reminds me - lunchtime. Two pieces bread, one slice cheese, quick zap in the toaster oven.....

828. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:25:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511122523.18755.00000682@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67074

In article <20030511082637.24849.00000123@mb-m06.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu (Chris)
>
>>1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
>>code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
>>code.
>
>Any broadcasting over Hamateur freqs is illegal, therefore such Morse code
>transmissions are illegal.
>
They are not "broadcasts" in the sense that the rules mean. They are one-way transmissions for training and information purposes, done in strict accordance with Part 97.

73 de Jim, N2EY

829. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:25:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511122525.18755.00000683@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67075

In article <20030511114321.07968.00000106@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 11 May 2003 15:43:21 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 8:47 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511094734.24849.00000167@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>From K4YZ:
>>
>>> What have you presented here that "we" didn't already know about?
>>
>>Hams do not know others view them as a cult, nerdy, anti-social, older
>>person,
>>overweight male hobby.
>
> You are the first and only person I have ever seen refer to ANY of
>Amateur
>Radio, in particular or in general, in that regard.

Same here. So why let it bother you so much?
>
> Amateur Radio is not a cult. You are the only person I have EVER seen
>refer to in that context. If you can provide a link or URL to some site that
>proves your asserion otherwise, please do so now. Otherwise, please accept
>my
>most unhumble opinion that you are a narrowminded idiot making this stuff up
>to
>be antagonistic.
>
Steve - did it ever occur to you that he might, just might, be doing that sort of thing to get you to call him things like "a narrowminded idiot" and get you all worked up?

> And "nerdy? I guess that's why they invented the term "egghead" for
>Amateurs...OH! WAIT! That was for computer ENGINEERING types!

ahem......
>
> Excuuuuuuuse me!
>

>>Electronic hobbyists view them as non-technical
>>(except
>>for antennas).
>
> Oh? I can name about a half dozen electronic and "science" related
>publications that contradict you, INCLUDING some "industry" periodicals.
>Again, please provide a link or URL, otherwise accept my unhumble opinion
>that
>you are making this up for the sole purpose of being antagonistic.

Sure - but there are none so blind as those who will not see.
>
>>Possible activities include radio direction finding, which Hams know about,
>>but
>>do not participate in.
>
> Stupid, Vipul. Really stupid, in light of recent coverage of US
>participation in INTERNATIONAL RDF competition.

He just got you to call him stupid...

How do you KNOW who "vshah101" really is, Steve?

73 de Jim, N2EY

830. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:26:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511122659.28341.00000253@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67077

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>I have mentioned ham radio to many non-hams. NONE ever asked if it was some
>kind of cult. The commonest response that I've heard is "Is that like CB?".

Most non-Hams do not know enough about Ham radio, so they would not call it a
cult.

Also, relative confused Ham radio with CB too. He said "breaker breaker". I can
understand why some would confuse Ham radio with CB. Prob is that they do not
know that one can xperiment, use a variety of modes, or do emergency comm, or
public service events though Ham radio.

More publicity for Field Day would help this. So far Field day not advertized
well to the public. Only those that already knew about it seem to attend.

831. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:43:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBE7DD2.2020003@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67078

Dave Heil wrote:
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>Date: 5/10/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030510162721.18775.00000560@mb-m11.aol.com>
>>
>>>don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
>>>completely different thought process than we're used to.
>>>
>>
>> Would that be the "Ostrich Vision" mode?
>
>
> What hamdom sees What Vipul sees
>
> operators enjoying radio contacts antisocial behavior
>
> amateurs having a good time at a hamfest Fat, old people on parade
>
> the comraderie of a Wouff-Hong ceremony A cult
>
> a group participating in a club meeting no one designing circuits
>
> 680,000 U.S. hams doing what they like lack of a EE training camp
>

I was going to do a synopsis, but you did a much better job, Dave.

Allowing the possibility that I was wrong about my thoughts on his hatred of Ham radio, I googled all his newsgroup posts. This resulted in pretty much what you have here.

So after some thought about why there is such a different perception of the ARS between say, most of us here, and Vipul, I came to the following conclusions:

1. He has a tendency to base his conclusions on insufficient input.

This isn't too unusual. Many prospective hams are scared away by a crank or two they meet. There are annoying people in every hobby, service, sport, whatever. Get over it. Prejudice won't get anyone anywhere.

There are obese Hams. Hams are not obese.

There are old Hams. Hams are not old.

There are White Hams. Hams are not all White.

There are Male Hames. Hams are not all Male.

I could go on forever.

or.............

2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll

832. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:48:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBE7F23.8010806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67079

Vshah101 wrote:
> From N2EY:
>
>
>>I don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
>>completely different thought process than we're used to.
>
>
> Thanks. There is another point of view than most Hams are used to. I do this
> from the electronic hobbyist person's and social aspects view. I'm just trying
> to point out Ham radio how others may see it.

So your idea is to change our minds by insulting us?

- Mike KB3EIA -

833. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 16:53:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBE802D.4090309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67080

Vshah101 wrote:
> From K4YZ:
>
>
>>What have you presented here that "we" didn't already know about?
>
>
> Hams do not know others view them as a cult, nerdy, anti-social, older person,
> overweight male hobby. Electronic hobbyists view them as non-technical (except
> for antennas).
>
> Possible activities include radio direction finding, which Hams know about, but
> do not participate in. Also, Hams can use other skills besides CW.
>

My club does every activity that you say Hams don't do. Unfortunately,
Doppler direction finders are so easy and inexpensive to make now that
RDF is annoyingly easy.

- Mike KB3EIA -

834. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 17:12:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBE84BA.3030004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67081

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>
>>>A child that doesn't know
>>>CW is "not good enough".
>>
>>That'd be particularly true if the mode in use was CW.
>
>
> The child said that before the other child got to operate the station. The
> contest had both HF phone and HF CW modes. I operated HF phone mode.
>
>
>>Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or
>>QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency
>>communications.
>
>
> In the contest, you know someone will be there since it is a contest. Also,
> this is one skill that happens to overlap. Contesting is a game, not a drill.
> The focus is to collect contacts, not emergency communications. This is weak
> correlation and you know that.

In an emergency you know someone is on the other end also, unless you
know another way of doing this sort of thing.

Yes, contesting is a game. But it trains you quite well for all the
things Dave mentioned. It isn't a weak correlation at all. There are
thousands of stations in a large contest. Any one of these might be
called upon if an emergency were to happen. Thing is, the random and
localized nature of most emergencies means that only a few stations will
be in use for any given emergency. And I can tell you from experience
that it trains you to be a better listener and to increase your ability
to pull a weak signal out of the noise. My ability has increased
tremendously since I started contesting.

Here's an idea. Since you think contesting is so strange and boring,
why don't you propose some kind of event that will train large numbers
of Hams in emergency comms?

- Mike KB3EIA -

>
>>>Hams do not understand thier anti-social nature and that others may
>>>see them as a cult.

>>
>>Others? You mean you? I see you as a one man cult, Vipul.
>
>
> When I said that I was a Ham to a non-Ham, he asked me if Ham radio is some
> kind of cult, and if they still used Morse code. Seems like some non-Hams can
> see their cult-like nature.
>
>

835. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 17:33:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511133311.28341.00000255@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67082

From N2EY:
> So why let it bother you so much?

K4YZ must defend amateur radio whenever possible. Thats his noble cause.

>Steve - did it ever occur to you that he might, just might, be doing that
>sort
>of thing to get you to call him things like "a narrowminded idiot" and get
>you
>all worked up?

My comments are about the Ham radio hobby, not anyone in particular.

>> And "nerdy? I guess that's why they invented the term "egghead" for
>>Amateurs...OH! WAIT! That was for computer ENGINEERING types!
>
>ahem......

I am not longer an Engineer. I know that Ham radio has a social aspect as well.

>Sure - but there are none so blind as those who will not see.

I see... Just not what you see.

>How do you KNOW who "vshah101" really is, Steve?

Identity includes one's belief system, view of the world. That can include
things like "American", "Indian", or "Ham radio member".

836. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 17:53:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511135306.28341.00000261@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67083

From (N2EY):

>No, you're doing it from your point of view.

I believe there is a large segment of EEs (which I am currently NOT),
interested in rf, that would be frustrated by the current nature of the hobby.

>Your point of view includes things
>like defining words differently from how almost everyone else defines them.

All of a sudden, the meaning of the word "Engineer" changed (or others defined
it differently than I believed).

Anyway, I am not longer "either" type of Engineer.

837. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 18:06:32 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93788F87EB976elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 67084

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in
news:20030511121925.28341.00000252@mb-m18.aol.com:

> From: "AMHAM" amham@connectnet.net
>
>>see Part 97.111 of the FCC
>>Rules which states:
>>
>>b) In addition to one-way transmissions specifically authorized
>>elsewhere in this Part, an amateur station may transmit the following
>>types of one-way communications:
>>
>> (1) Brief transmissions necessary to make adjustments to the station;
>> (2) Brief transmissions necessary to establishing two-way
>> communications
>>with other stations;
>>
>> (3) Telecommand;
>>
>> (4) Transmissions necessary to providing emergency communications;
>>
>> (5) Transmissions necessary to assisting persons learning, or
>> improving
>>proficiency in, the international Morse code;
>>
>> (6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins;
>>
>> (7) Transmissions of telemetry.
>>
>> All at URL:
>> http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/
>
> Okay, it seems I was mistaken about Morse code broadcasts not being
> allowed. My mistake. Sorry.
>

Note that W1AW is not the sole source of Morse practice transmissions. In
some areas there are sessions on local repeaters. Try asking around in
your area.

As for the differemce in audio quality between AM and SSB, all else being
equal on SSB the audio will be cut below about 300 Hz, and on AM the bass
response will extend lower. This is because doing so on SSB yields a
slight reduction in bandwidth and a corresponding reduction in background
noise, whereas on AM it wouldn't. The other differemce is that on SSB

anything more than a few tens of Hz error in tuning will cause audible distortion, and on AM there is no such effect. With practice, however, it is not hard to tune in an SSB signal sufficiently accurately to be undistorted. You will develop an 'ear' for it.

So why do we use SSB? With AM, 3/4 of the power is wasted in the carrier, which carries no information, and a further 1/8 in transmitting a scond sideband the same as the first one. So, a typical 100W HF SSB rig is equivalent to 800W of AM, and the US legal limit of 1,500W is equivalent to 12kW of AM, which would be more than most US AM broadcast stations. Not only that, but the bandwidth of SSB is (less than) half that of AM, which is worth a further doubling in power.

There are a few people still using AM, but they are mostly enthusiasts for older rigs. There is nothing wrong with being into the ham equivalent of a Model T Ford, but you can't expect it to perform like a new Ferrari.

838. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 18:14:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511141406.28341.00000266@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67085

From K4YZ:

>You are the only person I have EVER seen
>refer to in that context. If you can provide a link or URL to some site that
>proves your asserion otherwise, please do so now.

Quote:
"This anyway makes Ham radio prone to be called a cult".

See "Delhi slice of Ham".

839. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 18:22:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511142203.28341.00000272@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67086

Sorry, I don't do public service because:

I am too busy and in transition. Now that I am no longer an EE, I feel more relaxed and this will help me contribute to public service.

This may be considered selfish. I dont want to be selfish. Its just how it worked out.

Also, public service takes work. I recycle as long as it does not take too much effort.

Also, I don't know about many ways to do public service.

840. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 18:46:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heqbdf9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67087

On 11 May 2003 14:06:02 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>When I said that I was a Ham to a non-Ham, he asked me if Ham
>radio is some kind of cult, and if they still used Morse code.

Your lack of experience, knowledge, and insight prevented you
from giving the correct answers which are expanded versions of
"no" and "yes" (in order).

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

841. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 18:46:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heqbqga.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67088

On 11 May 2003 16:26:59 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>More publicity for Field Day would help this. So far Field day
>not advertized well to the public. Only those that already knew
>about it seem to attend.

Our club does its field day in the middle of a very popular
county park, and there's one or two club members there whose
role is to explain things to passers-by. We have big signs
with "Club Name - Field Day" on them.

What could be more visible than that?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

842. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 19:10:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511151020.13213.00000154@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67089

>Also, relative confused Ham radio with CB too. He said "breaker breaker". I
>can
>understand why some would confuse Ham radio with CB.

Is there really any difference anymore?

843. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 19:22:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511152225.18769.00000581@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67091

In article <gMUta.4597$GC6.3564@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Thanks, Jim
>
>Boy, you could mount a 40 foot tower to one of those things. That plus one
>of those new-fangled 4 element stepper motor adjusted to any frequency from
>13 to 30 MHz beams :)

HAW!

But you know that there are folks out there who would buy one and drive it on
the street if they could.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

844. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 19:22:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511152226.18769.00000582@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67090

In article <20030510202124.18775.00000685@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> Do you understand that radio physics is the same for any radio
> regardless of the man-made "service" designation applied?

Sure.

Do you understand that "radio physics" is not the only consideration in radio regulations?

>
>>The tests are still given in English, though. English is a pretty old
>>language.
>
> By which US radio regulating agency in the 1930s, senior?

There were three in the 1930s - first the Department of Commerce, then the Federal Radio Commission, then finally the Federal Communications Commission.

>>> I have one textbook on 1930s radio, "Communications
>>> Engineering," by Everitt, copyrighted and published 1932.
>>> Interesting book, contains radio technology information that
>>> was considered "up-to-date" in my 1978 ARRL Handbook.
>>
>>Like what? Ohm's Law? Dipole antennas?
>
> Try Chapter 16 in William Little Everitt's text of 1932, all about
> Modulation and Demodulation and the explanation of "SSSC"
> (the old acryonym for SSB as used by hams). Figure 243 on
> page 413 has a nice full-page block diagram of a 4-channel
> common carrier communications system. Before and after
> that diagram page is an explanation of relative phases of the
> sideband products.
>
> Elsewhere this 1932 text has photographs of waveforms taken
> on an "oscillogram scope," now commonly called an
> oscilloscope by all in the electronics industry.

So what's your point?

Did the "radio physics" of phasing-type SSB change from 1932 to 1978?

>>The only new
>>idea in amateur radio regulations I've ever seen you come up with is wanting
>>the FCC to enact a minimum age requirement so that young people under the
>>age of 14 would be banned from getting amateur radio licenses.

>
> Tsk, tsk. You totally ignored 13 pages of text submitted to the
> FCC in 1999 (and public record) to focus solely on the last page
> to attempt some depreciatory comment.

Not at all. Nothing you wrote in those first 13 pages was a new idea.

> "Behaving in a civil manner" applies to all.

So try it sometime.

> You have to understand that this is a very open forum, doesn't
> cater to your whims, desires, or anything you favor.

Neither are you, Len.

> You aren't
> moderator, aren't "leader" no matter how much you post in
> almost constant attendance daily.

Neither are you, Len.

> You've got to accept that.

I do. You obviously don't.

> This venue is unmoderated, open to any that have access. You
> can't dictate who can say what and when...the best you can do
> is try to wear down opposition with long, Long, LONG postings
> to make them go away out of irritation.

Sounds like what you do, Len.

> Expect the unexpected, roll with the punches. If you get wounded,
> lick the wounds and don't cry about it with crocodile tears...as you
> want to do from time to time.
>
"punches"? "wounded"? "cry"?

You gotta be kidding.

845. Re: Q's (more of them)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 19:31:46 UTC
From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu
Message-ID: <df510dbe.0305111131.45253aa3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67092

Please forgive me. I am still learning about Amateur Radio, and
probably just used the wrong term in attempt to express question.
Thank you again, Rod, for answering my question despite my inability
to do so suitably for others :-). I am very interested in DSP
implementation of filters, and will have to do some research on the
different modes and their detection schemes.

Thanks again!

-Chris

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030511082637.24849.00000123@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> From: cmoressi@cs.uiowa.edu (Chris)
>
> >1. I remember someone telling me that there is a broadcasting of Morse
> >code on one of the ham bands so that people could practice their Morse
> >code.
>
> Any broadcasting over Hamateur freqs is illegal, therefore such Morse code
> transmissions are illegal.

846. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 20:24:09 UTC
From: Bignoded Bernie the Bagleman <ballsdooo@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ebeb158@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67093

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030511133311.28341.00000255@mb-m18.aol.com...
>
> Identity includes one's belief system, view of the world. That can include
> things like "American", "Indian", or "Ham radio member".

Hmmmmmmmmmmmm.....

Ham radio "member" actually means *this* on some
choice freq's on 75 and 20 Meters.

http://www.lesbiansextoys.com/strapons.htm

(sorry folks.....I simply could not resist - grin)

See you at the "Motel" at Dayton - xoxoxo ;)

847. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 20:43:42 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b9mclu$bh8$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 67094

>Perhaps not feel welcome by the CW lovers. Some people with BSEEs have
>designed
>circuits, not limited to repeaters. But, the code requirement restricts their
>ability to design circuits <"legally"> on HF frequencies,

Nonsense. If they're serious in their desire to design circuitry for
HF applications, they can always apply for a Part 5 Experimental Radio
Service license from the FCC. There are certainly engineers employed
by Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom, et al, who do not possess amateur radio
licenses yet turn out products for HF.

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

848. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:00:23 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b9mdl7$c7k$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 67095

>You gave got to be kidding. All five de-volunteered themselves
>for that assignment in the future, just as I de-voluntered
>myself from riding aboard a USCG 46-footer again after a
>morning of running some water-borne field strength measurments
>in San Francisco Bay quite a while ago.

We don't have 46 footers; 41, 44, or 47, but no 46 footers.
The first two digits of the hull number indicate a UTB's length.

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

849. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:16:29 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b9mejdcjm1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 67096

Vshah101 wrote:
> Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.

And here we are, at our keyboards, while others are socializing.

According to the definition of "socialize" ("participate actively
in a social group"), we are in fact, socializing, whether sitting
at a keyboard or a radio.

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

850. ARNewsline 1343 - May 9 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:29:50 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511172950.20527.00000130@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67097

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1343 – May 9, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1343 with a release date of Friday, May 9th, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio provides aid as tornadoes rip across mid America, a record session for the VEC testing system and the FCC opens the filing period on 'Broadband over Power Line communications. All this and more on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1343 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: TORNADOES SWEEP THE NATIONS MID-REGION

Ham radio has again come to the aid of America. This time as a series of killer tornadoes rip across the Central and South-Eastern states. We have the details in this report:

--
Blackouts, water shortages and desperate searches for the missing. This is the situation confronting tornado battered residents of the central United States as the death toll rises to 40 from the most violent weather in four years.

Beginning on Sunday the 4th and continuing through most of the week, swarms of violent thunderstorms and tornadoes crashed through the United States midsection. They caused devastation in three states and are spawning problems in several others.

Kansas, Missouri and Tennessee suffered the worst damage in the initial Sunday onslaught. Kansas listed seven people killed, Missouri had seventeen fatalities and Tennessee sixteen. The storms also disrupted electrical power and telephone service with debris from fallen structures blocking roads in some areas.

One of the hardest hit areas was Madison County, Tennessee where ten people were killed. There, power blackouts were widespread and it was not known when telephone service can be restored. Several of the regions A-R-E-S groups were reported activated as was the Missouri Traffic Net operating near 3 point 960 MHz in the 75 meter band.

In Missouri, ARRL Section Emergency Coordinator, Don Moore, K-M-Zero-R, reports that amateur operators are continuing damage assessment duties. An ARRL bulletin says that the Amateur Radio Emergency Service, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service and SKYWARN groups were active across the affected area. Hams are also assisting the American Red Cross and Salvation Army relief operations.

A bit to the West, in Kansas, Section Manager Ron Cowan, K-B-Zero-D-T-I, says that one tornado touched down in Leavenworth County. It remained on the ground before crossing the border into Missouri. There the storm brought havoc to Platte and Clay counties before falling apart just North-East of Kansas City. But during its trek, Wyandotte and Leavenworth Counties sustained severe damage. Cowan says that homes were destroyed and utilities knocked out along the twisters path.

The tornadoes were believed to be a part of a huge weather system that rolled across the Midwest and parts of the South. It also spawned twisters in Arkansas, South Dakota and Nebraska. Storms on Tuesday and Wednesday accounted for funnel cloud sightings in Alabama, Illinois and here in Louisiana. In all, nine states are affected and the National Weather Service credited ham radio operators with dozens of storm related reports over the weekend and they are continuing into the week.

As we go to air, hundreds of people are still being housed in temporary shelters where Amateur Radio volunteers have become an important ingredient in relief efforts.

This is obviously an ongoing story and we will have an update in next week’s Amateur Radio Newsline report.

From New Orleans, Louisiana, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW.

Jim.

--

Thanks Don. (ARNewsline™ from various sources including ARRL bulletins)

**

RESCUE RADIO: TORNADO DESTROYS K0ETC BEACON

There is an ironic side to this story directly affecting ham radio. The K0ETC beacon North of Joplin Missouri in grid square EM27 was aparently destroyed when one of the twisters blew down the building housing it. An Internet posting by the beacons owner Jay Rupar, K0ETC, shortly after the incident said that there were no injuries at the former beacon site but two people were killed by the same storm about 30 miles away. Rupar says that the present location of the beacon itself is unknown but that it will be replaced. (KC6WFS/7)

**

HAM RADIO HEROES: NOAA HONORS “ALERT” VOLUNTEERS

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has selected ALERT -- the Alabama Emergency Response Team to receive one of this years NOAA Environmental Hero Awards. This award recognizes ALERT for its outstanding efforts in support of the NOAA National Weather Service Forecast Office in Birmingham.

NOAA says that under the leadership of ALERT president Chuck Arthur, KF4SSX, team members have spent hundreds of hours using ham radio to coordinate storm reports throughout the Birminham office’s warning area. The agency goes on

to say that over the years they have proven to be an invaluable resource during such major events as an F 4 tornado that struck Tuscaloolsa County on December 16th of 2000 and the tornado outbreak of November 24th 2001.

NOAA took special note of ALERT's work following last years Veterans Day severe weather outbreak that included to F 3 catagory tornados that killed 12 people. NOAA says that the ALERT volunteers stayed with their Amateur Radio stations relaying critical storm reports to meteorologists and relaying storm information to Emergency Manasers across the central and northern tiers of the state. NOAA says thart the steady flow of reports were crucial to the issuance of new warnings and the office's ability to quickly get the word out to the publiic.

Presented in in conjunction with Earth Day celebrations, the award honors NOAA volunteers for their tireless efforts to preserve and protect our nation's environment. It was presentede to ALERT on Satyrday, May 3rd. More on ALERT is on the web at www.alert-alabama.org. (NOAA)

**

THE VEC SYSTYEM: A PROBABLE E-FILING LICENSING RECORD SET

Before a ham can respond to an emergency, he or she first has to become licensed. And a Wisconsin college may have set a new Amateur Radio record in that area. Would you believe 81 new hams in less than 24 hours? Well its true and Amateur Radio Newsline's Roy Neal, K6DUE, is here with the rest of the story:

--

It happened in Wisconsin. Picture this. 81 students sat for and passed their amateur radio tech class license exams in one day. What's more, they received their license grants within 24 hours! This became the largest test session ever to employ the new technique of on-line submission of test results and applicant data to the FCC. They are the students of Dr. John Weiss, WD8KLO of U W Stouts' College of Technology, Engineering and Management

Weiss gave his students the option of earning their radio licenses in partial fulfillment of class requirements. The examination team was coordinated by John Burningham, WB8PUF, of UW-Stout's communication, Education and Training Department. It included Weiss; Jon Fuller, W9JHF, Student Life Services; and UW-Stout students Andy Wagner, KB9TAC and Scott Littfin, N0EDV.

The University of Wisconsin-Stout has a reputation for firsts. In 2001, the college, which is located in Menomonie, became the first to receive the prestigious Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. It was presented by none other than President George W. Bush.

The rapid license grants were made possible by using newly available VE-to-VEC-to-FCC electronic submission technology developed by the W5YI Volunteer Examination Coordinator. Using password-protected electronic forms posted to the W5YI VEC website, John Burningham, WB8PUF began keying in the test results right after the exam session.

All 81 applications were waiting at the VEC Office when it opened the following morning. After routine screening, the applications were electronically retransmitted to the FCC. Within an hour, the FCC issued the licenses and call signs. These were immediately forwarded over the Internet to Burningham who informed the waiting students of the new calls while at the same time probably setting a new electronic licensing record for ham radio in the United States. 81 new hams in one day at one licensing location.

Go Wisconsin Stout!

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Roy Neal, K6DUE.

--

Weiss is an Associate Professor at UW-Stout specializing in advanced telecommunications technology. Additional information on the school’s telecommunication systems program is available on the web at http://tcs.uwstout.edu. (W5YI)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WO4W repeater serving Besimer Alabama.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: FCC TO BE A NO-SHOW

Don't look for any major ham radio regulatory announcements at next weeks Dayton Hamvention. That's because the agency will not be there. David Black, KB4KCH, reports from Amateur Radio Newsline’s South-East Bureau on the what and the why:

--

Hamvention producer Garry Matthews, K-B-8-G-O-L says conflicting commitments will keep regular FCC presenters Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, and Bill Cross, W3TN from attending. Matthews says the Hamvention tried to find suitable replacements, but none were available.

Speculation suggested that FCC officials might use the Hamvention's Forum to release news of a so-called omnibus Amateur Radio Notice of Proposed Rule Making expected out in May. The notice would consist primarily of outstanding rules change requests and pending petitions for reconsideration. With the Dayton FCC forum canceled, what venue, if any, the Commission might use for its release is not clear.

And what about the two hours on Saturday morning May 17th the FCC was supposed to fill? Matthews says it's being offered to other session leaders who might not like their current time slots and want to change. He says the FCC hould be back in 2004 with Hollingsworth, Cross and perhaps others representing the

Commission.

From the South-East Bureau in Birmingham Alabama, I'm David Black, KB4KCH.

--

We will have more Hamvention 2003® happenings later on in this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report. (ARNewsline™)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC TAKING COMMENTS ON PLC NOI

And speaking about the FCC, e have a follow up on last weeks story about the agency releasing its Notice of Inquiry on the deployment of ''Broadband over Power Line'' or B-P-L technology. Now comes word that the complete Notice of Inquirey which was released on April 28th is available on the FCC Web site. Also that the FCC now is accepting electronically filed comments via its Electronic Comment Filing System ECFS Express page.

But what about the actual affect of B-P-L on ham radio. An ARRL Bulletin, explains that ''Broadband over Power Line'' is really a form of carrier-current communication better known around the world as power line carrier or P-L-C.

B-P-L would couple high-frequency RF to parts of the power grid and use existing power lines as the transmission medium to deliver broadband and Internet access. This is the same technology refused for use in Japan becuse tests showed signifigant interference to consumer electronic products including Amateur Radio on the high frequency bands. And in the Notice of Inquirey the FCC does acknowledge the signifigant interference risk from B-P-L.

ARRL Lab Manager and RFI-guru Ed Hare, W1RFI, also has concerns. A noted expert in the field, Hare cautions that deployment of B-P-L could affect every amateur in communities where it's employed. This, by causing a significant increase in noise levels. Obviously, this is one isssue that a lot of hams will be filing comments on with the FCC. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UNAUTHORIZED OPERATION BRINGS $5000 FINE

The FCC has issued a $5000 fine to Blue Ridge Erectors, Inc. of Bangor Pennsylvania. This, for operating radio transmitting equipment on 467.250 MHz without Commission authorization.

According to the FCC, back on August 27, 2002, the agency’s New York Field Office issued the forfeiture notice to Blue Ridge but the company has not filed a response to the N-A-L. After waiting almost three-quarters of a year the FCC has affirmed the fine and has ordered Blue Ridge Erectors to pay the $5000 within 30 days of the release of its Order.

For more information on this one take your web browser over to the FCC website at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-03-1366A1 (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ALLEGES MICHIGAN HAM ENGAGED IN DELIBERATE INTERFERENCE, THREATS

The FCC claims that a ham has engaged in deliberate interference, broadcasting and that he threatened other amateurs. And now the agency is sending Michael Guernsey Sr, ND8V, of Parchment Michigan a tape recording to back up those assertions. Amateur Radio Newsline's Blair Alper, KA9SEQ, has the details:

--

According to the ARRL Letter, since late 1998, Michael Guernsey, Sr., N-D-8-V, has been the recipient of seven letters from FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth. This includes two warning notices. And in 2000, the FCC threatened to designate Guernsey's license for a revocation and suspension hearing. Guernsey subsequently agreed to a nine-month suspension of his High Frequency operating privileges in 2001.

But on April 7th of this year Hollingsworth again wrote to Guernsey. This time Hollingsworth said that the operation of Guernsey's station over the last several years raises questions about the Michigan hams' qualifications to remain a Commission licensee.

According to Hollingsworth, this time there is audio to support the claims. The recorded transmissions were made this past March 26th, and are said to back up complaints from other amateurs of deliberate interference on 20 meters. In his letter, Hollingsworth noted that some of the interference apparently sprang from on-the-air personal disputes or from what Guernsey perceived as deliberate interference to his transmissions. Even so, Hollingsworth said, Guernsey has apparently ignored the Commission's written and verbal warnings to not retaliate with similar behavior.

Hollingsworth advised Guernsey that the alleged deliberate retaliatory threats and transmissions on top of other QSOs are contrary to FCC rules. He also stated this indicates that the numerous warnings issued to date have little, if any, effect in regarding to bringing Guernsey's operation into compliance with Commission rules, indicating that other, harsher enforcement action may be needed.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Blair Alper, KA9SEQ, reporting.

--

Hollingsworth told Guernsey review the tape recording and respond in writing and in detail within 20 days of reciept of its reciept. He said the FCC will use the information Guernsey submits to decide whether to designate ND8V's license for a suspension and revocation proceeding or to lift voice privileges from Guernsey's license for the remainder of his license term, which ends in 2012. (ARRL, FCC)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: MEET THE MAN BEHIND QRZ.COM

Want to meet the man who makes possible the famed QRZ.COM website? If you're going to the Dayton Hamvention this year, be sure and make it a point to stop

by the W5YI booth in the main building and say hello to Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ, the founder of QRZ.COM. Fred says that he will be there throughout the show and will have some nice QRZ.COM name badge souvineers to hand out to everyone who stops by along with the latest QRZ Ham Radio CD-ROM at a special show price. (QRZ.COM)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: THE DX HOSPITALITY SUITE

The Northern Ohio DX Association and WVNO Radio will once again sponsor a Hospitality Suite at this year's Dayton Hamvention. The suite will be open on Friday and Saturday evenings in Suite 1011 of the Crowne Plaza Hotel. The Crown Plaza is the old Stouffers located in downtown Dayton.

And in a tribute to one of the areas best known hams, the association is dedicating this year's Hospitality Suite to "Silent Key" Jim Hire, W8ZET, who was a Northern Ohio DX Association Honorary Life Member.

Hire’s wife, Janeen, KC8BRS, has decided to keep the tradition going. She will be providing some special memorabilia of Jim at the Hospitality Suite. (NODXA)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: RAIN - NEWSLINE BOOTH

And by the way, if you are one of those planning to attend Hamvention 2003, please be sure to pass by the RAIN, Newsline and WA0RCR combined booth to say hello. Its in the Silver Arena area of the HARA Arena complex in space number 358. We hope to see you there. (ARNewsline™)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org heard on the W7SP repeater in Salt Lake City Utah and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: ED JUGE, W5EJ, - S.K.

Some sad news to report. Word thar well-known amateur Ed Juge, W5EJ, has passed away.

Aaccording to longtime friend and colleague Bob Miller, K2RM, Juge, the former W5TOO, was an executive at RadioShack for many years and one of the people who kept ham radio on the company's radar. Outside the world of ham radio, W5EJ was a well-known and well-respected figure in the computer industry.

Ed Juge also had served on the ARRL No-Code committee in the late 1980s, chaired the ARRL Digital Committee in 1992 and was particularly active in QRP. He is survived by his wife, Jo, KA5ABC, by two children and three grandchildren. (CQ)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: COGNITIVE RADIO - IT LIVES

Believe it or not there a movement underway at the FCC to increase spectrum efficiency through the use of a new technology being called cognitive radio.

What is cognative radio you ask? This is radio gear and antenna systems that could adapt to their operating environments by automatically identifying vacant spectrum, switching to that spectrum and carrying out a specific communications mission.

Cognitive radio will also be the subject of an upcoming workshop at FCC headquarters. More information is at the http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-233615A1.doc (CGC)

**

ON THE WEB: HOW STUFF WORKS

Want to find out how something works? Try taking your web browser over to www.howstuffworks.com. The site is a wealth of information on just about anything in life including ham radio. In fact, if you want a good laymens explanation of our hobby, the direct U-R-L is http://electronics.howstuffworks.com/ham-radio.htm (AE5DW)

**

SPECIAL EVENT: AMATEUR CROSS BAND COMMUNICATIONS TEST

Iin celebration of the 54th anniversary of Armed Forces Day, the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard are co-sponsoring the annual Military and Amateur Radio Communication Test for 2003. These tests provide hams and short wave listeners an opportunity to demonstrate their individual technical skills while receiving recognition from the Secretary of Defense along with the appropriate military radio stations.

According to an Internet post by N6DDF, although the actual armed Forces Day is celebrated on Saturday, May 17th the crossband communications test was to be conducted one week earlier on May 10th. This, so that it would not conflict with the Dayton Hamvention

QSL cards will be provided to those stations who made contact with the military stations. Also, a special commemorative certificate will be awarded to anyone who receives and copies the digital message from the Secretary of Defense. (Via Internet)

**

DX

In D-X, members of the Clube Radioamadores do Entroncamento will use the special callsign, CS7AL, and will be active May 31st from Castel Alcanede for the Portuguese Castles Award. Operation will be on 40 and 20 meter SSB. Castel Alcanede is located in the Province of Ribatejo. QSL via CT1BXE, direct or via the bureau. (OPDX)

Also look for W2AZK and KF2HC from the North Jersey DX Association portable on St.Croix from June 12th to the 19th. Operation will be SSB and CW on 160 through 10 meters. QSL direct or via the bureau to the call worked. Confirmed QSOs are good towards the North Jersey D-X Association award. See www.njdxa.org for details. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: ROYAL HONORS

And finally this week, a radio amateur has received royal honors in the Netherlands. Hans van de Groenendaal, ZS6AKV, of the SARL news service has the story of Lou van de Nadort PA0LOU:

--

Lou van de Nadort PA0LOU, retired Chairman of the International Amateur Radio Union Region 1 was recognised by Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands for his outstanding contribution to Amateur Radio. He was decorated with Member of the “Order of Oranje Nassau”.

Lou was one of the 3594 people who were recognised this year by the queen when the Royal Recognition awards were announced on April 30, in Holland known as “Koningine dag”, the queens birthday .

Lou van de Nadort retired from the IARU Region 1 Executive in October last year after having been almost 28 years at the helm of the organisation. In his farewell editorial in Region 1 News he called it retirement from active duty and wrote “I will always have IARU and its work at heart and will continue to support the cause"

The medal was presented to Lou at his home in Zundert in Holland when the Major and a delegation of civics and members of the VERON Council arrived there on April 30. Lou said it took my totally by surprise, I never expected it.

Hans van de Groenendaal ZS6AKV

--

ZS6AKV adds that the award is an acknowledgement for PA0LOU’s outstanding contribution to the community. (SARL News Service)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More

information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2003 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year closes May 30th. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and a fill-in-the-blank electronic application are at our new special website at www.yhoty.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Davis, W2JKD, saying 73, see you next week from Hamvention 2003, and we thank you for listening.

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

851. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:30:20 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b9mfdc$d9b$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 66958

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> Please state the "bug" (automatic keyer mechanism) nomenclature
> you actually used in your military communications experience.

By definition, a "bug" is semi-automatic: Dits are automatically
generated, but the dahs are manually generated.

> The purpose of a military is "to close with and destroy
> the enemy."

By whose definition? The stated purpose of the Coast Guard, our
smallest military service, does not contain those words.

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

852. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173644.18769.00000541@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66952

In article <20030511114321.07968.00000106@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 8:47 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511094734.24849.00000167@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>From K4YZ:
>>
>>> What have you presented here that "we" didn't already know about?
>>
>>Hams do not know others view them as a cult, nerdy, anti-social, older
>>person, overweight male hobby.
>
> You are the first and only person I have ever seen refer to ANY of
>Amateur Radio, in particular or in general, in that regard.

Incorrect.

> Amateur Radio is not a cult. You are the only person I have EVER seen
>refer to in that context.

Incorrect again.

>If you can provide a link or URL to some site that
>proves your asserion otherwise, please do so now.

rec.radio.amateur.policy -or-

rec.radio.amateur.miscellaneous

>>Electronic hobbyists view them as non-technical
>>(except for antennas).
>
> Oh? I can name about a half dozen electronic and "science" related
>publications that contradict you, INCLUDING some "industry" periodicals.

Give the names of those "industry" periodicals.

>>Possible activities include radio direction finding, which Hams know about,
>>but do not participate in.
>
> Stupid, Vipul. Really stupid, in light of recent coverage of US
>participation in INTERNATIONAL RDF competition.

Name the radio INDUSTRY periodical covering that activity.

>>Also, Hams can use other skills besides CW.
>
> They do...In droves. Myself included.

The "droves" list:

1. Foul-mouthed shouting at others in newsgroups.

2. Memorizing all the advertisements in QST.

3. Bragging (sometimes incoherently) about past exploits
without providing viable references for same.

4. Obsessive crude, insulting behavior as a human being
in non-amateur communications.

> Again, you are asked...What is it you are trying to tell us about
>Amateur Radio that WE didn't already know about?

So...how is your experience with microwave ham bands,
mighty morseman? :-)

> So far you've made yourself appear an even bigger fool than you already
>were by reciting your previously disproven assertioons about Amatuer Radio.

Tsk, tsk.

A-S-S-E-R-T-I-O-N-S A-M-A-T-E-U-R

> Now, do you have anything CONSTRUCTIVE or ENLIGHTENING to suggest or
>offer...?!?!

I have a suggestion: Seek proper medical help.

Perhaps a mood-altering drug is available that could alleviate your
obvious disturbed state?

Self-help at the hospital medications cabinet is not a good
thing without full medical knowledge and proper diagnosis.

853. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173645.18769.00000542@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67098

In article <20030511121109.07968.00000109@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/10/2003 7:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030510202124.18775.00000685@mb-m02.aol.com>
>
>> Pedant. There you go, focussing on details, details, details in
>> order to misdirect away from the main subject.
>
> Whew! Lennie must be REALLY mad! Yet another mispelling of a word he's
>had pointed out to him repetitively!

The dictionary-accepted spelling of the verb transitive form of "focus" is with one OR two "S" as in F-O-C-U-S-S-I-N-G or F-O-C-U-S-I-N-G.

> Putz.

"Putz" is also a colloquial German term for "polishing" as in removal of metal tarnish from silverware.

It is clear that Robeson needs to putz his English word useage and spelling beyond 7th grade level.

854. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173647.18769.00000543@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66955

In article <20030511083536.07824.00000074@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, MD-wannabe and Self-Propelled Character Assassin) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/10/2003 7:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030510202133.18775.00000687@mb-m02.aol.com>
>
>>I got an Honorable Discharge in 1960. No preceding "medical
>> discharge" that later became "honorable."
>
> You keep repeating this, Lennie, but at no time was a "medical" discharge
>anything LESS than Honorable.

Then why didn't you get an Honorable right away?

You've claimed your Medical Discharge was due to an "accident."

Nobody in here has verified that. Medical Discharges are also
given for psychiatric problems in the military service.

Given your conduct in this newsgroup and its visible sociopathy,
a logical conclusion would be that the "accident" might be due
to mental-personality disorders.

> Again you've been caught lying. Why do you persist in lying?

No lies from me.

Robeson insists on calling all statements contrary to his Beliefs
as "lies." That is abnormal behavior and doesn't require any
"degree qualifications" to understand.

> Hmmmmm....Nothing in any era-specific radio clerk training manuals say
>ANYTHING about "closing with the enemy".

1. I was never any "radio clerk" while in the US Army.

2. I gave my Army MOS as "281.6" which is shown on my
DD-214 and has the full title of "Microwave Radio Relay
Operations and Maintenance Supervisor."

3. There are NO "radio clerk training manuals" to be found in
the US Army Training and Doctrine Command listings of
FMs, TMs, or other documents now, nor in the past.

4. Robeson's military service was in the USMC, not the Army.

5. Robeson did not claim or imply any military radio
communications duties nor was he able to state any
military radio equipment by name or nomenclature,
formal or familiar.

> Too bad those of us with REAL military experience in REAL combat can't
use
>that live ammunition on cowardly liars such as you, Lennie, who misrepresent
>their own military service by hiding behind KIA's they never knew or served
>with.

Fish story. Snow job. Lie.

Robeson implies that he has "REAL military experience in REAL
combat" yet has never been able to reference that through any
third-party reference or documentation.

Robeson stated that he had "seven hostile actions." Those three
words convey nothing definite. They are vague vapor.

> You may try to spin the servie records of ANY of us, Lennie, but YOUR
>misdeeds at the expense of KIAs is archived here.
>
> You ARE a liar.

No. I've stated no lies, committed no "misdeeds."

Robeson is off on another unbalanced trip to his own private
fairyland. He needs proper medical treatment.

I have all the names of the 71st Signal Service Battalion personnel
who were casualties in the Korean War period of 1950 to 1958.
The Korean War never officially ended and the 71st Sig Svc Bn
was renamed the Far East Command Signal Service Battalion in
late 1954. The FEC Sig Svc Bn merged with the Japan Sig Svc
Bn (old 72nd Sig Svc Bn) in 1956, taking the latter unit's name.
After that and three major Army reorganizations in Central Honshu,
The 78th Signal Service Battalion is today's name and it is based
at Camp Zama (near Yokohama), under command of the 516th
Signal Brigade at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, part of the Headquarters of
the US Army Pacific (USARPAC). The old Army radio callsign of
ADA used in Japan by the 71st remains as the Hq callsign of
USARPAC today.

There were 19 members of the 71st Sig Svc Bn killed on 1 Jul 50
in Korea. They and four crew members perished in a transport
plane landing crash, their mission to assist and strengthen radio
and wireline communications in Korea following the outbreak of
North Korean forces into South Korea in June of that year. One
of the casualties was Corporal Elmer Hardy. The billet for the 71st
and location of many Central Command agencies was renamed
"Hardy Barracks" in his honor in 1952. While most of the original
Hardy Barracks buildings and land were turned over to the
Japanese government in the 1970s, a newer, smaller building was

constructed to house several military interbranch agencies and to provide a small hotel for temporary lodging. The location and name of Hardy Barracks in Tokyo still exists for US military personnel and is listed in the current DSN directory.

The home office of the Pacific edition of the US military newspaper "Stars and Stripes" remains at Hardy Barracks (moved there in 1953). The November 10th, 2002, edition of the Pacific Stars and Stripes had several expanded Sunday memorial articles that included Hardy Barracks as a military billet in the 1950s, historical data of the location and buildings. It is on-line under the "estripes" archive section; search for "Hardy Barracks" or writer "Rick Chernitzer."

The names of various Korean War casualties are listed by military unit on at least three different websites. For other historical data on the Korean War period I would recommend Hal and Ted Barker's "Korean War Project" website. No fees are required for access or for their regular newsletter but they can use voluntary donations to maintain and keep that central information place.

The National Archives and Registration Agency (NARA) in St. Louis Illinois is the central repository for military records of US personnel of the last century. NARA will supply information on individuals who were veterans under certain conditions explained on their website. Such is available only through USPS mailings. Despite a near-disasterous fire that destroyed many records of Army and some USAF personnel, most are intact, including mine.

USARPAC has a website, as does the 516th Brigade and the 78th Signal Service Battalion. US Army "ARs" (Army Regulations) are found on a separate Army website and include verification of the callsign ADA assigned to USARPAC.

Eugene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, served in the 71st at the same time I did, doing the same Fixed Station Transmitter MOS work. He is retired from a career with the FAA and lives on Long Island, NY.

>>Try to firm up the when and where of "seven hostile actions"
>> claimed by the character assassin in the Gang of Four.
>> He hasn't done it yet.
>
> It's not necessary.

Very necessary to prove it is not a lie.

Without any references, vague vaporous statements are nothing but LIES.

855. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173649.18769.00000544@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66956

In article <20030511082538.18769.00000497@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>> The US Army taught me the BEGINNING of radio and electronics
>> knowledge I've acquired, despite already knowing the basics
>> before joining the Army voluntarily.
>
>Which agrees with what I wrote. So where was I wrong?

Refusing to use the word "beginning" in your original post.

You lie by omission. Not my fault.

>>>Len, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in
>>>the US Army is past for you.
>>
>> I got my Good Conduct Ribbon in 1955. That was good
>> enough for me at that time. :-)
>>
>> I got an Honorable Discharge in 1960. No preceding "medical
>> discharge" that later became "honorable." :-)
>
>You live in the past too much. Get out more.

I do get out, why don't you?

. I know about the larger world of radio while you are inward-
focussed only on amateur radio. I worked IN the larger world of
radio until retirement from regular hours. Very few know what
you work on or at since you won't divulge any such information.

All you state is that you graduated with a degree about a quarter
century ago. That's a long time ago. You can't live on old
accomplishments...except maybe in amateur radio.

>>>That was not amateur radio, it was PROFESSIONAL radio.
>>
>> I'd call it MILITARY radio.
>
>Were you not paid? That's the definition of professional.

Military tasks require the deliberate KILLING of the enemy.

What professions besides the military do you know where
the main priority is to KILL an enemy? I know of no
professions that do that other than executioners.

>> The job also required being able to "close with and destroy
>> the enemy."
>
>How many of the enemy did you close with and destroy?

None.

We were always training for that distinct possibility at any
time. That was a requirement.

It is common for all those who NEVER SERVED to sit back and
make fun of those who did serve.

Continue to feel smug and arrogant that you let others do their
military service while you remained a civilian.

Continue to feel smug and arrogant as a civilian...and your
apparent delusion that you were "too good" for such mundane
duties best done by "inferiors."

>>>I'm sure that the US Army did
>>>not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it.
>>
>> How can you possibly be "sure?" You've never served.
>
>True, true. You could have been unqualified to be in those watches.

The term "on watch" is a nautical one. I was in the Army.

I've never been "unqualified" for any Army duty I was assigned
to do. I was never relieved of duty due to any improper conduct
listed in the UCMJ. I was never on "company punishment,"
the Army's version of the Navy's "captain's mast."

You have NO qualifications to judge on the qualifications of
anyone in the military service at any time, past or present.

If you were "on watch" qualified, it would only be in the Iraqi
Navy before April 2003.

>And an age requirement for an amateur license, and a complete denial of the
>role of amateurs in emergency and public service communication, etc., etc.,
>ad intinitum.

You keep harping on some 1999 subject on 98-143. This is the
year 2003, four years and four months later.

I don't have a "complete denial of the role of amateurs in
emergency and public service," but I do object to the over-
exaggeration and self-important, self-righteous posturing of
many amateurs implying they are of vital necessity in radio
communications aid in such situations.

Amateur radio could disappear today and not make any
noticeable impact on REAL emergency and disaster work
done by public safety professionals and volunteers.

You and ARRL live in the fantasy glory of past
accomplishments by others in isolated incidents of
emergencies and disasters.

You don't get any medals for that, mighty morse warrior.

>> Somehow you've worked yourself up into some mighty morse
>> lather and want to damn anyone for even suggesting that
>> the morse code test be eliminated.
>
>Not me. Do you see me "damning" K2UNK?

Close to it...but you will vociferously deny that "ad intinitum."

Even now you are thinking to yourself, selecting key words
to search Google (again, "ad intinitum") in order to make some
cause celebre posting "vindicating" yourself and "proving" all
detractors of your noble god-like words never harmed anyone or
did anything wrong. The resulting cut-and-paste (for the "ad
intinitum" time) in here is a given.

>> Heh...it's true I don't have a lot of respect for the ENTIRETY
>> of the US Department of State and US foreign policy.
>
>Nor for individulas.

The word "entirety" includes ALL. Have you lost the capability
of understanding English words or do you need Remedial
English Comprehension extension courses also?

>> If ANY veteran of ANY branch of ANY military tries a snow
>> job in here or makes a lot of vapid vague generalities of any
>> sort of mighty military "experience," they should be a target
>> for veteran to practice some live fire.
>
>Sounds like a threat.

Live with it, mighty morseman. You NEVER earned any right
to posture as a military veteran.

>Were you ever in the State Department?

No. Were you?

>Ever participate in State Department communications?

Yes. Did you?

>How can you be SURE of "snow jobs"?

I was born and grew up in snow country.

I've heard more tall tales, exaggerations, fish stories, and blatant
lying tales from others about their exploits than I cared to. Some
of that even came from non-amateurs.

856. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173650.18769.00000545@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66954

In article <3EBE7DD2.2020003@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>>>>don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
>>>>completely different thought process than we're used to.
>>>>
>>>
>>> Would that be the "Ostrich Vision" mode?
>>
>>
>> What hamdom sees What Vipul sees
>>
>> operators enjoying radio contacts antisocial behavior
>>
>> amateurs having a good time at a hamfest Fat, old people on parade
>>
>> the comraderie of a Wouff-Hong ceremony A cult
>>
>> a group participating in a club meeting no one designing circuits
>>
>> 680,000 U.S. hams doing what they like lack of a EE training camp
>>
>
>
> I was going to do a synopsis, but you did a much better job, Dave.

Not really. He seemed highly biased...to "Class F"

> Allowing the possibility that I was wrong about my thoughts on his
>hatred of Ham radio, I googled all his newsgroup posts. This resulted in
>pretty much what you have here.

Believers are loathe to accept observation of others when such
observations are not agreeing with their fantasies and myths.

> So after some thought about why there is such a different perception of

>the ARS between say, most of us here, and Vipul, I came to the following
>conclusions:
>
>1. He has a tendency to base his conclusions on insufficient input.

The few radio amateurs frequenting this newsgroup have a
remarkably insufficient knowledge of the rest of the radio
world, including the beloved HF portion of the spectrum where
these amateurs seem to exclusively dwell in operating.

> This isn't too unusual. Many prospective hams are scared away by a
>crank or two they meet. There are annoying people in every hobby,
>service, sport, whatever. Get over it. Prejudice won't get anyone anywhere.

Prejudice is an extreme attitude of Believers. It is also an attitude of delusional self-importance over and above others. It is endemic through far too great a minority or US radio amateurs.

The most glaring example of prejudice in US amateur radio is the militant insistance past 1990 and even past the 1999 R&O on restucturing the morse code skills must be tested for in order to achieve any US amateur license having HF and lower privileges.

> There are obese Hams. Hams are not obese.

Anyone can "profile" the radio amateurs pictured in amateur radio publications over the last half century. Many thousands are shown in periodical photographs.

> There are old Hams. Hams are not old.

"Old" is a subjective word. Demographic listings at various places put the median US amateur age at about 50 years old, so-called "middle age." The FCC has public records on the given ages of all licensed US radio amateurs. Some amateurs, for various reasons, do not wish their real ages to be known in public. That desire may be due to wanting to relive their lost youth in fantasy.

> There are White Hams. Hams are not all White.
>
> There are Male Hames. Hams are not all Male.

Anyone can view the amateur radio periodicals' photographs of radio amateurs published over the last half century or so.

Unless the viewer is nearly blind, simple observation by anyone will show that the overwhelming majority are White Males.

That very simple, no qualifications needed observation can be done by anyone.

Yes, there are exceptions. The only thing proven by exceptions is that exceptions can exist. The overwhelming majority of US licensed radio amateurs are White Males.

If not that, the only other reasons from such photograph viewing would be:

1. Non-white or female radio amateurs are purposely kept to a minimum from being photographed. Illogical and unlikely.

2. There exists a secret supply of perverts make-up and clothing where non-whites can disguise their faces and races, females

can put on male garments for the purposes of photography.
Ridiculous.

> I could go on forever.

No one lives forever.

>or.............
>
>2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll

or...........

Some radio amateurs frequenting this newsgroup are both arrogant
and prejudicial in their attitudes, deliberately baiting others that
don't believe in their myths and fantasies.

Back under your bridge...

857. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173651.18769.00000546@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66951

In article <20030511093932.24849.00000155@mb-m06.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>
>>I don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
>>completely different thought process than we're used to.
>
>Thanks. There is another point of view than most Hams are used to. I do this
>from the electronic hobbyist person's and social aspects view. I'm just
>trying to point out Ham radio how others may see it.

Vipul, you are attempting an almost impossible task. :-)

The radio amateurs frequenting this newsgroup are existing in their own tight little fantasy, having dreams of self-importance through operating ready-made radios, pretending they are of vital importance to the nation ready to leap into action for any disaster condition and save civilization as they know it.

The sole national membership organization that purports to represent the radio amateurs frequenting this newsgroup has very little observable effort in publicizing the amateur activity to anyone but other amateurs. That lack of observable activity has continued for years despite the organization having a sub-group at their headquarters supposedly working on public relations. The organization's news department is focussed inward, not outward, seldom informing their membership of the radio services that are active and more numerous than amateurs in the EM spectrum from VLF to the maximum limit of ITU-R allocations. The end result is a profound ignorance of the rest of the radio world by amateurs unless those amateurs are also professionals in radio and electronics.

The few radio amateurs in this group manifest a mythology about their own abilities and skills that goes beyond reasonable bounds of today's radio. They are self-delusional as to their importance to their community and nation and take pride in their continuing maintenance of a living museum of the air showcasing the standards and practices of seven decades past.

858. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173652.18769.00000547@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67100

In article <20030511085711.07824.00000077@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, MD - Medical Diagnostic) writes:

>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/10/2003 11:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511001044.18783.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>>What have YOU presented in here that you DO know about?
>
> I know you are a pathological liar. Need more?

P-A-T-H-O-L-O-G-Y noun

1. the branch of medicine that deals with the nature of disease, especially with structural and functional effects;
2. any abnormal variation from a sound condition.

Ref: Webster's New World Home and Office Dictionary

As to the first definition, licensed nurses do not have the legal permission to diagnose and treat any effects in medicine; that is only allowed to licensed Medical Doctors.

As to the second definition, there is no sound carried in news-group messages...and "abnormalities" are not custom-fitted by individuals for use as pejoratives thrown for personal pleasure of the thrower.

The thread is clearly labeled as concerning itself with Public Service and whether or not individuals wish to engage in such.

Robeson has demonstrated an abnormality of mental function concerning his almost total obsession of stalking and attacking the character of certain individuals regardless of any message thread subject. That is on public display and has been for several years. Such is clearly abnormal in a civil society.

859. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173653.18769.00000548@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67099

In article <20030511090003.07824.00000078@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, the Snarly Speeler) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/10/2003 11:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511001047.18783.00000442@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>>> Off to a nice start...On topic...interesting...relevent...
>>
>> Why is it "interesting" to you? And why is something in the
>> 1950s "relevant?"
>
> I enjoy radio history. And it's "relevent" since it pertained to the
>"status" of CB as a "land mobile" service.

R-E-L-E-V-A-N-T

This newsgroup is about AMATEUR radio policy, mighty morse minuteman.

CB, or Citizen's Band Radio Service, regulated under Part 95 of Title 47 CFR, does not require either licensing, a test of any kind, or morsemanship skills.

It should be obvious to you that "CB" is NOT amateur radio as regulated under Part 97 of Title 47 CFR.

>>You are the acknowledged expert on FAA registration,
>> pathology, electronic engineering and so forth becues you
>> know all about them and thereby qualify as judge about them
>
> "Becuse"...?!?!

B-E-C-A-U-S-E

Think of this new word as a cue for you to jump in, pea-shooter blazing, distemper manifest in saliva-drooling open foul mouth to type more nonsense about your obsession targets.

You would do much better in getting off the Internet and using your beloved "amatuer" radios (apparently you have both amateur and "amature" radios, whatever the latter is) to engage in more meaningful morsemanship in civil dialogue using the truthfulness of 599 signal reports.

> Sheeeeesh. What a PUTZ!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...more amateur extra "civility" from the macho morse minuteman...proving that he has no social skills away from his "amatuer" radio.

860. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:36:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511173654.18769.00000549@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66953

In article <20030511115006.07968.00000107@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, Truthsayer Extraordinaire) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 9:06 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511100602.24849.00000173@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>>Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or
>>>QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency
>>>communications.
>>
>>In the contest, you know someone will be there since it is a contest. Also,
>>this is one skill that happens to overlap. Contesting is a game, not a
>drill.
>>The focus is to collect contacts, not emergency communications. This is weak
>>correlation and you know that.
>
> The "weakness" is in your attempts to spin this your way.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...truth as others see it must be terribly painful
for you...

> It's not just a matter of making contacts. You are up against a
>deadline
>to make a certain number of contact ACCURATELY. Inaccurate contacts mean
>either no points, or worse yet, points deducted for logging improperly copied
>or erroneous exchanges.

Vastly important to the nation's welfare...and to use later in more
fish stories on newsgroups to show how mighty morse minutemen
of ham radio can instantly leap into action in real emergencies.

> And what >>I<< know is that Dave Heil has over two decades of experience
>in just those venues while you have, at the most, a couple years.

Yes. Mighty macho morse minutemen, able to leap tall pileups
at a single bound!

> And so far your mouth has laid bare your glaring inexperience in
>contesting, emergency communicaitons AND Public Service.

Does mighty macho morse minuteman type by mouth? :-)

Extraordinary ability! All through his expertise of ham radio!

>>When I said that I was a Ham to a non-Ham, he asked me if Ham radio is some
>>kind of cult, and if they still used Morse code. Seems like some non-Hams
>can
>>see their cult-like nature.
>
> I think you are lying.

You think everyone is lying if they don't agree with you. :-)

Pity that all those others cannot see the glory and wisdom in the
glowing glory of your divine thoughts...

861. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:39:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9mftkvor0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 66957

Dave Heil wrote:

> You'd think that by age 70, a sense of humor would have emerged.

Or at least some horse sense. But that end of the horse doesn't develop sense.

862. Unblocking Cell Block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 21:56:04 UTC
From: Amaretto <someone@somewhere.com>
Message-ID: <b9mgsu$100$1@news.doit.wisc.edu>
Source record: 66959

Hello. I am interested in upgrading my BC-60XLT to something more comprehensive here in the USA. I was wondering if there are new scanners sold in the USA with cell blocking such that--using either software or hardware manipulation--the cell blocking could be removed. It is possible to have legal intentions; say, if a person purchased a scanner in the USA then wanted to bring it to Japan. Regardless, if anyone knows of a model and method of manipulation that would be excellent!

863. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:04:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511180415.29158.00000177@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66960

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/11/2003 12:53 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511135306.28341.00000261@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>From (N2EY):
>
>>No, you're doing it from your point of view.
>
>I believe there is a large segment of EEs (which I am currently NOT),
>interested in rf, that would be frustrated by the current nature of the
>hobby.

And of which you never were...

>>Your point of view includes things
>>like defining words differently from how almost everyone else defines them.
>
>All of a sudden, the meaning of the word "Engineer" changed (or others
>defined
>it differently than I believed).

Hmmmmm....I just looked in my Webster's...No one has changed any entries
there.

>Anyway, I am not longer "either" type of Engineer

You never were ANY type of engineer to have EVER been any type of engineer.

Steve, K4YZ

864. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:06:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511180600.29158.00000178@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66961

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/11/2003 1:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511142203.28341.00000272@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>Sorry, I don't do public service because:
>
>I am too busy and in transition. Now that I am no longer an EE, I feel more
>relaxed and this will help me contribute to public service.
>
>This may be considered selfish. I dont want to be selfish. Its just how it
>worked out.
>
>Also, public service takes work. I recycle as long as it does not take too
>much
>effort.
>
>Also, I don't know about many ways to do public service.

Perhaps if you took the time to ask.

We wouldn't want you to do anything that made you break a swaet now,
Vippy.

Steve, K4YZ

865. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:12:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511181242.29158.00000179@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66962

>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/11/2003 11:25 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511122525.18755.00000683@mb-m06.aol.com>

>> And "nerdy? I guess that's why they invented the term "egghead" for
>>Amateurs...OH! WAIT! That was for computer ENGINEERING types!
>
>ahem......

Sorry, Jim! My apologies to you, Kind Sir!

>> Oh? I can name about a half dozen electronic and "science" related
>>publications that contradict you, INCLUDING some "industry" periodicals.
>>Again, please provide a link or URL, otherwise accept my unhumble opinion
>>that
>>you are making this up for the sole purpose of being antagonistic.
>
>Sure - but there are none so blind as those who will not see.

I agree...And it's GOT to hurt, being bent around with one's head so
impositioned to the rectum.....

>> Stupid, Vipul. Really stupid, in light of recent coverage of US
>>participation in INTERNATIONAL RDF competition.
>
>He just got you to call him stupid...

He made it soooooooo easy, Jim.

>How do you KNOW who "vshah101" really is, Steve?

Other than by some detective work, I wouldn't have, but it didn't take
much to find a name to match a callsign. Have I seen the critter in the flesh?
Nope? Do I want to? Nope.

Also, he admitted to being the person I thought him to be...So unless he's
stupid AND lying, I can only go by what has transpired here.

Sorry again about the egghead thing! I know YOU knew it wasn't for you!

73

Steve, K4YZ

866. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:17:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511181722.29158.00000180@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66963

>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/11/2003 12:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511133311.28341.00000255@mb-m18.aol.com>

>From N2EY:
>> So why let it bother you so much?
>
>K4YZ must defend amateur radio whenever possible. Thats his noble cause.

No...my "noble cause" is highlighting the malodorous verbal emanations
from people who must speak in mistruths and antagonistic bile to try and
mislead people about Amatuer Radio.>>Steve - did it ever occur to you that he
might, just might, be doing that
>>sort
>>of thing to get you to call him things like "a narrowminded idiot" and get
>>you
>>all worked up?
>
>My comments are about the Ham radio hobby, not anyone in particular.

I guess I >>AM<< all worked up. Narrow minded idiots do that to me.

>>> And "nerdy? I guess that's why they invented the term "egghead" for
>>>Amateurs...OH! WAIT! That was for computer ENGINEERING types!
>>
>>ahem......
>
>I am not longer an Engineer. I know that Ham radio has a social aspect as
>well.

You were an "engineer" just like being a house parent makes one an
"independent domestic engineer".

>>Sure - but there are none so blind as those who will not see.
>
>I see... Just not what you see.

No...You don't see it at all.

>>How do you KNOW who "vshah101" really is, Steve?
>
>Identity includes one's belief system, view of the world. That can include
>things like "American", "Indian", or "Ham radio member".

Uh huh...

Steve, K4YZ

867. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:21:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511182155.29158.00000182@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66964

>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/11/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511173644.18769.00000541@mb-m21.aol.com>

Rest of Lennie's post snipped save for...

>> So far you've made yourself appear an even bigger fool than you already
>>were by reciting your previously disproven assertioons about Amatuer Radio.
>
> Tsk, tsk.
>
> A-S-S-E-R-T-I-O-N-S A-M-A-T-E-U-R

You should be cautions of geetting into the spelling business, Oh Scummy
One...

F-0-C-U-S-E-D B-E-C-A-U-S-E

There are many others.

>Self-help at the hospital medications cabinet is not a good
> thing without full medical knowledge and proper diagnosis.

Perhaps if the help YOU sought was other than your correspondence course
trained shrink wife...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

868. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:23:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511182333.29158.00000183@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66965

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/11/2003 1:46 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.heqbqga.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>What could be more visible than that?

"Preety fems" dancing on go-go platforms on the towers?

Steve, K4YZ

869. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:25:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511182544.29158.00000184@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66966

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/11/2003 11:43 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EBE7DD2.2020003@adelphia.net>

>2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll

Ah ah ahhhh, Mike! It's vipulling now, rembember..?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

870. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:29:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511182939.29158.00000185@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66967

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/11/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511173652.18769.00000547@mb-m21.aol.com>

>Robeson has demonstrated an abnormality of mental function
> concerning his almost total obsession of stalking and attacking
> the character of certain individuals regardless of any message
> thread subject. That is on public display and has been for
> several years. Such is clearly abnormal in a civil society.

We can equally apply your dogged antagonizing and telling of mistruths and
insults in THIS forum as the same, Lennie.

Sorry. You fit your own profile to a "T".

Steve, K4YZ

871. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 22:39:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511183913.29158.00000186@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66968

>Subject: Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/11/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511173653.18769.00000548@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030511090003.07824.00000078@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steamy
>Stalker, the Snarly Speeler) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/10/2003 11:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030511001047.18783.00000442@mb-m27.aol.com>
>>
>>>> Off to a nice start...On topic...interesting...relevent...
>>>
>>> Why is it "interesting" to you? And why is something in the
>>> 1950s "relevant?"
>>
>> I enjoy radio history. And it's "relevent" since it pertained to the
>>"status" of CB as a "land mobile" service.
>
> R-E-L-E-V-A-N-T
>
> This newsgroup is about AMATEUR radio policy, mighty morse
> minuteman

As YOU ahve pointed out, it IS an UNMODERATED newsgroup.

The THREAD was about CB vs Land Mobile Radio.

YOU posted a rather thorough historical bit on CB radio since it gave you
a chance to flash a bit, and now you are "redirecting" back to the overall
newsgroup purpose.

YOU found it perfectly acceptable to post your stuff without question.
Now that it is no longer in YOUR best interest to do so, you wuill try and
redirect the conversation away from it.

"Two-faced".

>CB, or Citizen's Band Radio Service, regulated under Part 95 of
> Title 47 CFR, does not require either licensing, a test of any kind,
> or morsemanship skills

"Licensing" was not the topic. The international definitions of what constitutes "land mobile" was. Neither was mode of operation. A "land mobile" station is not limitied to voice communications.

>It should be obvious to you that "CB" is NOT amateur radio as
> regulated under Part 97 of Title 47 CFR

Duuuuuuh...ya think?

>You would do much better in getting off the Internet...(SNIP)

WHAT...?!?! And leave you all alone to lie, deceive and mislead all by yourslef..?!?!

HEAVEN FORBID!

>Tsk, tsk, tsk...more amateur extra "civility" from the macho morse
> minuteman...proving that he has no social skills away from his
> "amatuer" radio.

Keep on thinking that on thinking that if it makes you happy, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

872. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-11 23:00:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511190044.29158.00000192@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66969

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/11/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511173647.18769.00000543@mb-m21.aol.com>

>> You keep repeating this, Lennie, but at no time was a "medical"
>discharge
>>anything LESS than Honorable.
>
> Then why didn't you get an Honorable right away?

I did, Lennie. Why do you keep asserting otherwise?

> You've claimed your Medical Discharge was due to an "accident."

Yep.

>Nobody in here has verified that. Medical Discharges are also
> given for psychiatric problems in the military service.

Was that YOUR reason for terminating so brilliant a career?

>> Again you've been caught lying. Why do you persist in lying?
>
> No lies from me.

Oh? Your correspondence course trained shrink wife does this for you
then?

>Robeson insists on calling all statements contrary to his Beliefs
> as "lies."

Something is a "lie" when it's meaning is inherently false. You make
frequent and obvious false sttements.

>That is abnormal behavior and doesn't require any
> "degree qualifications" to understand.

You're right. It doesn't. That's why I am not the only person inhere who
calls you for what you are...a liar.

>> Hmmmmm....Nothing in any era-specific radio clerk training manuals say
>>ANYTHING about "closing with the enemy".
>
> 1. I was never any "radio clerk" while in the US Army.

Uh huh.

>2. I gave my Army MOS as "281.6" which is shown on my
> DD-214 and has the full title of "Microwave Radio Relay
> Operations and Maintenance Supervisor."

No doubt the parallel MOS to the Marine Corps' MOS 1369.

>3. There are NO "radio clerk training manuals" to be found in
> the US Army Training and Doctrine Command listings of
> FMs, TMs, or other documents now, nor in the past.

Maybe that's why you were so inadequately trained.

>4. Robeson's military service was in the USMC, not the Army.

I see...Only LENNIE can cross military roles and be accurate?

> 5. Robeson did not claim or imply any military radio
> communications duties nor was he able to state any
> military radio equipment by name or nomenclature,
> formal or familiar.

I have. You just choose to ignore it. And what part of it you
"acknowledged" you simply made fun of or tried to denigrate.

Oh well.

>Fish story. Snow job. Lie.

Keep telling yourself that, Lennie. Repeat it over and over. It still
won't make it any more accurate, but it will make you FEEL better for having
done it, and that's all that counts.

>Robeson stated that he had "seven hostile actions." Those three
> words convey nothing definite. They are vague vapor.

Kinda like your "Extra lite out of the box" comments, Lennie?

>No. I've stated no lies, committed no "misdeeds."

You may continue to repeat THAT to yourself too, Lennie...And it still
won't make THAT any more accurate either.

>Robeson is off on another unbalanced trip to his own private
> fairyland. He needs proper medical treatment.

Remember to keep clickng your Ruby Slippers while repeating it over and
over....

>I have all the names of the 71st Signal Service Battalion personnel
> who were casualties...(SNIP)

I am sure you do.

Have you sent that letter to their families apologizing for using them as
opportunities for embellishing your own meager service record, Lennie?

>There were 19 members of the 71st Sig Svc Bn killed on 1 Jul 50
> in Korea.

You've just violated your own five year three month "taht's too old to discuss here" threshold, Lennie.

You still have not satisfactorilly explained how these guy's deaths had anything to do with YOUR qualifications to be an FCC licensee or your qualifications to discuss Amatuer Radio policy.

You brought them up ONLY to somehow, however remotely, polish your own brass.

>The home office of the Pacific edition of the US military newspaper
> "Stars and Stripes"...(SNIP)

...has nothing to do with the thread topic, nor of YOUR qualifications to be an FCC licensee or discuss Amateur Radio policy.

>The names of various Korean War casualties are listed by military
> unit on at least three different websites.

Makes it a lot easier for you to pull a spin together, doesn't it?

>Without any references, vague vaporous statements are nothing
> but LIES.

If you insist, Lennie. While were at it, we're still waiting on YOUR "extra lite" to show up on the database.

Now...continue to click your ruby slippers together while reciting all those things you insist must be true in order to make your disgusting rants true, Lennie.

It won't work, but eventually you'll fall asleep for the night.

Steve, K4YZ

873. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 00:42:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBEEE25.2060309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66970

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 5/11/2003 11:43 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3EBE7DD2.2020003@adelphia.net>
>
>
>>2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll
>
>
> Ah ah ahhhh, Mike! It's vipulling now, rembember..?!?!

Ack! My bad. Next time I'll do better...

- Mike KB3EIA -

874. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 00:59:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EBEF22B.6010009@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66972

Vshah101 wrote:
> Sorry, I don't do public service because:
>
> I am too busy and in transition. Now that I am no longer an EE, I feel more
> relaxed and this will help me contribute to public service.
>
> This may be considered selfish. I dont want to be selfish. Its just how it
> worked out.
>
> Also, public service takes work. I recycle as long as it does not take too much
> effort.
>
> Also, I don't know about many ways to do public service.

Okay. You're licensed as a Technician. So here are some of the things
you can do:

Lots of charities have events that need radio comms to coordinate their
events. At times, there may be emergencies at the same events. It isn't
glamorous work most of the time, but you get the chance to meet and talk
to the other volunteers and participants. This isn't the sort of thing
that gets written up in QST, but it is valuable service nonetheless.

Skywarn. NOAA runs this. In addition to first alerting about tornados,
they collect data about other weather, disasters and mini disasters.
Even localized damage is incorporated into their databases. This is
because they can correlate between say a report that a strong wind blew
over a tree in your yard, and what their radar might have been showing
them. Although anyone can get involved in this, they seem to like hams a
lot.

ARES/RACES. There is probably a net in your area. Even something as
simple as checking into the net gives the group an idea of net/repeater
coverage, who is out there, and let you know where to turn if there is a
problem in your area.

You might just enjoy it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

875. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:00:44 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <b9mrof$ik2$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 66993

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:tBgua.247575$Si4.196455@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> Hello Vito .....
>
> Shelfish ...well some people are allergic to that stuff just like they are
> not motivated to even try at 5 WPM a mode which offers a simple elegant
> means of communication.

Gee, why not also make 'em type on an old-fashioned Kleinschmidt and
wind Baudot paper tape from thumb to little finger in an oh-so-elegant
figure-8? Makes every bit as much sense.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/2003

876. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:01:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210128.20149.00000179@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66973

Quote:
"This anyway makes the hobby prone to be called a cult."

http://www.qsl.net/vu2kyp/news.html

Click on "Delhi slice of HAM" article, in Hindustan Times, about Indians in Ham radio.

877. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:05:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210545.18770.00000524@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66976

In article <b9mclu$bh8$1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>Perhaps not feel welcome by the CW lovers. Some people with BSEEs have designed
>>circuits, not limited to repeaters. But, the code requirement restricts their
>>ability to design circuits <"legally"> on HF frequencies,
>
>Nonsense. If they're serious in their desire to design circuitry for
>HF applications, they can always apply for a Part 5 Experimental Radio
>Service license from the FCC.

Actually, NO license is required to DESIGN or even test circuitry at HF or anywhere from VLF to light frequencies.

Not even a permit required.

Radiated RF testing can be performed in shield and screen rooms, has been done so for decades. Shield rooms and screen rooms can contain all the RF radiation power above permitted FCC regulations.

Few radio amateurs know of shield rooms or screen rooms, even fewer have actually done any sort of work in them. Ignorance of long-standing technology widely used in the electronics industry is not a virtue.

Unrestricted RF propagation of civil radio systems or circuits requires licensing by the FCC in the USA is their RF power is above certain levels on certain frequencies. Any power level below the FCC maxima is free and open, without license. See all of Title 47 CFR to verify, most Parts.

The FCC does not regulate government radio use in any way. The NTIA does that. Nearly all government contracts for radio systems that radiate RF allow unrestricted operation without any license from any civil radio regulating agency. Perfectly legal. Done all over the USA and possessions.

>There are certainly engineers employed
>by Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom, et al, who do not possess amateur radio
>licenses yet turn out products for HF.

There are no engineers at all at Hallicrafters in Chicago. Halligan's company dissolved long ago. Bye-bye.

There are thousands of engineers, most not licensed in amateur radio, designing and testing cellular telephone handsets and cell

site equipment in the USA. One in three Americans is a cell phone subscriber according to the US Census Bureau in 2002. The modern hold-in-one-hand cellular telephone handset was 30 years old in April, 2003...first such cell phone call then and also the first to have a noisy connection on a cell phone (IEEE SPECTRUM for May 2003).

Engineers at ITT Fort Wayne, IN, designed the present-day US military small-unit land-air radio system...and also engineered the "SIP" or SINCGARS Improvement Program version of same which is half the original size. Over 240 thousand radio sets were produced and fielded to US forces since 1988 according to US military public data as of the end of 2002.

Harris Corporation, headquartered in Rochester, NY, has several divisions designing and manufacturing radios for both commercial and military use, including the UK military compatible counter-part to the US SINCGARS. Harris' Broadcast Division made the HF transmitters used by W1AW memorial station. Harris is presently hiring engineers...in case anyone wishes to "step up."

There is a great deal of RF design, production, and test going on today in the USA at all frequencies from VLF on out past 100 GHz for a wide variety of radio service applications. There has been no emphasis on HF in the USA for at least 3 decades, so the "example" of only off-shore amateur equipment manufacturers and their designers is too limited. Nearly all off-shore companies design and produce radio equipment for non-amateur service equal or exceeding their revenue from amateur markets.

SGC in the Puget Sound area of Washington is a wholly-US corporation and their chief product is an HF SSB transceiver sold to both amateurs and small boat owners. The founders are in the first two letters of their corporate logo: Stoner and Goral, both licensed radio amateurs though Don Stoner is SK.

There doesn't seem to be any limit for the future in "radio" design and development since that keeps increasing in size, scope, and applications over the entire EM spectrum. Narrow focus on radio development only for amateur markets and only by off-shore companies is far too limiting. The future is open for the daring.

878. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:05:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210548.18770.00000525@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66980

In article <20030511152226.18769.00000582@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030510202124.18775.00000685@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>> Do you understand that radio physics is the same for any radio
>> regardless of the man-made "service" designation applied?
>
>Sure.
>
>Do you understand that "radio physics" is not the only consideration in radio
>regulations?
>

>So what's your point?

That you are unable to focus on any "point" other than what is
allowed by your amateur technology blinders permit. That is
tantamount to tunnel-vision.

>Did the "radio physics" of phasing-type SSB change from 1932 to 1978?

Absolutely...and all the way to 2001 with the merger of the
four-channel CMOS switch (Tayloe Mixer) and the Gingell
polyphase network.

You are apparently unable to "see" the evolution because of
your fixation on amateur technology and Belief System in
the amateur-as-pioneer myth.

>Not at all. Nothing you wrote in those first 13 pages was a new idea.

Comments on NPRMs are not required to have "new ideas."

Try to study what they really are. The FCC website is one
place to go for such insight.

>> "Behaving in a civil manner" applies to all.
>
>So try it sometime.

I did. In here. At first. The avalanche of boorish, insulting,
puerile, snarly, sarcastic name-calling from pro-code test
advocates of that time quickly demonstrated that this arena
does not allow civility as a norm.

Syncophancy to ARRL maxims does not equate to civility.

Holier-than-thou attitudes of the already-licensed olde-tymer
does not equate to civility.

Exaggeration and sins-by-omission do not equate to civility.

Assumptions of god-like knowledge and behavior does not
equate to civility.

Pedantic preaching of some fraternal gospel does not equate
to civility.

Constant misdirection into minutae and unrelated areas
along with demands to answer your obviously biased
questions does not equate to civility.

You have claimed equality to all six of those in here.

That is invalid, incorrect, and uncivil as well.

Try to argue the SUBJECT, not the person of those who
have differing opinions to yours.
>
>> You have to understand that this is a very open forum, doesn't
>> cater to your whims, desires, or anything you favor.
>
>Neither are you, Len.

I understand perfectly well...and also understand the mindset
of those syncophants demanding capitulation to their false
Belief system.

>> You aren't
>> moderator, aren't "leader" no matter how much you post in
>> almost constant attendance daily.
>
>Neither are you, Len.

Incorrect. I'm trying to focus on the SUBJECTS. You
constantly try to boresight persons whose opinions differ
from your concept of the subject.

>> You've got to accept that.
>
>I do. You obviously don't.

Incorrect on both sentences of yours.

You strive constantly to spin others' opposite-opinion replies
to some kind of negative ethical attribute. All that is is just
a politer form of personal insult and a denigration for heresy
in your Belief System.

I understand far more than you expect and have been pointing
that out to the insulters, the smug and arrogant self-righteous

radio gods who permit only a Belief in their System.

True civil debate on subjects long since disappeared in this newsgroup. The snarly acidic wit of Jim Kehler, KH2D, led the forum's general tone six years ago...Kehler was not forgiving of any person who ventured opinions to the opposite of his obvious extreme PCTA viewpoint and let everyone know it. Not in "polite terms," either. Kehler became sickly, moved from Guam to the mainland, hasn't been here for years. I'm still here.

>> This venue is unmoderated, open to any that have access. You
>> can't dictate who can say what and when...the best you can do
>> is try to wear down opposition with long, Long, LONG postings
>> to make them go away out of irritation.
>
>Sounds like what you do, Len.

I reply to messages. Short messages get short replies. Long messages get long replies. I start very few threads in here, but have from time to time.

You issue "Sermons on the Antenna Mount" from time to time and become agitated when the congregation becomes unruly, not honoring or revering your creed of code. Then you complain about those of opposing opinion being "uncivil." Tsk, tsk. TS.

879. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:05:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210549.18770.00000526@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66978

In article <20030511182155.29158.00000182@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511173644.18769.00000541@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>Rest of Lennie's post snipped save for...
>
>>> So far you've made yourself appear an even bigger fool than you already
>>>were by reciting your previously disproven assertioons about Amatuer Radio.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk.
>>
>> A-S-S-E-R-T-I-O-N-S A-M-A-T-E-U-R
>
> You should be cautions of geetting into the spelling business, Oh Scummy
>One...
>
> F-0-C-U-S-E-D

The verb intransitive form of the word "focus" can have one "S" or two. Both forms are acceptible.

>>Self-help at the hospital medications cabinet is not a good
>> thing without full medical knowledge and proper diagnosis.
>
> Perhaps if the help YOU sought was other than your correspondence course
>trained shrink wife...?!?!

My wife NEVER took any "correspondence courses" to obtain her Bachelors or her two Masters degrees. All required formal classroom attendance. That included additional extension classes at the University of Wisconsin...not to be confusd with Beloit College also located in the state of Wisconsin. Her MS in Education allowed her several years of teaching (K to 12) experience in classrooms in the state of Illinois.

My wife is not a "shrink." She retired from private practice as a Social Work Counselor in the state of Washington. Previously she was in private practice in Social Work in the state of Illinois and also worked for the government of the state of Illinois in Social Work, part of that time counseling mental patients.

Counseling in Social Work requires a great deal of applied psychology with all patients. Had you bothered to see what is required under Social Work curricula and state licensing for same you would understand that.

You are not interested in seeing anydamthing, only interested in the sociopathic, disrputive, foul-mouthed, foul-minded behavior you exhibit in this newsgroup, insulting and trying to demean anyone who does not agree with you...and not stopping to attempt any civility, just doing more of the same to targets' spouses, families, ancestry, and ethnic origin.

Is that a fine, noble attitude to display to the world as an AMATEUR Extra Class licensee?

That isn't an attitude for a civilized human being.

880. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:05:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210550.18770.00000527@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66979

In article <20030511181722.29158.00000180@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, Black Knight of the Airways) scribbled:

>>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 12:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511133311.28341.00000255@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>>From N2EY:
>>> So why let it bother you so much?
>>
>>K4YZ must defend amateur radio whenever possible. Thats his noble cause.
>
> No...my "noble cause" is highlighting the malodorous verbal emanations
>from people who must speak in mistruths and antagonistic bile to try and
>mislead people about Amatuer Radio.>>Steve - did it ever occur to you that he
>might, just might, be doing that
>>>sort
>>>of thing to get you to call him things like "a narrowminded idiot" and get
>>>you
>>>all worked up?

Tsk, tsk. Evident rage boiling over...improper formatting of replies,
once again the repeated typo of "Amatuer."

Sad thing to see...a breakdown in progress.

>>My comments are about the Ham radio hobby, not anyone in particular.
>
> I guess I >>AM<< all worked up. Narrow minded idiots do that to me.

Poor baby. No gunnery sergeant stripes on the arm to back you
up nowadays?

You can't make someone "get down and give you ten," can you?

Why do you keep on trying?

> You were an "engineer" just like being a house parent makes one an
>"independent domestic engineer".

Tsk, tsk. Manifest envy from the ex-purchasing agent.

>>>Sure - but there are none so blind as those who will not see.
>>
>>I see... Just not what you see.
>

> No...You don't see it at all.

Poor Steamy is still seeing things no one else sees...

Who knows, he might be on some halucinatory substance
of some kind?

881. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:05:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210551.18770.00000528@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66974

In article <b9mfdc$d9b$1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>> Please state the "bug" (automatic keyer mechanism) nomenclature
>> you actually used in your military communications experience.
>
>By definition, a "bug" is semi-automatic: Dits are automatically
>generated, but the dahs are manually generated.

Are you another pedant? Did you answer the call of nature today? :-)

I'm just curious as to who used "bugs" for radio communications purposes in the military.

>> The purpose of a military is "to close with and destroy
>> the enemy."
>
>By whose definition? The stated purpose of the Coast Guard, our
>smallest military service, does not contain those words.

By definition of the UNITED STATES ARMY for over a decade, since the late 1940s to sometime in the 1960s when the hanky holders and other cowardly peaceniks forced some politicians to change the wording.

The USCG isn't always a "military service," is it?

If you bothered to read the newspapers last month, you may have seen what the US and UK ARMIES could do in the Middle East...with a lot of help from the United States Air Force and United States Navy. Three weeks. A whole middle-sized country invaded, rolled over, occupied with an enormous "kill ratio" in the US-UK favor.

Today the buzzword in the REAL United States military is "warfighter." It's been around for nearly a decade.

Communications-wise, your "bug" got squashed a long time ago by everyone else except the amateurs.

Try to wipe up the old squash marks, okay?

882. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:05:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210552.18770.00000529@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66977

In article <20030511180600.29158.00000178@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Also, I don't know about many ways to do public service.
>
> Perhaps if you took the time to ask.
>
> We wouldn't want you to do anything that made you break a swaet now,
>Vippy.

Okay, I'll ask. What is a "swaet?"

Is that some kind of medical thing, Doctor Killgore?

Or did you almost OD again and get your fingers twisted again?

883. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:05:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511210553.18770.00000530@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66975

In article <20030511180415.29158.00000177@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, Never An Engineer) writes:

>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 12:53 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511135306.28341.00000261@mb-m18.aol.com>
>>
>>From (N2EY):
>>
>>>No, you're doing it from your point of view.
>>
>>I believe there is a large segment of EEs (which I am currently NOT),
>>interested in rf, that would be frustrated by the current nature of the
>>hobby.
>
> And of which you never were...

Poor lil Steamy, worked as a purchasing agent for less than a year "in the electronics industry" and never once got into REAL engineering of any kind. Now he pretends to be some kind of judge on what engineers do.

Steamy only has one kind of "do." Do-do.

>>>Your point of view includes things
>>>like defining words differently from how almost everyone else defines them.
>
>>All of a sudden, the meaning of the word "Engineer" changed (or others
>>defined it differently than I believed).
>
> Hmmmmm....I just looked in my Webster's...No one has changed any entries
>there.

That's the closest lil Steamy ever got to any engineering.

>>Anyway, I am not longer "either" type of Engineer
>
> You never were ANY type of engineer to have EVER been any type of
>engineer.

Actually, Vipul has been FAR CLOSER, for LONGER to Real Engineering than lil Steamy ever did.

Steamy is stalking up a storm in his fantasyland of dreams.

884. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:43:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <c%Cva.8988$3f7.5863570@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 66971

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030511141406.28341.00000266@mb-m18.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
>
> >You are the only person I have EVER seen
> >refer to in that context. If you can provide a link or URL to some site
that
> >proves your asserion otherwise, please do so now.
>
> Quote:
> "This anyway makes Ham radio prone to be called a cult".
>
> See "Delhi slice of Ham".

There is no URL cited here. Nor have you provided any way to check on the quote. You've given a title of an item but is it a book or an article. If it is a book, who is the author and what is the publishing company? If it is an article, who is the author, what publication is it printed in, and where can one access this publication.

In other words, you've just failed the most basic of citation requirements.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

885. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 01:50:58 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <b9mv9i$vt8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 66981

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030511082539.18769.00000498@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <b9kfci$8na@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Did you hear the NPR interview with the author of a new book, "The Iron
> >Triangle" and then the interview with the public spokesperson for the
> >Carlisle Group?
>
> I think I missed that one, Kim. Can you summarize for us?
>
> There was an excellent Terry Gross interview with the author of a book on
the
> 1919 Treaty of Paris negotiations that formally ended WW1 - and alos
carved up
> the old Ottoman Empire.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Sorry 'bout that, had the wrong spelling for "Carlisle;" it's actually Carlyle. Anyway, here's the synopsis from the NPR website:

"May 6, 2003

Author of The Iron Triangle: Inside the Secret World of the Carlyle Group (Wiley). The Carlyle Group is one of the most powerful and well-connected private equity firms in the world. Its investments -- most notably -- in timely defense and aerospace industries has made it highly profitable. The group's roster includes or has included former President George Bush, Sr., (advisor), former Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci (former chairman), Saudi Arabian Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal (investor) and former Secretary of State, James Baker III (managing director and senior counselor). Briody writes that the Carlyle Group "operates within the so-called iron triangle of industry, government, and the military" and that it "leaves itself open to any number of conflicts of interest and stunning ironies." "

I believe it was both the author and, later, the Spokesperson for the Carlyle Group that were on Fresh Air. A Synopsis is the topic was about the revolving door between the govt. and defense industry, and the topic of conflict of interest. The interview is available from http://discover.npr.org/features/feature.jhtml?wfId=1253480.

Kim W5TIT

886. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 02:08:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511220842.20149.00000180@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 66982

From (Jeffrey Herman):

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.
>
>And here we are, at our keyboards, while others are socializing.
>

Calling CQ and collecting signal reports (such as 5er-9er) is not socializing.
Thats why they call it "work"ing stations. Boring. Seems like work too.

> we are in fact, socializing, whether sitting
>at a keyboard or a radio.

Hams operated while others at the DX location were at the beach, walking
around, boating, cycling etc.

Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.

887. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 02:59:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030511225958.05936.00000178@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 66983

>Hams operated while others at the DX location were at the beach, walking
>around, boating, cycling etc.
>
>Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activit

GOOD, since this is not what you want to do, then PACK your Bag and move on.
You will not be missed.

888. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 04:08:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF1E0F.D9B5981D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66984

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From (Jeffrey Herman):
>
> >Vshah101 wrote:
> >> Here they are, at their radios, while others are socializing.
> >
> >And here we are, at our keyboards, while others are socializing.
> >
>
> Calling CQ and collecting signal reports (such as 5er-9er) is not socializing.

"5er-9er"? What a laugher.

> Thats why they call it "work"ing stations. Boring. Seems like work too.

What you need now, in addition to your new job, is a new avocation. What
kind of moron sticks to something he so obviously detests?

> > we are in fact, socializing, whether sitting
> >at a keyboard or a radio.
>
> Hams operated while others at the DX location were at the beach, walking
> around, boating, cycling etc.

It's pretty hard to socialize while cycling. I can almost imagine you
cycling about the green while discussing classic poetry or 12th century
Chinese pottery.

> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.

I see. This is another version of "one definition for Vipul, another
meaning for the rest of humanity".

Dave K8MN

889. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 04:25:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF226D.15A5C8E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66985

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030511082538.18769.00000497@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

>
> Military tasks require the deliberate KILLING of the enemy.
>
> What professions besides the military do you know where
> the main priority is to KILL an enemy? I know of no
> professions that do that other than executioners.

Retired engineers? You seem hell bent on boring us to death.

> >> The job also required being able to "close with and destroy
> >> the enemy."
> >
> >How many of the enemy did you close with and destroy?
>
> None.

There you have it. What about you comments to another about how it
feels to be under fire?

> We were always training for that distinct possibility at any
> time. That was a requirement.
>
> It is common for all those who NEVER SERVED to sit back and
> make fun of those who did serve.

You make it easier for them with your "close with and destroy the
enemby" spiel.

> Continue to feel smug and arrogant that you let others do their
> military service while you remained a civilian.

Leonard, you are one pathetic hunk of DNA.

> Continue to feel smug and arrogant as a civilian...and your
> apparent delusion that you were "too good" for such mundane
> duties best done by "inferiors."

This new revelation of an inferiority complex over your military service
is only rivaled by your amateur radio inferiority complex.
Jim is probably a bit young to have pulled your military duty for you.
I tried to get my dad's okay to enlist for Korea but he thought it best
until I was a bit older. I was four when the fighting stopped.

>
> You have NO qualifications to judge on the qualifications of
> anyone in the military service at any time, past or present.

Keep that in mind the next time you're tempted to comment on the
military service of others.

> I don't have a "complete denial of the role of amateurs in
> emergency and public service," but I do object to the over-
> exaggeration and self-important, self-righteous posturing of
> many amateurs implying they are of vital necessity in radio
> communications aid in such situations.

That's not exactly what a record of your posts would demonstrate, is it,
Leonard?

> Amateur radio could disappear today and not make any
> noticeable impact on REAL emergency and disaster work
> done by public safety professionals and volunteers.

You could disappear today and not have a noticeable impact on amateur
radio. That's a far more likely scenario.

> You and ARRL live in the fantasy glory of past
> accomplishments by others in isolated incidents of
> emergencies and disasters.

Your statement seems to have no basis in fact.

> >Not me. Do you see me "damning" K2UNK?
>
> Close to it...but you will vociferously deny that "ad intinitum."

...only because it happens to be true.

> >> Heh...it's true I don't have a lot of respect for the ENTIRETY
> >> of the US Department of State and US foreign policy.
> >
> >Nor for individulas.
>
> The word "entirety" includes ALL. Have you lost the capability
> of understanding English words or do you need Remedial
> English Comprehension extension courses also?

Let me paraphrase your statement found above: You have NO qualifications
to judge on the qualifications of anyone in the Department of State at
any time, past or present.

> Live with it, mighty morseman. You NEVER earned any right
> to posture as a military veteran.

...and neither did you.

> >Were you ever in the State Department?
>
> No. Were you?

>
> >Ever participate in State Department communications?
>
> Yes. Did you?

Not quite true, Leonard, old bean. You participated in some contract
work some decades past. You were not doing State Department commo.
Come clean.

> >How can you be SURE of "snow jobs"?
>
> I was born and grew up in snow country.
>
> I've heard more tall tales, exaggerations, fish stories, and blatant
> lying tales from others about their exploits than I cared to. Some
> of that even came from non-amateurs.

...and you generated the rest?

Dave K8MN

890. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 04:30:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF23BC.32EA8C3B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66986

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EBE7DD2.2020003@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:

> Anyone can view the amateur radio periodicals' photographs
> of radio amateurs published over the last half century or so.
>
> Unless the viewer is nearly blind, simple observation by anyone
> will show that the overwhelming majority are White Males.

You've skipped down this path before. You have never managed to attach
a point to your statement.

> Some radio amateurs frequenting this newsgroup are both arrogant
> and prejudicial in their attitudes, deliberately baiting others that
> don't believe in their myths and fantasies.

...and some others find you both arrogant and prejudicial in your
attitudes, deliberately baiting others who don't support your views.

Dave K8MN

891. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 04:35:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF24C8.4432479F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66987

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Actually, NO license is required to DESIGN or even test circuitry
> at HF or anywhere from VLF to light frequencies.
>
> Not even a permit required.
>
> Radiated RF testing can be performed in shield and screen rooms,
> has been done so for decades. Shield rooms and screen rooms can
> contain all the RF radiation power above permitted FCC regulations.

Well, there you go, old timer. You don't need an amateur license, just
a screen room of your own.

> Few radio amateurs know of shield rooms or screen rooms, even
> fewer have actually done any sort of work in them. Ignorance of long-
> standing technology widely used in the electronics industry is not a
> virtue.

Nor is pretending that you have a lock on such knowledge. I know about
shield rooms and screen rooms. I have done work in them. No, I won't
provide you any details.

Dave K8MN

892. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 04:51:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF2819.E95CFA67@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66988

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030511152226.18769.00000582@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> >> "Behaving in a civil manner" applies to all.
> >
> >So try it sometime.
>
> I did. In here. At first. The avalanche of boorish, insulting,
> puerile, snarly, sarcastic name-calling from pro-code test
> advocates of that time quickly demonstrated that this arena
> does not allow civility as a norm.

I've been here since '96. I've not observed you to ever try civility
here.

> Syncophancy to ARRL maxims does not equate to civility.

...nor does some boor writing of "syncophancy".

> Holier-than-thou attitudes of the already-licensed olde-tymer
> does not equate to civility.

nor does using "Holier-than-thou" or "olde-tymer".

> Exaggeration and sins-by-omission do not equate to civility.

Yours or another's?

> Assumptions of god-like knowledge and behavior does not
> equate to civility.

Yours or another's?

> Pedantic preaching of some fraternal gospel does not equate
> to civility.

...nor does use of terms like "Pedantic preaching of some fraternal
gospel"?

> Constant misdirection into minutae and unrelated areas
> along with demands to answer your obviously biased
> questions does not equate to civility.

Yours or another's?

> You have claimed equality to all six of those in here.

You haven't claimed them but you've earned them.

> Try to argue the SUBJECT, not the person of those who
> have differing opinions to yours.

When might we expect you to begin practicing your own advice?

> I understand perfectly well...and also understand the mindset
> of those syncophants demanding capitulation to their false
> Belief system.

It has to be understood that Len wants only to engage in civil debate.

> >> You aren't
> >> moderator, aren't "leader" no matter how much you post in
> >> almost constant attendance daily.
> >
> >Neither are you, Len.
>
> Incorrect. I'm trying to focus on the SUBJECTS.

Whaddya mean "Incorrect."? It looked correct to me. When does the part
where you "focus on the SUBJECTS" part begin? Was that a part of your
moving-boxes-in-a-supply-depot routine? Pretty sharp focus. I suppose
the SUBJECT is whatever you determine the SUBJECT is.

> You
> constantly try to boresight persons whose opinions differ
> from your concept of the subject.

Did you read my lines on same, posted above?

> You strive constantly to spin others' opposite-opinion replies
> to some kind of negative ethical attribute. All that is is just
> a politer form of personal insult and a denigration for heresy
> in your Belief System.

> I understand far more than you expect and have been pointing
> that out to the insulters, the smug and arrogant self-righteous
> radio gods who permit only a Belief in their System.
>
> True civil debate on subjects long since disappeared in this
> newsgroup. The snarly acidic wit of Jim Kehler, KH2D, led
> the forum's general tone six years ago...Kehler was not
> forgiving of any person who ventured opinions to the opposite
> of his obvious extreme PCTA viewpoint and let everyone
> know it. Not in "polite terms," either. Kehler became sickly,
> moved from Guam to the mainland, hasn't been here for years.

Len, meet your own worst enemy: Len.

> I'm still here.

That's been noted.
> >> This venue is unmoderated, open to any that have access. You

> >> can't dictate who can say what and when...the best you can do
> >> is try to wear down opposition with long, Long, LONG postings
> >> to make them go away out of irritation.
> >
> >Sounds like what you do, Len.
>
> I reply to messages. Short messages get short replies. Long
> messages get long replies.

That just isn't the truth, Len.

> You issue "Sermons on the Antenna Mount" from time to time
> and become agitated when the congregation becomes unruly,
> not honoring or revering your creed of code. Then you complain
> about those of opposing opinion being "uncivil." Tsk, tsk. TS.

The added "TS" is sure to gain you civility points. You don't seem able
to avoid fulfilling the well known N2EY profile.

Dave K8MN

893. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 04:59:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF29F2.944390DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66989

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <b9mfdc$d9b$1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> >> Please state the "bug" (automatic keyer mechanism) nomenclature
> >> you actually used in your military communications experience.
> >>
> >>By definition, a "bug" is semi-automatic: Dits are automatically
> >>generated, but the dahs are manually generated.

> I'm just curious as to who used "bugs" for radio communications
> purposes in the military.

So you purposely misdefined the term as a cleverly laid trap, in order
to get to the bottom of this military bug use thing. That's quite a
plan, Len.

> >> The purpose of a military is "to close with and destroy
> >> the enemy."
> >>
> >>By whose definition? The stated purpose of the Coast Guard, our
> >>smallest military service, does not contain those words.
>
> By definition of the UNITED STATES ARMY for over a decade,
> since the late 1940s to sometime in the 1960s when the
> hanky holders and other cowardly peaceniks forced some
> politicians to change the wording.

But the UNITED STATES ARMY isn't the entire military and the late 1940's
through "sometime" in the 1960's isn't today, is it? So your statement
of purpose must be...wrong.

> The USCG isn't always a "military service," is it?
>
> If you bothered to read the newspapers last month, you may
> have seen what the US and UK ARMIES could do in the
> Middle East...with a lot of help from the United States Air
> Force and United States Navy. Three weeks. A whole
> middle-sized country invaded, rolled over, occupied with an
> enormous "kill ratio" in the US-UK favor.

I seem to recall something about the Coast Guard being involved. There
might have been a few Marines scattered about. Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

> Today the buzzword in the REAL United States military
> is "warfighter." It's been around for nearly a decade.

The "REAL" military? Surely more civility points for you, Leonard, you old "warfighter".

Dave K8MN

894. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 12:22:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF9287.2360A2B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66994

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> A child that doesn't know
> >> CW is "not good enough".
> > >
> > >That'd be particularly true if the mode in use was CW.
> >
> > The child said that before the other child got to operate the station.
That'd be particularly true if the mode in use was CW.

> The
> contest had both HF phone and HF CW modes.

Great. If the mode in use was CW, the kid who didn't know morse
wouldn't be good enough to operate.

> I operated HF phone mode.

Were you good enough?

> > >Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or
> > >QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency
> > >communications.
> >
> > In the contest, you know someone will be there since it is a contest.

Someone is always "there".

> Also,
> this is one skill that happens to overlap. Contesting is a game, not a drill.

No one claimed that contesting is a drill. It is a good way to build
skills needed for emergency communications.

> The focus is to collect contacts, not emergency communications. This > is weak
correlation and you know that.

Yes, your correlation is generally weak but I've allowed for that.

> > >> Hams do not understand thier anti-social nature and that others may
> > >> see them as a cult.
> > >
> > >Others? You mean you? I see you as a one man cult, Vipul.
> >
> > When I said that I was a Ham to a non-Ham, he asked me if Ham radio is some
> > kind of cult, and if they still used Morse code. Seems like some non-Hams can

> see their cult-like nature.

Seems like one guy, if you are to be believed, said that to you. I've now written it about you. By that standard, are you now a cult?

Dave K8MN

895. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 12:25:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512082527.18772.00000526@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 66995

In article <20030511173649.18769.00000544@mb-m21.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030511082538.18769.00000497@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>> The US Army taught me the BEGINNING of radio and electronics
>>> knowledge I've acquired, despite already knowing the basics
>>> before joining the Army voluntarily.
>>
>>Which agrees with what I wrote. So where was I wrong?
>
> Refusing to use the word "beginning" in your original post.

I did not "refuse" to use it. The discussion was about your military
communications experience, and how the Army taught you what you needed to know.

In fact, the words I used were your own words to Jeff Herman, KH6O, back on
3/28/00 , with a simple substitution of your name for his name and "US Army"
for "USCG" (US Coast Guard).
>
> You lie by omission.

No, I don't.

If you insist that I did, then you admit to doing the same thing yourself.

>Not my fault.

Yes, it is.
>
>>>>Len, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in
>>>>the US Army is past for you.
>>>
>>> I got my Good Conduct Ribbon in 1955. That was good
>>> enough for me at that time. :-)
>>>
>>> I got an Honorable Discharge in 1960. No preceding "medical
>>> discharge" that later became "honorable." :-)
>>
>>You live in the past too much. Get out more.
>
> I do get out, why don't you?

You're hung up on events of 40+ years ago.
>

>. I know about the larger world of radio while you are inward-
> focussed only on amateur radio. I worked IN the larger world of
> radio until retirement from regular hours.

So you keep reminding us. But you're not a radio amateur, never even tried to
be one. Yet you want to lecture us endlessly on what is best for amateur radio.
Ho-hum.

> Very few know what
> you work on or at since you won't divulge any such information.
>
It would not make any difference to the validity and truth of my arguments.

I've already offered to tell you all about it, but you won't take me up on the
offer. t.

> All you state is that you graduated with a degree about a quarter
> century ago.

BSEE, 1976. Followed up by MSEE a little over ten years ago.

> That's a long time ago.

Much newer than your military experience.

>>>>That was not amateur radio, it was PROFESSIONAL radio.
>>>
>>> I'd call it MILITARY radio.
>>
>>Were you not paid? That's the definition of professional.
>
> Military tasks require the deliberate KILLING of the enemy.

How many of the enemy did you KILL, Len?
>
> What professions besides the military do you know where
> the main priority is to KILL an enemy?

Hit men.

> I know of no
> professions that do that other than executioners.

You need to get out more.
>
>>> The job also required being able to "close with and destroy
>>> the enemy."
>>
>>How many of the enemy did you close with and destroy?
>
> None.

Well, there you have it.
>

> We were always training for that distinct possibility at any
> time. That was a requirement.

So you trained for something but never actually did it/
>
> It is common for all those who NEVER SERVED to sit back and
> make fun of those who did serve.

Well, that leaves me out, because I don't make fun of people's military
service. You do.

Does the fact that you served give you the right to make fun of others who
served?

>>>>I'm sure that the US Army did
>>>>not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it.
>>>
>>> How can you possibly be "sure?" You've never served.
>>
>>True, true. You could have been unqualified to be in those watches.
>
> The term "on watch" is a nautical one. I was in the Army.

Details, minutiae.

>>And an age requirement for an amateur license, and a complete denial of the
>>role of amateurs in emergency and public service communication, etc., etc.,
>>ad intinitum.
>
> You keep harping on some 1999 subject on 98-143. This is the
> year 2003, four years and four months later.

You keep harping on some 1959 subject. This is the
year 2003, forty four years later.
>
> I don't have a "complete denial of the role of amateurs in
> emergency and public service," but I do object to the over-
> exaggeration and self-important, self-righteous posturing of
> many amateurs implying they are of vital necessity in radio
> communications aid in such situations.

I have never seen you acknowledge that amateur radio has any real role in
emergency or public service communications.

>>> Somehow you've worked yourself up into some mighty morse
>>> lather and want to damn anyone for even suggesting that
>>> the morse code test be eliminated.
>>
>>Not me. Do you see me "damning" K2UNK?
>
> Close to it...

Where?

>>> Heh...it's true I don't have a lot of respect for the ENTIRETY
>>> of the US Department of State and US foreign policy.
>>
>>Nor for individulas.
>
> The word "entirety" includes ALL.

IOW, not for certain individuals who served their country far longer than you did.

>
>>> If ANY veteran of ANY branch of ANY military tries a snow
>>> job in here or makes a lot of vapid vague generalities of any
>>> sort of mighty military "experience," they should be a target
>>> for veteran to practice some live fire.
>>
>>Sounds like a threat.
>
> Live with it, mighty morseman. You NEVER earned any right
> to posture as a military veteran.

I have never claimed to be one. So what's your problem?

896. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 12:25:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF9336.C20AD791@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66996

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >What hamdom sees What Vipul sees
> >
> >operators enjoying radio contacts antisocial behavior
> >
> >amateurs having a good time at a hamfest Fat, old people on parade
> >
> >the comraderie of a Wouff-Hong ceremony A cult
> >
> >a group participating in a club meeting no one designing circuits
> >
> >680,000 U.S. hams doing what they like lack of a EE training camp
>
> Thats right.

Good for you. Admission of your errors is the first step toward inner
renewal.

Dave K8MN

897. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 12:33:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF94F1.8F50992@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66997

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20030511001042.18783.00000437@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <3EBD2883.453E8FC7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>I've only called you a horse's ass because you are a horse's ass. I
> >>recognized that from the road apples you keep dropping here and there in
> >>the newsgroup. Did you ever catch up with the front end of that horse
> >>you're supposed to be following?
> >
> > The above is what
>
> (N2EY)
>
> > condones as "civil behavior?" :-)
> >
> Nope. I'm temprted to call it a fairly accurate description of how you behave
> here, Len, except that would be an insult to horses everywhere. ;-)
>
> Dave, please don't insult the horses. Upsets them almost as much as saying
> "Frau Blucher".

I have to admit that I'm more accustomed to dealing with the front end
of horses. Len's kind of like an inverted Mister Ed.

> >>It'd be just as easy to dimiss any of your friends, Leonard. I figure
> >>that the opinions of anyone who claims you as a friend can't be worth
> >>that much.
> >
> > More PCTA "civility?" :-)
>
> Much more civil than a typical post by you, Len. ;-) ;-)

...and an honest assessment of my perception of Len. I

> >>Len, ever since I began reading this group, you've been rude and
> >>uncivil. You've been doing the demeaning and the insulting and you've
> >>gotten back what you've dished out. You're an unpleasant man.
>
> That's better, Dave. No reason to upset the horses ;-) ;-) ;-)

I think that seven years of observation of Len's behavior toward others
is sufficient time to allow as the basis for forming an opinion. Len

doesn't play well with others.

Dave K8MN

898. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 12:40:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EBF96C4.FA8896CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66998

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> >>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
> >>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >>>Date: 5/10/2003 3:27 PM Central Daylight Time
> >>>Message-id: <20030510162721.18775.00000560@mb-m11.aol.com>
> >>
> >>>don't think Vipul is trolling at all. I think he's just showing us a
> >>>completely different thought process than we're used to.
> >>>
> >>
> >> Would that be the "Ostrich Vision" mode?
> >
> >
> > What hamdom sees What Vipul sees
> >
> > operators enjoying radio contacts antisocial behavior
> >
> > amateurs having a good time at a hamfest Fat, old people on parade
> >
> > the comraderie of a Wouff-Hong ceremony A cult
> >
> > a group participating in a club meeting no one designing circuits
> >
> > 680,000 U.S. hams doing what they like lack of a EE training camp
> >
>
> I was going to do a synopsis, but you did a much better job, Dave.
>
> Allowing the possibility that I was wrong about my thoughts on his
> hatred of Ham radio, I googled all his newsgroup posts. This resulted in
> pretty much what you have here.
>
> So after some thought about why there is such a different perception of
> the ARS between say, most of us here, and Vipul, I came to the following
> conclusions:
>
> 1. He has a tendency to base his conclusions on insufficient input.
>
> This isn't too unusual. Many prospective hams are scared away by a
> crank or two they meet. There are annoying people in every hobby,

> service, sport, whatever. Get over it. Prejudice won't get anyone anywhere.
>
> There are obese Hams. Hams are not obese.

Jim N2EY is reported to be thin.

> There are old Hams. Hams are not old.

Antti OH2KMG is in his early twenties.

> There are White Hams. Hams are not all White.

John WB8WRQ is black.

> There are Male Hames. Hams are not all Male.

Dee N8UZE is a woman.

> I could go on forever.

Len Anderson (no license) does that.

> or.............
>
> 2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll

I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
so unpleasant.

Dave K8MN

899. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 13:17:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512091713.11574.00000239@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 66999

>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/11/2003 8:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030511210549.18770.00000526@mb-m22.aol.com>

>> Perhaps if the help YOU sought was other than your correspondence course
>>trained shrink wife...?!?!
>
> My wife NEVER took any "correspondence courses" to obtain her
> Bachelors or her two Masters degrees.

Too bad, Lennie. Perhaps if she had she could have saved you from the
terrible emotional manifestations you seem to suffer now.

>My wife is not a "shrink."

That's for sure. Married to you, what IS she?

>Counseling in Social Work requires a great deal of applied
> psychology with all patients. Had you bothered to see what is
> required under Social Work curricula and state licensing for
> same you would understand that.

This is a forum about Amateur Radio policy. Had you read the charter YOU
would have known THAT.

>You are not interested in seeing anydamthing, only interested in
> the sociopathic, disrputive, foul-mouthed, foul-minded behavior
> you exhibit in this newsgroup, insulting and trying to demean
> anyone who does not agree with you.

When you're done talking to yourself, Lennie...we're over here...

>...and not stopping to
> attempt any civility, just doing more of the same to targets'
> spouses, families, ancestry, and ethnic origin

I have tried civility with you, Lennie...YEARS ago. Publically apologized
for mean comments, only to have you rub my nose in it.

THAT won't happen again.

>Is that a fine, noble attitude to display to the world as an AMATEUR
> Extra Class licensee?

Substitute "professional radio engineer" and ask yourself the same
question, Lennie.

>That isn't an attitude for a civilized human being.

That's what I've been saying. Now what are you going to do to fix it?

Steve, K4YZ

900. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 14:21:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9oalutgm0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 67000

Dave Heil wrote:

> Len doesn't play well with others.

And the evidence is darn scant that he even plays well by himself.

901. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 14:52:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EBFB53E.4050601@psu.edu>
Source record: 67001

Vshah101 wrote:
> From K4YZ:
>
>
>>Nothing must be followed "exactly" except as directed by the Federal
>>Communications Commission.
>
>
> Contests, while not FCC rules, should be followed exactly. The thing that makes
> it a cult is the arbitrary rules to "work" certain segments to collect points.

Lets try to make some sense of this, Vipul.

Which contest was this? It is easy to pull up the rules to most
contests. we can find out what the deal was with the "improper contacts.

What was it that made the contacts improper?

For instance, I participated in the NEQP the other week. I answered a
CQ. Turns out the person I answered was in Virginia. Since I was in
Pennsylvania, the QSO did not count. The reason? At least one of the
stations had to be in one of the New England states. It sounds arbitrary
until you consider that it is a State (regional) QSO party. The goal is
to contact as many counties in the region as possible, and secondarily
have as many QSO's as possible.

Each contact is worth so many points (determined by mode used)

Each county is considered a multiplier. every new county worked advances
the multiplier by one.

Each State is a multiplier. Same as the counties.

At the end of the contest, you take the points times the multipliers,
and there is the score.

As for 10-10 numbers, it wouldn't make sense to exchange them in a
contest in which they were irrelevant. It would be like exchanging the
year we were first licensed in a contest where we were supposed to
exchange the county we were in.

I think you were making a judgement on insufficient data here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

902. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 16:01:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9oggr$3mo$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67002

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:b9mrof$ik2$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
> news:tBgua.247575$Si4.196455@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> > Hello Vito .....
> >
> > Shelfish ...well some people are allergic to that stuff just like they
are
> > not motivated to even try at 5 WPM a mode which offers a simple elegant
> > means of communication.
>
> Gee, why not also make 'em type on an old-fashioned Kleinschmidt
and
> wind Baudot paper tape from thumb to little finger in an oh-so-elegant
> figure-8? Makes every bit as much sense.
>
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/2003
>
>

Baudot is still being used on a daily basis in ham radio, and probably
elsewhere for that matter.

Just because its old don't make it useless.

Dan/W4NTI

903. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 16:47:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305120847.5e800ec9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67003

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<b9mv9i$vt8@library2.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030511082539.18769.00000498@mb-m25.aol.com...
> > In article <b9kfci$8na@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >Did you hear the NPR interview with the author of a new book, "The Iron
> > >Triangle" and then the interview with the public spokesperson for the
> > >Carlisle Group?
> >
> > I think I missed that one, Kim. Can you summarize for us?
> >
> > There was an excellent Terry Gross interview with the author of a book on
> the
> > 1919 Treaty of Paris negotiations that formally ended WW1 - and alos
> carved up
> > the old Ottoman Empire.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Sorry 'bout that, had the wrong spelling for "Carlisle;" it's actually
> Carlyle. Anyway, here's the synopsis from the NPR website:
>
> "May 6, 2003
>
> Author of The Iron Triangle: Inside the Secret World of the Carlyle Group
> (Wiley). The Carlyle Group is one of the most powerful and well-connected
> private equity firms in the world. Its investments -- most notably -- in
> timely defense and aerospace industries has made it highly profitable. The
> group's roster includes or has included former President George Bush, Sr.,
> (advisor), former Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci (former chairman),
> Saudi Arabian Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal (investor) and former Secretary of
> State, James Baker III (managing director and senior counselor). Briody
> writes that the Carlyle Group "operates within the so-called iron triangle
> of industry, government, and the military" and that it "leaves itself open
> to any number of conflicts of interest and stunning ironies." "
>
> I believe it was both the author and, later, the Spokesperson for the
> Carlyle Group that were on Fresh Air. A Synopsis is the topic was about the
> revolving door between the govt. and defense industry, and the topic of
> conflict of interest. The interview is available from

http://discover.npr.org/features/feature.jhtml?wfId=1253480.

Kim,

Thanks for the link!

It can be listened to over the net via Windows Media Player or Real Player.

Fascinating interview! Terry Gross does a very balanced & thorough job.

73 de Jim, N2EY

904. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 17:48:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512134831.18759.00000829@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67005

In article <20030511190044.29158.00000192@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker of the Let's Pretend Radio Show) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511173647.18769.00000543@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>> You keep repeating this, Lennie, but at no time was a "medical" discharge
>>>anything LESS than Honorable.
>>
>> Then why didn't you get an Honorable right away?
>
> I did, Lennie. Why do you keep asserting otherwise?

Because of your own words in here.

An Honorable Discharge is NOT the same as a Medical Discharge.

If they were the same then there would not be two different documents.

>> You've claimed your Medical Discharge was due to an "accident."
>
> Yep.

You can't have it both ways. Make up your fantasy mind.

You said you got a Medical Discharge first, due to an "accident."

Later on you said it was the "same" as an Honorable.

>>Nobody in here has verified that. Medical Discharges are also
>> given for psychiatric problems in the military service.
>
> Was that YOUR reason for terminating so brilliant a career?

I retired at age 65. Not a problem.

When I enlisted voluntarily in the US Army, ALL who entered Army service regardless of being a compulsory or volunteer, were contracted for an 8-year term. After an active duty period, the remainder of the 8-year term was spent in reserves.

>>> Again you've been caught lying. Why do you persist in lying?
>>
>> No lies from me.

>
> Oh? Your correspondence course trained shrink wife does this for you
>then?

There is NO one here who is "correspondence course trained," and
you've had it explained about education adequately in a previous
message.

You continue with stalking, baiting, personal insults about my wife as
well as about me.

That is reprehensible conduct by any human being.

>>Robeson insists on calling all statements contrary to his Beliefs
>> as "lies."
>
> Something is a "lie" when it's meaning is inherently false. You make
>frequent and obvious false sttements.

No. I make neither false statements nor "sttements"
(whatever the latter is).

You cannot blithely label someone as a "liar" without showing
proof of such "lying."

You are digging yourself deeper into a pit of fantasy existance that
exists only in your imagination.

>>That is abnormal behavior and doesn't require any
>> "degree qualifications" to understand.
>
> You're right. It doesn't. That's why I am not the only person inhere
>who calls you for what you are...a liar.

There are others in here as well as "inhere" who have the same
affliction for Orwellian "Newspeak." They also want to call truth
as "lies" when such truth does not fit their Beliefs.

>>> Hmmmmm....Nothing in any era-specific radio clerk training manuals say
>>>ANYTHING about "closing with the enemy".
>>
>> 1. I was never any "radio clerk" while in the US Army.
>
> Uh huh.

I'm glad that you are capable of some agreement, however slight.

Feel free to check with NARA on my Army service record.

Army Serial Number RA16408336

>>3. There are NO "radio clerk training manuals" to be found in
>> the US Army Training and Doctrine Command listings of
>> FMs, TMs, or other documents now, nor in the past.
>

> Maybe that's why you were so inadequately trained.

You have NO experience in military radio communications and
cannot judge what is adequate or inadequate in military
radio communications of the USA.

There were NO "radio clerk" MOSs in the US Army in the 1950s
or now. There were somewhat similar MOSs in the US Army
of the 1950s but those pertain only to NON-radio clerking jobs.

My training was adequate for all jobs that needed to be done:
Fixed Station Transmitter, Carrier Equipment, Radio Relay
and finally Microwave Radio Relay. All with combined operations
and maintenance at supervisory rank.

>>4. Robeson's military service was in the USMC, not the Army.
>
> I see...Only LENNIE can cross military roles and be accurate?

I've had OVER 50 years of exposure to all branches of the US
military, first as a US Army soldier-signalman for 4 years, then
as an electronics engineer on-site at many US military
installations, all branches, while working in electronics
corporations after 1956. I stay informed on many things,
factual data rather than emotion-driven fantasies of greatness
and play-acting...as you do.

>> 5. Robeson did not claim or imply any military radio
>> communications duties nor was he able to state any
>> military radio equipment by name or nomenclature,
>> formal or familiar.
>
> I have. You just choose to ignore it.

You have not. You should have known about the basic small-
unit radio system in use in US land-air forces that has been
operational for 14 years. You should have known about its two
predecessors. You've not mentioned word-one about any of
them. One of the two computer training aids in operation of the
basic US land-air radio system was written by the USMC and
has been in use at the Army's Signal Center at Fort Gordon for
at least 4 years. Both are and have been public release items
for that length of time. You've not mentioned word-one about the
supplementary HF radio systems used by US military land
forces (both USA and USMC) for several years yet you claim
to have done so. All you've done on such mentions is to say
you could not mention them in detail because those are "secret."
That's nonsense since details of name, nomenclature, general
details, manufacturer, contract award monies and duration has
been public knowledge since the first bids. Such has been public
in the USA as long as you've been alive.

> And what part of it you
>"acknowledged" you simply made fun of or tried to denigrate.

I've only made fun of your attempts at LIES, sins of omission,
FALSE information, snow jobs, and fish stories you've done
because there is NO verification or valid reference to any of
your military radio communications claims.

> Keep telling yourself that, Lennie. Repeat it over and over. It still
>won't make it any more accurate, but it will make you FEEL better for having
>done it, and that's all that counts.

I will continue to expose your bluffing and lying, continuing to post
references and true public data about REAL world radio
communications. Your only references to radio seem to be QST
or Popular Communications and "facts" from ham radio
advertisements.

>>Robeson stated that he had "seven hostile actions." Those three
>> words convey nothing definite. They are vague vapor.
>
> Kinda like your "Extra lite out of the box" comments, Lennie?

Absolutely NOT.

Not only do you bluff and lie about overall radio knowledge and
testing but your disordered mental fantasy cannot differentiate
between situations of military service and amateur hobby
activities.

Now, describe WHERE and WHEN those "seven hostile actions"
took place and provide a reference to the validity of that claim or
admit you were bluffing, lying, and stop with such tale-telling.

>>No. I've stated no lies, committed no "misdeeds."
>
> You may continue to repeat THAT to yourself too, Lennie...And it still
>won't make THAT any more accurate either.

Your mental state is not rational, cannot differentiate between
reality and the fantasy of your imagination.

What I've said as to factual data and information is all, repeat
ALL referencible. I've given such references in here, continually
since I began posting. Some are not easy-to-get-at references
but can be found and verified. I try to limit references to the
easiest to "get at" in the form of websites...for others to verify
for themselves.

As to OPINIONS, those vary with individuals and one person's
opinion is no more "valid" than anothers. You apparently cannot
understand that since you constantly express your personal
opinion as "truth," thereby making opposite opinions "lies." That's
a fantasy, a mental problem common to all self-righteous people
who refuse to accept other points of view.

You constantly confuse factual data with the fantasy of your own
opinions.

>>I have all the names of the 71st Signal Service Battalion personnel
>> who were casualties...(SNIP)
>
> I am sure you do.
>
> Have you sent that letter to their families apologizing for using them as
>opportunities for embellishing your own meager service record, Lennie?

That's a disgusting little statement, unworthy of a rational human
being let alone a veteran of the military.

I've honored their memory, not only in words but in military
ceremonies such as Retreat (lowering of the US flag at sundown).

My US military service record is archived at NARA. It is detailed,
honest, no lies, distortions, or untruths. There is not the slightest
condemnation by anyone or any agency in it. It is not extra-
ordinary but it does indicate I received promotion in rank almost
as soon as I was eligible after time-in-rank. Thousands after
thousands of us served in the same signal battalion, doing our
duty during a time of active war followed by uneasy truce, then
continuing with our lives afterwards. I've been in communication
with five of those veterans since, plus one civilian employee
of the Army, later the Air Force, for shared interests in a single
small organization and the part it played in the larger world of
radio communications...and some kinship of all contributing to
the sucesses of our tasks. We did no Great Deeds, were not
deserving of high battle-won medals of valor...we just did our
jobs well, did them as required, kept the communications
running "24/7" for years, serving our country.

None of us, Army or Air Force or a few civilians, are worthy of
the condemnation, hatred, bitterness, and contempt of others
who came later or were never in the military service.

>>Without any references, vague vaporous statements are nothing
>> but LIES.
>
> If you insist, Lennie. While were at it, we're still waiting on YOUR
>"extra lite" to show up on the database.

Not a requirement to serve one's country in any future.

US amateur radio is NOT a military service, never was.

There is NO "extra lite" in any "database" other than some
brewery.

Robeson has NOT supplied the WHEN and WHERE of his
claimed "seven hostile actions." If he does, then he must
provide references where anyone can verify his claims.

No references, no validity mean just LIES, exaggerations,
fish stories, snow jobbing.

Put up or shut up, Robeson.

905. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 17:48:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512134837.18759.00000830@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67004

In article <20030511133311.28341.00000255@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>> So why let it bother you so much?
>
>K4YZ must defend amateur radio whenever possible. Thats his noble cause.

I don't think so. By four years of nearly uninterrupted posting, he defends only Himself and His Viewpoints.

He only accepts those who think alike with Him.

With such an attitude anything He does is "noble," but only to his imagination.

906. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 19:16:35 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@BARFlivesforever.net>
Message-ID: <b9orur$h6o$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67006
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian,

You REALLY need to overcome your obsession with
K1MAN.

Herb

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305120605.420b6326@posting.google.com...
>
> Teaching at Baghdad U would be a fitting position for the Belgrade
> Blowhard, but he is much too busy in his other "position" playing
> cabin boy for Chris No-Coq. The powers that be are tightening the
> net... taking notes, making recordings and taking names.
>
> Old Boo-Hoo is going down (and I don't mean just on Chris and Joe).
> Mike may be losing his voice priviliges for two years, but old Boo Hoo
> will never key a ham radio again after Riley cleans his clock!
>
> The boy broadcaster is like a fish gasping for breath... going
> going... gone!

907. Re: Unblocking Cell Block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 20:27:31 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <TsTva.6346$MN5.2014@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67007

There are radios that can be purchased without the cell blocking. You would have to have a purpose for it such as EMC/EMI applications. The ones I know of sold for around $60,000 in 1995 dollars, so I suspect they are a bit more expensive today. Perhaps you'd rather buy a Porsche?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Amaretto" <someone@somewhere.com> wrote in message
news:b9mgsu$100$1@news.doit.wisc.edu...
> Hello. I am interested in upgrading my BC-60XLT to something more
> comprehensive here in the USA. I was wondering if there are new scanners
> sold in the USA with cell blocking such that--using either software or
> hardware manipulation--the cell blocking could be removed. It is possible
> to have legal intentions; say, if a person purchased a scanner in the USA
> then wanted to bring it to Japan. Regardless, if anyone knows of a model
> and method of manipulation that would be excellent!
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/03

908. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 20:30:30 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <FvTva.6348$DO5.6222@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67008

Len,

Thanks for a pleasant trip down memory lane. I appreciated your thoughts
even though some flames apparently had to appear :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
ps - you are correct about the UHF. Good add to the thread.

".

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/03

909. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 22:04:43 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0305121404.1581ad42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67009
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard W" <Sigs@nononnetanon.net> wrote in message news:<b9jujr$gf8$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > I wasn't aware there was a group of unlicensed truckers using 3.898. A
> > new one on me...But no matter. They are "sick-bird" ops, IE:
> > ill-eagle, and their views don't count. No one cares what they think.
> > I hope Riley takes a big dump on them. And yes, they generally don't
> > have time to go after unlicensed ops's unless they start causing a
> > noticable ruckus. But getting 2 kc away from a wx net will bring the
> > heat down on them mucho fast. The FCC has the ability to easily find
> > these guys IF they really want to. MK
>
> Not really. The commission cannot "easily" find someone, even
> when they want to. Example. We had some nut case get on
> air traffic control frequencies here for weeks! Yes weeks. FCC
> had several people in town and could not locate the guy. The
> nut case's radio signals were finally tracked down by another agency,
> using techniques the commission does not possess. Sorry, I know
> I am being vague on purpose. I don't want some nut to read details
> here in a public forum and make it that much more difficult for the
> authorities to locate him next time. Bottom line, the commission
> tried for weeks to locate the guy and failed. No FCC news release
> this time. They were just as glad to sweep the whole thing under
> the carpet. And the outfit that found the guy is not in the habit
> of putting out news releases for any reason.
>
> Rich W
> (Scanner enthusiast since 1955)

Sounds more like the local agents incompetence rather than the fcc as
a whole. They don't seem to have as much trouble here. We had a couple
of squirrels jamming a repeater here, and they did it from mobiles.
The fcc sure had no trouble locating them. They came up and tapped on
his window while he was talking sitting in a parking lot. I wasn't
there, but I wouldn't be surprised if he made a mess on his seats.
They also had no trouble tracking an "11m freebander" friend of mine.
Didn't take them long at all. I know "myself", I wouldn't have any
trouble tracking these people. If I can do it, the fcc should be able
to do it better. Being the air bands are VHF, and line of sight, if
they couldn't find that guy, they need to go back to "tracking
school". That should have been a piece of cake, as the other agency
apparently showed them. I would have been embarrassed too...:/

910. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 22:30:04 UTC
From: Henry <henry@wsimconews.org>
Message-ID: <b9p79p$r71$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67010
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
news:25eb70d7.0305121404.1581ad42@posting.google.com...
>>
> Sounds more like the local agents incompetence rather than the fcc as
> a whole. They don't seem to have as much trouble here. We had a couple
> of squirrels jamming a repeater here, and they did it from mobiles.
> The fcc sure had no trouble locating them. They came up and tapped on
> his window while he was talking sitting in a parking lot. I wasn't
> there, but I wouldn't be surprised if he made a mess on his seats.
> They also had no trouble tracking an "11m freebander" friend of mine.
> Didn't take them long at all. I know "myself", I wouldn't have any
> trouble tracking these people. If I can do it, the fcc should be able
> to do it better. Being the air bands are VHF, and line of sight, if
> they couldn't find that guy, they need to go back to "tracking
> school". That should have been a piece of cake, as the other agency
> apparently showed them. I would have been embarrassed too...:/

And your "story" sounds like wishful thinking on your part,
a fairy tale. It doesn't take much to see how you deliberately
left out any verifiable details. 11m freebander? Yeah right,
like they're going to waste their time. Ditto with amateur
repeaters, they don't waste their time. Post proof. How
about a news release reference for starters. And where did
all this supposedly happen? Nice try, but your "story" is
just a truck load of Bullshit.

Henry

911. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 22:34:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.heqkunb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67011

On 11 May 2003 21:00:23 GMT, Jeffrey Herman wrote:

>>You gave got to be kidding. All five de-volunteered themselves
>>for that assignment in the future, just as I de-voluntered
>>myself from riding aboard a USCG 46-footer again after a
>>morning of running some water-borne field strength measurments
>>in San Francisco Bay quite a while ago.
>
>We don't have 46 footers; 41, 44, or 47, but no 46 footers.
>The first two digits of the hull number indicate a UTB's length.

This was thirty years ago. My details could have been
"time-degraded". It probably was a 41-footer.

We were measuring the field pattern of a MF (468 kHz as I
remember it) vertical antenna on a cargo vessel as the vessel
steamed a fairly tight circle in San Francisco Bay and we were
keeping radar station on that vessel. I remember it vividly
because it was my birthday.

--

73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

912. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 22:40:43 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <LpVva.860928$S_4.877248@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 67012

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b9oggr$3mo$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:b9mrof$ik2$1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
> > news:tBgua.247575$Si4.196455@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> > > Hello Vito .....
> > >
> > > Shelfish ...well some people are allergic to that stuff just like they
> are
> > > not motivated to even try at 5 WPM a mode which offers a simple
elegant
> > > means of communication.
> >
> > Gee, why not also make 'em type on an old-fashioned Kleinschmidt
> and
snip ......

Hello Robert .... I couldn't even put this in the non-sequitur bin. I use a key board all the time..straight baudot etc. FEC is a very under utilized mode with which I have had a lot of fun with over the years. Unfortunately my PK 232 bit the dust and all my attempts at repair have failed. Also unfortunately is the fact that my tower and antennas are coming down after 28 years. I will be on with a $3 dollar piece of wire and having fun on ...you guessed it CW with my K2. It is a shame Bob that you couldn't muster the meager effort to pass 5 WPM. I say this because of a lack of a call after Robert. Either that or you are ashamed of your call ...either way I would like to work you qrp one cold winter night with the mellow sounds cont. wave.

I'll be waiting ....God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr Pittsburgh

913. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 23:20:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9paad$h66$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67013

>
> I'll be waiting ....God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr
Pittsburgh
>
>

Dont waste your breath trying to convert the unwashed Tom. Sorry your
dropping the beam. But I have worked with wires for years. It can be done.

See ya some cold winter night. I'll be listening for the sailors swing and
the slight chirp on my 50 year old Halliscratcher and single tube 807 tx.

Dan/W4NTI

914. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-12 23:25:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512192544.06007.00000249@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 67014

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/12/2003 12:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030512134831.18759.00000829@mb-m04.aol.com>

>> I did, Lennie. Why do you keep asserting otherwise?
>
> Because of your own words in here.
>
> An Honorable Discharge is NOT the same as a Medical Discharge.

Sure it is. I ahe an Honorable Discharge. It was due to medical reasons.

Sorry. You may argue with DoD on this if you acare to..thier rules. Sorry
they didn't clear it through you first.

>If they were the same then there would not be two different
> documents.

It's not two diferent documents. One DD214. One Honorable Discharge.

>>> You've claimed your Medical Discharge was due to an "accident."
>>
>> Yep.
>
> You can't have it both ways. Make up your fantasy mind.

No fantasy. One document. Honorable with a medical code. Sorry
again,.Your Putziness. I wudda had the USMC call you first if I thought it was
going to give you so bad a case of heartburn.

>You said you got a Medical Discharge first, due to an "accident."

Not "first". Same time. If I didn't give yuo "all the details", too bad.
I didn't think a fellow Veteran was going to try and make some "federal case"
out of it.

>Later on you said it was the "same" as an Honorable.

I is the same. Sorry.

>I retired at age 65. Not a problem.

Not from the Armed Forces you didn't.

>There is NO one here who is "correspondence course trained," and
> you've had it explained about education adequately in a previous
> message.

"Explained" is one thing. "Believed" is another. Form YOUR conduct in this forum, I cannot accept that she is very competent nor observant of your behaviour.

>You continue with stalking, baiting, personal insults about my wife as
> well as about me.

I am not stalking. You post in a public forum. I respond. YOU bring up your wife, her education an alleged credentials. I respond. If you don't want that discussed here, then don't bring it Lennie.

>That is reprehensible conduct by any human being.

Let's see...YOU brought your wife into the forum. Who would subject a spouse they love to such ridicule knowing the nature of this forum (especially from the ay YOU act)...?!?!

YOU are in a forum of a radio service for which you are NOT a licensee and show great contempt for those that are...Who's "stalking" who?

You attempt to shine your brass on the deaths of Army servicemen who died in combat, then have the temerity to accuse others of "vaporous" service duties.

Yeah...something's reprehensible here, Lennie...but it isn't me.

>No. I make neither false statements nor "sttements"
> (whatever the latter is).

Lying about lying. That's funny.

>You cannot blithely label someone as a "liar" without showing
> proof of such "lying."

You (with the assistance of Google, and Deja before it...) do that for me, Lennie. All I need to do on any particular topic is refer you back to your own words. Got that Extra Lite yet?

>You are digging yourself deeper into a pit of fantasy existance that
> exists only in your imagination.

Got that Extra Lite yet?

>There are others in here as well as "inhere" who have the same
> affliction for Orwellian "Newspeak." They also want to call truth
> as "lies" when such truth does not fit their Beliefs.

My "Bleiefs" are that when you say something that is not truthful, it is a lie. Websters and several other sources prove me correct in this matter.

You have uttered numerous "mistruths" in this forum, thier many number being brought to light by numerous other persons. So who's digging who into what pit of fantasy existence?

>>>4. Robeson's military service was in the USMC, not the Army.
>>
>> I see...Only LENNIE can cross military roles and be accurate?

>
> I've had OVER 50 years of exposure to all branches of the US
> military...(SNIP)

Ahhhh...EXPOSURE! THAT makes you qualified on explicit details of all the services!

Now...Tell us about Navy And Air Force "MOS's" again...?!?!

>You have not. You should have known about the basic small-
> unit radio system in use in US land-air forces that has been
> operational for 14 years. You should have known about its two
> predecessors. You've not mentioned word-one about any of
> them.

Why? Are they germane to Amateur Radio Policy? PLEASE tell us one more time just how SINCGARS implementation is pertinent to Amateur radio policy?

>You've not mentioned word-one about the
> supplementary HF radio systems used by US military land
> forces (both USA and USMC) for several years yet you claim
> to have done so. All you've done on such mentions is to say
> you could not mention them in detail because those are "secret."

No, I have not. I have said I won't discuss such things furhter because they are not germane to this forum. Unlike you, I realize that my time in the service, while fulfilling and productive, were not contributory to Amateur Radio.

That I was on several operational missions that I was proud to have been part of was part and parcel of those years. That I cannot or willnot discuss them with you is irrelevent. That you think them "vaporous" is een more irrelevent

Besides, it ticks you off to no end that I won't contribute to your rant fuel, ergo it stays shelved!

I am not laughing with yuo, Lennie...I am laughing AT you.

>I've only made fun of your attempts at LIES, sins of omission,
> FALSE information, snow jobs, and fish stories you've done
> because there is NO verification or valid reference to any of
> your military radio communications claims.

So far all you can do is whine about my unwillingness to give up details. On the otherhand, you have given up details on things that gave you away.

>I will continue to expose your bluffing and lying, continuing to post
> references and true public data about REAL world radio
> communications.

If you think that somehow contributes to specific details about Amateur Radio policy, then it's YOUR time being wasted, not mine, Lennie.

>Your only references to radio seem to be QST
> or Popular Communications and "facts" from ham radio
> advertisements.

Gee whiz, and I thought this was ABOUT Amateur radio.

>>Kinda like your "Extra lite out of the box" comments, Lennie?
>
> Absolutely NOT.

Absolutely yes. You have lied about that for years now. A lie is a lie.

>Not only do you bluff and lie about overall radio knowledge and
> testing but your disordered mental fantasy cannot differentiate
> between situations of military service and amateur hobby
> activities.

I HAVE been in the Armed Forces and WAS a part of military communications for a part of it. I AM licensed in the Amateur Radio service and ACTIVELY participate in on-the-air activities and off-the-air programs and practices.

>Now, describe WHERE and WHEN those "seven hostile actions"
> took place and provide a reference to the validity of that claim or
> admit you were bluffing, lying, and stop with such tale-telling.

And how are they germane to Amatuer Radio policy, Lennie? How is ANY "military service" germane, unless you care to discuss MARS, CAP, SHARES or Coast Guard Auxiliary activities that may involve some number of Amatuer licensees...?!?!

>Your mental state is not rational, cannot differentiate between
> reality and the fantasy of your imagination.

Please tell us again how your years in the 71st are relative to what's going on in here?

>What I've said as to factual data and information is all, repeat
> ALL referencible.

Much of it is, to your credit...just enough for you to try and slide the baloney in between. We keep catching you with the baloney, Lennie, and that's what sinks you EVERY time.

>> Have you sent that letter to their families apologizing for using them
>as
>>opportunities for embellishing your own meager service record, Lennie?
>
> That's a disgusting little statement, unworthy of a rational human
> being let alone a veteran of the military.

HAVE you apologized to them for the cowardly use of their memory, Lennie? THAT is disgusting...not anything I have said to expose your horrific abuse of their deaths.

Enough for now, Lennie...I grow tired of your sillines for one day.

Steve, K4YZ

915. Re: The Ultimate Mobile Rig for Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 01:30:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030512213040.18828.00000959@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67016

In article <b9o2tn$lcrrl$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>Yeah... that is one to look at. Might even look at those Geo series of
>cars. I enjoy my truck, but am considering getting a second vehicle for
>those routine trips such as driving to work etc., where the enjoyment of a
>truck is not a big requirement. Actually I am looking a getting a
>motorcycle (not sure what type/style/manufacturer yet) as those seem to get
>great mpg's as well.
>
>My necessary mileage on the average week is around 300 miles, and another
>100-200 of "recreational" mileage.
>

Ryan:

Well, motorcycles are fun, but they leave a lot to be desired in inclement
weather, and are not something I'd rely on for primary transportation.

Corollas are infinitely better than Geo's. Period. End of story. If you want
horror stories about Geo's and good information about the Toyota Corolla,
try the Owner's Forum at www.corolland.com (yes, "corolland" is spelled
correctly).

73 de Larry, K3LT

916. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 01:43:07 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <L4Yva.826781$F1.104315@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 67017

Hi Dan .... no difficulty with the wires ...just got off of 40 and I enjoy stuff that's a mile away as much as I do the DX ... not going to move the tower as it is not a fold over and it is at 50 feet which is about 47 feet too high for me. I have a fellow who is interested in the TH-6 and the tower but I am going to keep the rotor as I may put up a crank up -tilt over or a similar mast. Will try a quad this time if any. I did get a lot of use with this setup but I will be on. We will have to set up a sked Dan after I am in place at the new QTH which is about 20 miles south of here.

God Bless catch you on the air Dan ....Tom KI3R
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b9paad$h66$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> >
> > I'll be waiting ....God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr
> Pittsburgh
> >
> >
>
> Dont waste your breath trying to convert the unwashed Tom. Sorry your
> dropping the beam. But I have worked with wires for years. It can be
done.
>
> See ya some cold winter night. I'll be listening for the sailors swing
and
> the slight chirp on my 50 year old Halliscratcher and single tube 807 tx.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

917. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:09:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LtYva.14$sh5.10665@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67015

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030511210128.20149.00000179@mb-m13.aol.com...
> Quote:
> "This anyway makes the hobby prone to be called a cult."
>
> http://www.qsl.net/vu2kyp/news.html
>
> Click on "Delhi slice of HAM" article, in Hindustan Times, about Indians
in Ham
> radio.

Boy are you way off base. You took the quote entirely out of context. For one thing, the author of the article overall is talking about all the good things of ham radio.

Secondly the only item that he was talking about when he made this statement is that in India, the knowledge of the existence of ham radio is spread primarily by word of mouth mainly to friends and relatives. However notice that he did not say it was a cult only that it might be called that. And he did not indicate that he himself was prone to think that way. Nor did he indicate that he had ever heard any non-hams refer to it that way.

Third, the author has only talked to hams in India and only to a limited number there at best. There is no reason to apply the results of his interviews to the hobby in other countries. Matter of fact it can really be applied to hams in India as the sample is too small to be statistically valid.

Fourth, the author appears to have no personal background in amateur radio.

Sheesh, talk about trying to twist an article to one's own viewpoint, you sure try hard.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Fifth, was this article originally printed in English or was it a translation from some other language. Translating is often inaccurate. There is nothing with the article to indicate what language it was compose in.

918. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:24:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512222419.11670.00000205@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67019

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>What
>kind of moron sticks to something he so obviously detests?

K4YZ.

>It's pretty hard to socialize while cycling.

Not if you carry HTs while doing so.

>> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
>
>I see. This is another version of "one definition for Vipul, another
>meaning for the rest of humanity".

No, its most of "humanity" that decides the definition, allowing for common
sense. The weird people, Hams, do not decide for themselves.

Common sense is allowed. For example an activity that has never been done
before may be innovative, not weird.

919. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:28:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512222802.11670.00000206@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67020

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>What was it that made the contacts improper?

>As for 10-10 numbers, it wouldn't make sense to exchange them in a
>contest in which they were irrelevant

>I think you were making a judgement on insufficient data here.

No, the adult was not talking about the contest. I understood perfectly what he said. He explained that 10-10 contacts were not desireable any time, contest or not.

Its because it did not fit proper Ham traditions.

920. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:33:31 UTC
From: Doug Graves <res0pxse@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <%PYva.8361$Ur1.7451@nwrddc03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 67021
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Oh but they do go after repeater interference.

March 24, 2003

Mr. Anthony L. Basile
RD 2 Box 164C
Cherrytree, PA 15724

RE: Warning Notice: Amateur Radio license N3HFB
Case #EB-2003-566

Dear Mr. Basile:

Monitoring information before the Commission indicates that you have been deliberately interfering with the N3HAO (147.39 MHz), KE3DR (146.655 MHz) and N3QC (146.865 MHz) repeater systems in your area. The interference has consisted, among other things, of keying the repeater repeatedly without communications.

Continued incidents of such interference to the above repeaters, or to any other Amateur communications, will subject you to revocation and suspension proceedings, as well as a monetary forfeiture. Fines normally range from $7,500 to $10,000.

We note that your license is due for renewal in September 2003. Until this matter is resolved, your license will not be routinely renewed.

Please call me at 717-338-2502 if you have any questions about this matter.

CC: Northeast Regional Director, FCC

And are going after any unlicensed operation in the Ten Meter Amateur Band

TO:
Chuck Skolaut, Field & Regulatory Correspondent
American Radio Relay League

FROM:
W. Riley Hollingsworth, Special Counsel
Enforcement Bureau

SUBJECT:
Unlicensed incursion into the Ten Meter Amateur Band

DATE:
April 28, 2003

This referral is made pursuant to Section 4(f)(4)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(f)(4)(B), and the "Amended Agreement Between the Field Operations Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission and the American Radio Relay League, Inc. Regarding the Use of Amateur Volunteers.

We request the assistance of the ARRL Auxiliary in identifying, over the next 6 months (May through October), any unlicensed operation in the Ten Meter Amateur Band, whether from business entities including trucking companies, truckers or other individuals operating domestically. We do not request direction finding, but would appreciate, where possible, the names and cities of the operators, and license plate numbers and state if from a vehicle.

Please use your best judgment as to whether to include tapes, and please use case number 2003-583

Thank you

"Henry" <henry@wsimconews.org> wrote in message
news:b9p79p$r71$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
> news:25eb70d7.0305121404.1581ad42@posting.google.com...
> >>
> > Sounds more like the local agents incompetence rather than the fcc as
> > a whole. They don't seem to have as much trouble here. We had a couple
> > of squirrels jamming a repeater here, and they did it from mobiles.
> > The fcc sure had no trouble locating them. They came up and tapped on
> > his window while he was talking sitting in a parking lot. I wasn't
> > there, but I wouldn't be surprised if he made a mess on his seats.
> > They also had no trouble tracking an "11m freebander" friend of mine.
> > Didn't take them long at all. I know "myself", I wouldn't have any
> > trouble tracking these people. If I can do it, the fcc should be able
> > to do it better. Being the air bands are VHF, and line of sight, if
> > they couldn't find that guy, they need to go back to "tracking
> > school". That should have been a piece of cake, as the other agency
> > apparently showed them. I would have been embarrassed too...:/
>
>
> And your "story" sounds like wishful thinking on your part,
> a fairy tale. It doesn't take much to see how you deliberately
> left out any verifiable details. 11m freebander? Yeah right,
> like they're going to waste their time. Ditto with amateur
> repeaters, they don't waste their time. Post proof. How
> about a news release reference for starters. And where did
> all this supposedly happen? Nice try, but your "story" is
> just a truck load of Bullshit.
>
> Henry
>
>

>
>

921. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:44:40 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512224440.11670.00000207@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67023

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> >> A child that doesn't know
>> >> CW is "not good enough".
>> >
>> >That'd be particularly true if the mode in use was CW.

Seems like you misunderstood. The child said this well before any contest began. He meant the other child was "not good enough" as a Ham for not learning CW. I was surprised to hear the child saay that.

I think you understood, but are trying to justify what the child said.

>> >Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or
>> >QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency
>> >communications.

> It is a good way to build
>skills needed for emergency communications.

Chance correlation of a few skills is not preparation. Emergency comm involves many skills, most of which are not used in contests.

This is dangerous if you actually believe that. Real emergency skills involve many elements which are not part of contests.

Or do you know that and are trying to mis-inform?

>Seems like one guy, if you are to be believed, said that to you.

He's one of the few non-Hams that knew enough about it to know its a cult. I'll be many spouses of Hams (that are not also Hams) also feel its a cult too.

922. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:46:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <K%Yva.20$sh5.19981@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67018

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:LtYva.14$sh5.10665@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

... Matter of fact it can NOT really be applied to hams in India as the
sample is too small to be statistically valid ...

Typo correction for my previous post.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

923. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:47:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512224727.11670.00000208@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67024

>From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> >What hamdom sees What Vipul sees

<list snipped>

>Good for you. Admission of your errors is the first step toward inner
>renewal.

Who said they were errors. It just shows that there are two ways to view the situations you mentioned.

924. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:48:23 UTC
From: Henry <henry@wsimconews.org>
Message-ID: <b9pmdkncb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Doug Graves" <res0pxse@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:%PYva.8361$Ur1.7451@nwrddc03.gnilink.net...
> Oh but they do go after repeater interference.
>
> <<<drivel snipped>>>>>

<<<plonk>>>

<<<drivel flushed>>>

And your point is?

925. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 02:59:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512225926.11670.00000209@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67026

>From: Dave Heil k8mn

Dave Heil found some Hams;
one that is thin,
one that is an EE,
one that is black,
one that is a woman.

Please not that these are exceptions. One can find exceptions in many groups. There are a high majority of Hams that fit a different demographic than these exceptions.

Also, for the overweight part, I never claimed a majority of Hams are overweight. Just that a significantly higher percentage of Hams are overweight than the general poplulation.

The Ham radio hobby has something to do with this. Please note that I met with <random> Hams. So, I had NO influence on whether they were overweight.

>I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
>mistaken claims any number of times.

This is not a correction. Demographics does not mean everyone, just most. These are exceptions.

926. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:06:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512230605.11670.00000211@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67027

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Hams do not know others view them as a cult, nerdy, anti-social, older >
>person, overweight male hobby.

>> Electronic hobbyists view them as non-technical (except
>> for antennas).

>> Possible activities include radio direction finding, which Hams know >
>about, but do not participate in.

>> Also, Hams can use other skills besides CW.

>Your statement is not supported by fact.

These are not facts. These are views.

This has been my experience. Any meeting, Hamfest, Ham convention, Field day, random Ham gathering seems to almost always confirm this. I met up with a group of <random> Hams about a week ago and they were much the same way.

927. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:07:26 UTC
From: Ken Wolinsky <none@wckwconsults.com>
Message-ID: <b9pnhcpge0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67028
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"R274C" <r274c@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030512183720.13958.00000259@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Communications emergency declared
> >From: "Henry" henry@wsimconews.org
> >Date: 5/12/2003 5:30 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <b9p79p$r71$0@pita.alt.net>
> >
> >
> >"Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
> >news:25eb70d7.0305121404.1581ad42@posting.google.com...
> >>>
> >> Sounds more like the local agents incompetence rather than the fcc as
> >> a whole. They don't seem to have as much trouble here. We had a couple
> >> of squirrels jamming a repeater here, and they did it from mobiles.
> >> The fcc sure had no trouble locating them. They came up and tapped on
> >> his window while he was talking sitting in a parking lot. I wasn't
> >> there, but I wouldn't be surprised if he made a mess on his seats.
> >> They also had no trouble tracking an "11m freebander" friend of mine.
> >> Didn't take them long at all. I know "myself", I wouldn't have any
> >> trouble tracking these people. If I can do it, the fcc should be able
> >> to do it better. Being the air bands are VHF, and line of sight, if
> >> they couldn't find that guy, they need to go back to "tracking
> >> school". That should have been a piece of cake, as the other agency
> >> apparently showed them. I would have been embarrassed too...:/
> >
> >
> > And your "story" sounds like wishful thinking on your part,
> >a fairy tale. It doesn't take much to see how you deliberately
> >left out any verifiable details. 11m freebander? Yeah right,
> >like they're going to waste their time. Ditto with amateur
> >repeaters, they don't waste their time. Post proof. How
> >about a news release reference for starters. And where did
> >all this supposedly happen? Nice try, but your "story" is
> >just a truck load of Bullshit.
> >
> >Henry
> >
> >
> >
> I thought it sounded like bullshit too. The FCC is so undermanned they
don't
> have time to wipe thier own asses.....pretty much like all the
government
```

> agencies that W and Rummy don't favor.
>
>
>
Yup. The Commission reacts strictly to "Safety-of-Life"
situations. Probably 99% of the clowns in this forum think that
means interference to amateur radio repeaters and Riley's
warning letters. Not up to me to educate the fools either, and
it's more fun to see them post stupid statements. It was once
estimated to a fairly accurate degree that 94% of all amateur
radio operators believe the FCC's sole mission is to regulate
amateur radio. Talk about tunnel vision and a limited view of
life!

73 from ken w
Houston Texas
Toolin' down the E-highway at blazing super speed.

928. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:14:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512231419.18828.00000960@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67030

In article <20030511190044.29158.00000192@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker of the Let's Pretend Radio Show) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/11/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030511173647.18769.00000543@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>> You keep repeating this, Lennie, but at no time was a "medical" discharge
>>>anything LESS than Honorable.
>>
>> Then why didn't you get an Honorable right away?
>
> I did, Lennie. Why do you keep asserting otherwise?

Because of your own words in here.

An Honorable Discharge is NOT the same as a Medical Discharge.

If they were the same then there would not be two different documents.

>> You've claimed your Medical Discharge was due to an "accident."
>
> Yep.

You can't have it both ways. Make up your fantasy mind.

You said you got a Medical Discharge first, due to an "accident."

Later on you said it was the "same" as an Honorable.

>>Nobody in here has verified that. Medical Discharges are also
>> given for psychiatric problems in the military service.
>
> Was that YOUR reason for terminating so brilliant a career?

I retired at age 65. Not a problem.

When I enlisted voluntarily in the US Army, ALL who entered Army service regardless of being a compulsory or volunteer, were contracted for an 8-year term. After an active duty period, the remainder of the 8-year term was spent in reserves.

>>> Again you've been caught lying. Why do you persist in lying?
>>
>> No lies from me.

>
> Oh? Your correspondence course trained shrink wife does this for you
>then?

There is NO one here who is "correspondence course trained," and
you've had it explained about education adequately in a previous
message.

You continue with stalking, baiting, personal insults about my wife as
well as about me.

That is reprehensible conduct by any human being.

>>Robeson insists on calling all statements contrary to his Beliefs
>> as "lies."
>
> Something is a "lie" when it's meaning is inherently false. You make
>frequent and obvious false sttements.

No. I make neither false statements nor "sttements"
(whatever the latter is).

You cannot blithely label someone as a "liar" without showing
proof of such "lying."

You are digging yourself deeper into a pit of fantasy existance that
exists only in your imagination.

>>That is abnormal behavior and doesn't require any
>> "degree qualifications" to understand.
>
> You're right. It doesn't. That's why I am not the only person inhere
>who calls you for what you are...a liar.

There are others in here as well as "inhere" who have the same
affliction for Orwellian "Newspeak." They also want to call truth
as "lies" when such truth does not fit their Beliefs.

>>> Hmmmmm....Nothing in any era-specific radio clerk training manuals say
>>>ANYTHING about "closing with the enemy".
>>
>> 1. I was never any "radio clerk" while in the US Army.
>
> Uh huh.

I'm glad that you are capable of some agreement, however slight.

Feel free to check with NARA on my Army service record.

Army Serial Number RA16408336

>>3. There are NO "radio clerk training manuals" to be found in
>> the US Army Training and Doctrine Command listings of
>> FMs, TMs, or other documents now, nor in the past.
>

> Maybe that's why you were so inadequately trained.

You have NO experience in military radio communications and
cannot judge what is adequate or inadequate in military
radio communications of the USA.

There were NO "radio clerk" MOSs in the US Army in the 1950s
or now. There were somewhat similar MOSs in the US Army
of the 1950s but those pertain only to NON-radio clerking jobs.

My training was adequate for all jobs that needed to be done:
Fixed Station Transmitter, Carrier Equipment, Radio Relay
and finally Microwave Radio Relay. All with combined operations
and maintenance at supervisory rank.

>>4. Robeson's military service was in the USMC, not the Army.
>
> I see...Only LENNIE can cross military roles and be accurate?

I've had OVER 50 years of exposure to all branches of the US
military, first as a US Army soldier-signalman for 4 years, then
as an electronics engineer on-site at many US military
installations, all branches, while working in electronics
corporations after 1956. I stay informed on many things,
factual data rather than emotion-driven fantasies of greatness
and play-acting...as you do.

>> 5. Robeson did not claim or imply any military radio
>> communications duties nor was he able to state any
>> military radio equipment by name or nomenclature,
>> formal or familiar.
>
> I have. You just choose to ignore it.

You have not. You should have known about the basic small-
unit radio system in use in US land-air forces that has been
operational for 14 years. You should have known about its two
predecessors. You've not mentioned word-one about any of
them. One of the two computer training aids in operation of the
basic US land-air radio system was written by the USMC and
has been in use at the Army's Signal Center at Fort Gordon for
at least 4 years. Both are and have been public release items
for that length of time. You've not mentioned word-one about the
supplementary HF radio systems used by US military land
forces (both USA and USMC) for several years yet you claim
to have done so. All you've done on such mentions is to say
you could not mention them in detail because those are "secret."
That's nonsense since details of name, nomenclature, general
details, manufacturer, contract award monies and duration has
been public knowledge since the first bids. Such has been public
in the USA as long as you've been alive.

> And what part of it you
>"acknowledged" you simply made fun of or tried to denigrate.

I've only made fun of your attempts at LIES, sins of omission,
FALSE information, snow jobs, and fish stories you've done
because there is NO verification or valid reference to any of
your military radio communications claims.

> Keep telling yourself that, Lennie. Repeat it over and over. It still
>won't make it any more accurate, but it will make you FEEL better for having
>done it, and that's all that counts.

I will continue to expose your bluffing and lying, continuing to post
references and true public data about REAL world radio
communications. Your only references to radio seem to be QST
or Popular Communications and "facts" from ham radio
advertisements.

>>Robeson stated that he had "seven hostile actions." Those three
>> words convey nothing definite. They are vague vapor.
>
> Kinda like your "Extra lite out of the box" comments, Lennie?

Absolutely NOT.

Not only do you bluff and lie about overall radio knowledge and
testing but your disordered mental fantasy cannot differentiate
between situations of military service and amateur hobby
activities.

Now, describe WHERE and WHEN those "seven hostile actions"
took place and provide a reference to the validity of that claim or
admit you were bluffing, lying, and stop with such tale-telling.

>>No. I've stated no lies, committed no "misdeeds."
>
> You may continue to repeat THAT to yourself too, Lennie...And it still
>won't make THAT any more accurate either.

Your mental state is not rational, cannot differentiate between
reality and the fantasy of your imagination.

What I've said as to factual data and information is all, repeat
ALL referencible. I've given such references in here, continually
since I began posting. Some are not easy-to-get-at references
but can be found and verified. I try to limit references to the
easiest to "get at" in the form of websites...for others to verify
for themselves.

As to OPINIONS, those vary with individuals and one person's
opinion is no more "valid" than anothers. You apparently cannot
understand that since you constantly express your personal
opinion as "truth," thereby making opposite opinions "lies." That's
a fantasy, a mental problem common to all self-righteous people
who refuse to accept other points of view.

You constantly confuse factual data with the fantasy of your own opinions.

>>I have all the names of the 71st Signal Service Battalion personnel
>> who were casualties...(SNIP)
>
> I am sure you do.
>
> Have you sent that letter to their families apologizing for using them as
>opportunities for embellishing your own meager service record, Lennie?

That's a disgusting little statement, unworthy of a rational human being let alone a veteran of the military.

I've honored their memory, not only in words but in military ceremonies such as Retreat (lowering of the US flag at sundown).

My US military service record is archived at NARA. It is detailed, honest, no lies, distortions, or untruths. There is not the slightest condemnation by anyone or any agency in it. It is not extra-ordinary but it does indicate I received promotion in rank almost as soon as I was eligible after time-in-rank. Thousands after thousands of us served in the same signal battalion, doing our duty during a time of active war followed by uneasy truce, then continuing with our lives afterwards. I've been in communication with five of those veterans since, plus one civilian employee of the Army, later the Air Force, for shared interests in a single small organization and the part it played in the larger world of radio communications...and some kinship of all contributing to the sucesses of our tasks. We did no Great Deeds, were not deserving of high battle-won medals of valor...we just did our jobs well, did them as required, kept the communications running "24/7" for years, serving our country.

None of us, Army or Air Force or a few civilians, are worthy of the condemnation, hatred, bitterness, and contempt of others who came later or were never in the military service.

>>Without any references, vague vaporous statements are nothing
>> but LIES.
>
> If you insist, Lennie. While were at it, we're still waiting on YOUR
>"extra lite" to show up on the database.

Not a requirement to serve one's country in any future.

US amateur radio is NOT a military service, never was.

There is NO "extra lite" in any "database" other than some brewery.

Robeson has NOT supplied the WHEN and WHERE of his claimed "seven hostile actions." If he does, then he must provide references where anyone can verify his claims.

No references, no validity mean just LIES, exaggerations,
fish stories, snow jobbing.

929. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:14:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512231423.18828.00000961@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67029

In article <20030511133311.28341.00000255@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>> So why let it bother you so much?
>
>K4YZ must defend amateur radio whenever possible. Thats his noble cause.

I don't think so. By four years of nearly uninterrupted posting, he defends only Himself and His Viewpoints.

He only accepts those who think alike with Him.

With such an attitude anything He does is "noble," but only to his imagination.

930. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:31:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512233111.18769.00000514@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67032

In article <FvTva.6348$DO5.6222@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Thanks for a pleasant trip down memory lane. I appreciated your thoughts
>even though some flames apparently had to appear :)
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim
>ps - you are correct about the UHF. Good add to the thread.

You are welcome.

Brush Fire Season is 12 months out of the year in here, always
a lot of flames. :-)

We can always see ham sizzling on an open fire after he
(or she) opens fire. :-)

931. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:31:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512233112.18769.00000516@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67031

In article <20030512225926.11670.00000209@mb-m24.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Dave Heil found some Hams;
>one that is thin,
>one that is an EE,
>one that is black,
>one that is a woman.

Careful, if he ever locates a thin black female EE with a ham license he will be even harder to live with than he is now... :-)

932. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:31:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512233112.18769.00000515@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67033

In article <20030512230605.11670.00000211@mb-m24.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>Your statement is not supported by fact.
>
>These are not facts. These are views.
>
>This has been my experience. Any meeting, Hamfest, Ham convention, Field day, >random Ham gathering seems to almost always confirm this. I met up with a group
>of <random> Hams about a week ago and they were much the same way.

In any argument or disagreement with Heil, all arguments and disagreements are irrelevant and not factual. :-)

933. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:33:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XHZva.29$sh5.33519@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67022

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030512222802.11670.00000206@mb-m24.aol.com...
> No, the adult was not talking about the contest. I understood perfectly
what he
> said. He explained that 10-10 contacts were not desireable any time,
contest or
> not.
>
> Its because it did not fit proper Ham traditions.

As I said before. Either that adult was wrong or you didn't hear it right. There is a time a place for collecting 10-10 numbers. And it does fit proper Ham traditions. The 10-10 club and 10-10 numbers are some of the older traditions of ham radio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

934. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:33:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512233351.11670.00000212@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67034

Anyone know of any good Ham radio urban legends?

Heres three. I don't know if they are true or not. Also, I don't know if they are Ham radio urban legends or not.

1. Wouff Hong was heard in some CW message. This is definately a Ham radio urban legend.

2. I dont remember this one exactly. Heres what I remember. A few details may be incorrect, but the point of the story is the same.

A Ham's brother was going on a trip. He turned on his rig. He heard mostly static. Like seing figures in the clouds, he heard something that resembled: "don't take the trip". Another operator, said that it could sound like that but it probably was just static.

He called his brother and left a message on his cell phone. The brother, heard the message and decided not to board the plane.

Later, the plane was hijacked.

3. I dont remember this one exactly.

One young Ham got into a car accident. He radioed for help. An older Ham helped him and took him to the hospital. The young Ham never saw the older man, but dropped an identity card.

Years later, the older Ham got into an accident. He radioed for help. The Ham that came to his rescue was the young Ham that got into an accident before!

935. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 03:45:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030512234519.11670.00000213@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67035

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>Fifth, was this article originally printed in English or was it a
>translation from some other language.

I can tell you that that paper is printed in English.

936. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 04:05:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC06F72.D3B97717@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67036

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >What
> >kind of moron sticks to something he so obviously detests?
>
> K4YZ.

Sorry, that answer is incorrect. That person would be you. The only
question remaining is your motivation for doing so.

> >It's pretty hard to socialize while cycling.
>
> Not if you carry HTs while doing so.

According to your newest theory, that isn't socializing if it is done
via radio.

> >> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
> >
> >I see. This is another version of "one definition for Vipul, another
> >meaning for the rest of humanity".
>
> No, its most of "humanity" that decides the definition, allowing for common
> sense.

It appears that you've skipped the common sense portion.

> The weird people, Hams, do not decide for themselves.

Again you've provided a bogus adjective.

> Common sense is allowed.

May I suggest that you implement its practice.

> For example an activity that has never been done
> before may be innovative, not weird.

I hate to burst your bubble, Vipul. I don't consider you innovative but
I do consider you weird.

Dave K8MN

937. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 04:13:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC07143.F4FC12F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67037

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> >> A child that doesn't know
> >> >> CW is "not good enough".
> >> >
> >> >That'd be particularly true if the mode in use was CW.
>
> Seems like you misunderstood. The child said this well before any contest
> began. He meant the other child was "not good enough" as a Ham for not learning
> CW. I was surprised to hear the child saay that.
>
> I think you understood, but are trying to justify what the child said.

You did not make yourself clear. As children will be children, you'll
likely have to live with it. I don't see anything which is going to get
the idea out of your head.

> >> >Copying the exchange information correctly at high speeds through QRM or
> >> >QRN is certainly the kind of skill which is useful in emergency
> >> >communications.
>
> > It is a good way to build
> >skills needed for emergency communications.
>
> Chance correlation of a few skills is not preparation. Emergency comm > involves many
skills, most of which are not used in contests.

I'm not talking about chance correlation. I'm talking about skill
building. I don't think you have enough experience in either contesting
or emergency communications to put up a rational argument.

> This is dangerous if you actually believe that

I really do believe that and it has not proved dangerous. What
practical experience in either thing do you have which lends proof to
your claim?

> Real emergency skills involve
> many elements which are not part of contests.

Who told you about them?

> Or do you know that and are trying to mis-inform?

You're already misinformed. I couldn't possibly do a better job of misinforming you than the individuals responsible for your current outlook.

> >Seems like one guy, if you are to be believed, said that to you.
>
> He's one of the few non-Hams that knew enough about it to know its a cult.

You mean he didn't know enough about it and believed it to be cult-like. Try to get your ever-changing story straight.

> I'll be many spouses of Hams (that are not also Hams) also feel its a cult too.

I'm looking forward to hearing of your amorous adventures after you become many spouses.

Dave K8MN

938. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 04:14:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC07199.19E049D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67038

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> >What hamdom sees What Vipul sees
>
> <list snipped>
>
> >Good for you. Admission of your errors is the first step toward inner
> >renewal.
>
> Who said they were errors. It just shows that there are two ways to view the
> situations you mentioned.

Who says they're errors? Have you found anyone here in agreement with
your peculiar ideas?

Dave K8MN

939. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 04:23:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC073C4.B3DA18B5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67039

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> Dave Heil found some Hams;
> one that is thin,
> one that is an EE,
> one that is black,
> one that is a woman.
>
> Please not that these are exceptions.

Please prove that these are one-time exceptions. I'll be waiting for
some solid fact from you. It will be a refreshing change of pace.

> One can find exceptions in many groups.

You've offered no proof for any of your rather silly claims.

> Also, for the overweight part, I never claimed a majority of Hams are
> overweight.

> Just that a significantly higher percentage of Hams are overweight
> than the general poplulation.

...and you are offering what as proof of your statement?

> The Ham radio hobby has something to do with this. Please note that I met with
> <random> Hams. So, I had NO influence on whether they were overweight.

I'm pretty sure that after a half hour conversation with you, I'd be
ready for a large pizza and a couple of milkshakes.

> >I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
> >mistaken claims any number of times.
>
> This is not a correction. Demographics does not mean everyone, just most. These are
exceptions.

For there to be exceptions, you'll have to offer something in the way of
proof that your claims are true.

So far, you're a guy with very limited experience as a ham--a guy who
doesn't appear to know very much about amateur radio. You also seem to
actively dislike amateur radio. You're getting about as much of an
audience for your strange views as you've reported getting at amateur
radio club meetings you've attended. You're the odd man, Vipul.

Dave K8MN

940. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 04:30:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC074D5.86632357@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67040

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Hams do not know others view them as a cult, nerdy, anti-social, older >
> >person, overweight male hobby.
>
> >> Electronic hobbyists view them as non-technical (except
> >> for antennas).
>
> >> Possible activities include radio direction finding, which Hams know >
> >about, but do not participate in.
>
> >> Also, Hams can use other skills besides CW.
>
> >Your statement is not supported by fact.
>
> These are not facts. These are views.

They are views unsupported by fact.

> This has been my experience. Any meeting, Hamfest, Ham convention, Field day,
> random Ham gathering seems to almost always confirm this.

That might be part of your problem. I don't know of anyone doing much
direction finding at Field Day. Some hamfests have direction finding on
the program but not all do. A "random Ham gathering" would likely be
for random direction finding.

> I met up with a group
> of <random> Hams about a week ago and they were much the same way.

All standing around and not direction finding?

Dave K8MN

941. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 04:34:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC075B1.C2CB2A4D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67041

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030512230605.11670.00000211@mb-m24.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >>Your statement is not supported by fact.
> >
> >These are not facts. These are views.
> >
> >This has been my experience. Any meeting, Hamfest, Ham convention, Field day,
> >random Ham gathering seems to almost always confirm this. I met up with a
> group
> >of <random> Hams about a week ago and they were much the same way.
>
> In any argument or disagreement with Heil, all arguments and
> disagreements are irrelevant and not factual. :-)

I'm glad you found a kindred spirit here, Leonard. You, much like
water, seek your own level.

Dave K8MN

942. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 04:47:30 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9qqn9$m0407$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67049

I keep telling myself the same thing about my truck!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Just because its old don't make it useless.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

943. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 06:05:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <7X%va.6309$VR.985@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67042

Just wear your asbestos long johns :)

73,
Jim

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030512233111.18769.00000514@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <FvTva.6348$DO5.6222@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim
Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Thanks for a pleasant trip down memory lane. I appreciated your thoughts
> >even though some flames apparently had to appear :)
> >
> >73 from Rochester, NY
> >Jim
> >ps - you are correct about the UHF. Good add to the thread.
>
> You are welcome.
>
> Brush Fire Season is 12 months out of the year in here, always
> a lot of flames. :-)
>
> We can always see ham sizzling on an open fire after he
> (or she) opens fire. :-)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/03

944. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 11:04:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513070438.16173.00000455@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67043

In article <20030511210548.18770.00000525@mb-m22.aol.com
>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030511152226.18769.00000582@mb-m12.aol.com
>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <20030510202124.18775.00000685@mb-m02.aol.com
>>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> Do you understand that radio physics is the same for any radio
>>> regardless of the man-made "service" designation applied?
>>
>>Sure.
>>
>>Do you understand that "radio physics" is not the only consideration in
>>radio regulations?
>>
I suppose not.
>
>>So what's your point?
>
> That you are unable to focus on any "point" other than what is
> allowed by your amateur technology blinders permit. That is
> tantamount to tunnel-vision.
>
Incorrect. "Radio physics" is only one consideration in regulation-making.
Otherwise amateurs would be allowed to use the same power as SWBC stations.

>>Did the "radio physics" of phasing-type SSB change from 1932 to 1978?
>
> Absolutely...and all the way to 2001 with the merger of the
> four-channel CMOS switch (Tayloe Mixer) and the Gingell
> polyphase network.

Incorrect. The technology was improved, but the basic physics did not change.
The Gingell network, for example, is simply another way of getting the required
90 degree phase shift. It offers greater unwanted-sideband rejection, less
precision requiured in the components and less loss than, say, the Dome
network. At a price of increased complexity.
>
> You are apparently unable to "see" the evolution because of
> your fixation on amateur technology and Belief System in
> the amateur-as-pioneer myth.

Not at all. The basic physics is the same. The implementations change. Ohm's Law hasn't changed, has it?
>
>>Not at all. Nothing you wrote in those first 13 pages was a new idea.
>
> Comments on NPRMs are not required to have "new ideas."

Then you agree that (except for the age limit idea) your comments to the FCC were just a rehash of tired old arguments ;-)

>>> "Behaving in a civil manner" applies to all.
>>
>>So try it sometime.
>
> I did. In here. At first.

Under what screen name? You've used at least six here in rrap that I know of.

> The avalanche of boorish, insulting,
> puerile, snarly, sarcastic name-calling from pro-code test
> advocates of that time quickly demonstrated that this arena
> does not allow civility as a norm.

What about the avalanche of boorish, insulting, puerile, snarly, sarcastic name-calling from no-code test advocates?

I've been reading this ng since late 1997. There's as much nastiness on one side as the other. Looking back at your old posts, I note a very low level of civility back then. Same as now.

>>> You have to understand that this is a very open forum, doesn't
>>> cater to your whims, desires, or anything you favor.
>>
>>Neither are you, Len.
>
> I understand perfectly well...and also understand the mindset
> of those syncophants demanding capitulation to their false
> Belief system.

>>> You aren't
>>> moderator, aren't "leader" no matter how much you post in
>>> almost constant attendance daily.
>>
>>Neither are you, Len.
>
> Incorrect.

You're the leader? I don;t think so!

> I'm trying to focus on the SUBJECTS.

Not from what I can see.

> You strive constantly to spin others' opposite-opinion replies
> to some kind of negative ethical attribute. All that is is just

> a politer form of personal insult and a denigration for heresy
> in your Belief System.

In other words, you take my disagreement as a personal insult. Proving you wrong is therefore immoral.

> True civil debate on subjects long since disappeared in this
> newsgroup.

Incorrect. K2UNK and I do it all the time.

> The snarly acidic wit of Jim Kehler, KH2D, led
> the forum's general tone six years ago...Kehler was not
> forgiving of any person who ventured opinions to the opposite
> of his obvious extreme PCTA viewpoint and let everyone
> know it. Not in "polite terms," either. Kehler became sickly,
> moved from Guam to the mainland, hasn't been here for years.
> I'm still here.

OK, let's get this straight....

Somebody disagreed with you six years ago, called you names you didn't like, or whatever. That person is now long gone, but his behavior gives YOU the right to behave the same way here, now, today, towards others who disagree with you.

That's simply illogical.

You live in the past too much!

>>> This venue is unmoderated, open to any that have access. You
>>> can't dictate who can say what and when...the best you can do
>>> is try to wear down opposition with long, Long, LONG postings
>>> to make them go away out of irritation.
>>
>>Sounds like what you do, Len.
>
> I reply to messages. Short messages get short replies.

Short messages also get very long replies from you.

> Long
> messages get long replies.

Long messages also get very short replies from you.

> I start very few threads in here, but have from time to time.

So?

You certainly don't stick to the subject. Not a word about "ARS Advertisement" in your post.

Try to stay focused.

945. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 11:34:08 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@cablemodemensinc.org>
Message-ID: <b9ql7d$ot8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67044
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Wipe the spittle off your face, take three deep breaths,
then come back and join the discussion.

Herb

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305121937.63235319@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
>
>
> Herb queefed...
>
> "Obsession with MAN?"
>
>
> Isn't it funny how all the "no-call, no-balls" fags seem to hide under
> the old BARF banner with false names, grasping at straws, spouting all
> the obvious names, with nothing of interest added to the
> conversational thread, similar to the way your typical aging closet
> queen spouts off while watching home movies of Boy Scouts jamborees?
>
> Here's some advice for you there "no-balls," "Herb," or "Queenie,"
> which seems more apt. Shut up and butt out or you may be the subject
> of the next investigatory foray. I happen to know Brian and he could
> have your computer turned inside out by your local FBI office about an
> hour after they got the phone call. Then all your kiddie porn and
> pedophilic homoerotic movies would be discovered wouldn't they,
> no-balls? And even if you managed to wipe your hard drive, your ISP
> would still have all the records of all those pedophilic porn pages
> you visited wouldn't they? Want to test me? Keep it up coward.
>
> Chris
>
>

946. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 11:41:28 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@acnewsersee.net>
Message-ID: <b9qll7prd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67045
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Threats are in violation of virtually any ISP TOS.

Herb

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305121937.63235319@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
>
>
> Herb queefed...
>
> "Obsession with MAN?"
>
>
> Isn't it funny how all the "no-call, no-balls" fags seem to hide under
> the old BARF banner with false names, grasping at straws, spouting all
> the obvious names, with nothing of interest added to the
> conversational thread, similar to the way your typical aging closet
> queen spouts off while watching home movies of Boy Scouts jamborees?
>
> Here's some advice for you there "no-balls," "Herb," or "Queenie,"
> which seems more apt. Shut up and butt out or you may be the subject
> of the next investigatory foray. I happen to know Brian and he could
> have your computer turned inside out by your local FBI office about an
> hour after they got the phone call. Then all your kiddie porn and
> pedophilic homoerotic movies would be discovered wouldn't they,
> no-balls? And even if you managed to wipe your hard drive, your ISP
> would still have all the records of all those pedophilic porn pages
> you visited wouldn't they? Want to test me? Keep it up coward.
>
> Chris
>
>
>
>

947. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 12:35:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC0E698.1030101@psu.edu>
Source record: 67048

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Dave Heil
>
>
>>Vipul Shah finds anything he doesn't understand "cultlike".
>
>
> I DO understand contesting. I don't understand why the fanatical following of
> certain traditions. 10-10 numbers are "not allowed".

Your paragraph shows that you very much *do not* understand contesting.
10-10 numbers are not related to many contests.

Question: what is a 10-10 number?

> A child that doesn't know
> CW is "not good enough".

Check out a contest and let us know what the majority of the traffic is,
CW or SSB.

The use of codewords as some kind of agreed upon
> tradition. Plus many more examples.

Why not give us a dissertation on:

Why hams are not allowed to use buzzwords when all other groups are?

When was the last time you heard something like "I put new RAM in my
CPU, then defragg'ed my HD? And did you see my new USB CD/RW and Zip?"

Elaborate on how *that* little bit of nonsense above, which is
understood by many computer jockeys, is different than a ham calling CQ?
How about an alternative to CQ?

- Mike KB3EIA -

948. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 13:14:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC0EFAC.5090507@psu.edu>
Source record: 67050

Vshah101 wrote:

> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.

This of course is a contradiction of terms.

- mike KB3EIA -

949. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 13:32:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC0F3F0.1080603@psu.edu>
Source record: 67101

Vshah101 wrote:
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>
>>What was it that made the contacts improper?
>
>
>>As for 10-10 numbers, it wouldn't make sense to exchange them in a
>>contest in which they were irrelevant
>
>
>>I think you were making a judgement on insufficient data here.
>
>
> No, the adult was not talking about the contest. I understood perfectly what he
> said. He explained that 10-10 contacts were not desireable any time, contest or
> not.
>
> Its because it did not fit proper Ham traditions.

There are some (many) hams who do not like the 10-10 number business.
Larry Roll for one. There are some hams who will chew another ham out
over not having one, and some won't even talk to another ham if they
don't have one.I've heard a public dressing-down or two. I'm not overly
wild about it myself, as while the idea sounds okay, the implementation
has become one of exclusivity. So that may have been what the one ham
was talking to the other about.

but..... I didn't catch your other answers!

What contest was it?

What were the "improper" contacts?

I still think you are making your conclusions on some shaky evidence,
Vipul.

- Mike KB3EIA -

- Mike KB3EIA -

950. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 13:39:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513093906.09397.00000412@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67102

>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/12/2003 10:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030512233351.11670.00000212@mb-m24.aol.com>

>Anyone know of any good Ham radio urban legends?

Snipped.

All of the stories you related were originally other "urban legend"
stories told around camp fires for generations, certainly pre-dating Amateur
Rado.

Steve,K4YZ

951. Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 13:41:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513094157.09397.00000414@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67103

>Subject: Re: One Again With The "Cult" Crap from VShah101
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/12/2003 10:14 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030512231423.18828.00000961@mb-m07.aol.com>

>>From N2EY:
>>> So why let it bother you so much?
>>
>>K4YZ must defend amateur radio whenever possible. Thats his noble cause.
>
> I don't think so. By four years of nearly uninterrupted posting,
> he defends only Himself and His Viewpoints.

ERROR WILL ROBINSON! ERROR!

I am certainly quick to point out your assinine rantings, Lennie, but most
of my responses to you rhetoric is vis-a-vis Amateur Radio as a whole.

(NOT the "hole" you'd like to see us fall into, I am sure)

>He only accepts those who think alike with Him.

Not true.

>With such an attitude anything He does is "noble," but only
> to his imagination.

Like your assertions about Extra Lite and your Army record...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

952. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 13:44:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513094437.09397.00000415@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67104

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/12/2003 9:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030512222419.11670.00000205@mb-m24.aol.com>

>K4YZ.
>
>>It's pretty hard to socialize while cycling.

Why is it so hard for you to get attributions corect, Vipul...???

I did not make that statement.

Find out who did and get it right.

Steve, K4YZ

953. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 13:46:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513094644.09397.00000416@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67105

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/12/2003 11:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EC06F72.D3B97717@earthlink.net>
>
>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>
>> >What
>> >kind of moron sticks to something he so obviously detests?
>>
>> K4YZ.
>
>Sorry, that answer is incorrect. That person would be you. The only
>question remaining is your motivation for doing so.

I think he was trying to misquote me, Dave, but it's interesting to wait and see what it was he thinks I detest so much, other than liars.

73

Steve, K4YZ

954. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 14:00:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513100045.09397.00000420@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67106

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/12/2003 10:14 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030512231419.18828.00000960@mb-m07.aol.com>

>An Honorable Discharge is NOT the same as a Medical Discharge.

Try this one instead, Lennie...it's more accurate:

"I do not fully comprehend the current practices of the Armed Forces of
the United States as it pertains to character of discharge or reason codes. I
do not understand that it IS possible to be honorably discharged from the Armed
Forces of the Untied States due to medical reasons."

This one's a bit briefer and to the point:

"I am an idiot who tries to compare present day military policies to what
I knew over 50 years ago. I am a fool."

>If they were the same then there would not be two different
> documents.

They are not "two different documents". One DD214. One Honorable
Discharge. One medical validation code.

>>> You've claimed your Medical Discharge was due to an "accident."
>>
>> Yep.
>
> You can't have it both ways. Make up your fantasy mind.

I don't have to "make up" anything, Lennie. I was Honorably Discharged
due to medical causes.

> You said you got a Medical Discharge first, due to an "accident."
>
> Later on you said it was the "same" as an Honorable

It IS "the same". You may ask your VA rep.

I'd go on...but why? You've already made a fool of yourself and are only
making it easier for me to poke holes in you with each retelling.

Thanks. I needed the laugh. It was a rough shift.

Steve, K4YZ

955. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 14:49:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b9r0o7$e85$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67107

I can be found on the low end of 160/80/40 especially during winter when its
quiet.

Dan/W4NTI

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:L4Yva.826781$F1.104315@sccrnsc04...
> Hi Dan .... no difficulty with the wires ...just got off of 40 and I
enjoy
> stuff that's a mile away as much as I do the DX ... not going to move the
> tower as it is not a fold over and it is at 50 feet which is about 47 feet
> too high for me. I have a fellow who is interested in the TH-6 and the
> tower but I am going to keep the rotor as I may put up a crank up -tilt
over
> or a similar mast. Will try a quad this time if any. I did get a lot of
> use with this setup but I will be on. We will have to set up a sked Dan
> after I am in place at the new QTH which is about 20 miles south of here.
>
> God Bless catch you on the air Dan ....Tom KI3R
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b9paad$h66$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > >
> > > I'll be waiting ....God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr
> > Pittsburgh
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Dont waste your breath trying to convert the unwashed Tom. Sorry your
> > dropping the beam. But I have worked with wires for years. It can be
> done.
> >
> > See ya some cold winter night. I'll be listening for the sailors swing
> and
> > the slight chirp on my 50 year old Halliscratcher and single tube 807
tx.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

956. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 15:18:14 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC10CB6.C4A727B7@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67046
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mark Keith wrote:
>
> "Richard W" <Sigs@nononnetanon.net> wrote
> >
> > ... The commission cannot "easily" find someone, ...
>
> Sounds more like the local agents incompetence....

Or lack of equipment and/or manpower. 15 years ago the Army had
man-portable (backpack) scanner/DF rigs (AN/PRD-12). Put out 3 of them
and they'll automatically DF and triangulate to give you the
transmitter's coord's in seconds. No doubt they have even better now.
Does FCC have any? ????

73, K3DWW

957. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 15:19:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC10D14.2050507@psu.edu>
Source record: 67108

Dave Heil wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:

<some snippage>

>> I could go on forever.
>
>
> Len Anderson (no license) does that.

HAR! Good one Dave!

>>or.....
>>
>>2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll
>
>
> I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
> mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
> reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
> amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
> so unpleasant.

Absolutely! If he *is* seriously interested in the ARS, then he needs some instruction in the social graces. Coming into a room and calling the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do boring is a good way to get their attention. It is not a good way to get them to change their erring ways.

- Mike KB3EIA -

958. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 15:29:13 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC10F49.E6FC28B3@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67047
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ken Wolinsky wrote:
>
> Yup. The Commission reacts strictly to "Safety-of-Life"
> situations. Probably 99% of the clowns in this forum think that
> means interference to amateur radio ....

It could if we made it that way. Tar and feathers were not uncommon in my youth but practical jokes were preferred at Compton High (Between LA and San Pedro): pouring a tablespoon of gasoline down the miscreants crack and lighting him off worked wonders. After all, FCC keeps telling us to police ourselves, right? (c:

73, K3DWW

959. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 15:56:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC1157F.474544DF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67109

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:

> > Mike Coslo wrote:

> > I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
> > mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
> > reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
> > amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
> > so unpleasant.
>
> Absolutely! If he *is* seriously interested in the ARS, then he needs
> some instruction in the social graces. Coming into a room and calling
> the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
> boring is a good way to get their attention. It is not a good way to get
> them to change their erring ways.

Going to a club meeting and telling the members that they don't know anything technical except maybe about antennas is the sign of a socially unskilled individual. Letting them know that you think they ought to be homebrewing and designing circuits instead of operating is a mark of the socially inept. Referring to some members as "only coders" probably doesn't go over well. Showing up at Field Day and complaining bitterly about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers marks one as a social outcast.

For a graphic illustration, fill a saucer with cold tap water. Sprinkle black pepper on the surface of the water. Let the black pepper represent the club members. Now place a drop of ordinary dishwashing detergent in the saucer. Let the drop of detergent represent Vipul's entrance. Observe carefully. (Thanks to Don Herbert in his "Mister Wizard" persona in the 1950's)

Dave K8MN

960. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 17:56:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hetym2f.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67110

On Mon, 12 May 2003 04:08:47 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>It's pretty hard to socialize while cycling.

My 32-year-old son is an avid long-distance cycler. It has never stopped him from meeting other cyclists of the "good looking chicks" category as he puts it (and in general they WERE good-looking).

All depends on one's attitude and abilities.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

961. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 18:11:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513141152.05972.00000316@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 67111

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/13/2003 12:56 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hetym2f.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>>It's pretty hard to socialize while cycling.
>
> My 32-year-old son is an avid long-distance cycler. It has
> never stopped him from meeting other cyclists of the "good
> looking chicks" category as he puts it (and in general they
> WERE good-looking).
>
> All depends on one's attitude and abilities.

One can "socialize" where one want's to. It's all a matter of desire and initiative.

Ham Radio has been a great ice breaker for me in several countries, especially Japan. It's also opened doors for me all over the United States. My most memorable times were in Pennsylvania. Their license plates used to say "You've Got A Friend In Pennsylvania", and it was true...all-the-more-so if you happened to have Ham Radio with whcih to "say hello" with.

73

Steve, K4CAP

962. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 21:18:14 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@acnewsersee.net>
Message-ID: <b9rnekof0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67112
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You really need to get your anger under control.

Herb

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305131255.67293845@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
>
> "Herb" <Herb@acnewsersee.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272
> Date: Tue, 13 May 2003 07:41:28 -0400
> Organization: Cable Modem Consults
> Lines: 37
> Message-ID: <b9qll7prd0@pita.alt.net>
> References: <3ea8162b_3@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
> <20030425134156.26434.00000060@mb-m19.aol.com>
> <634e00e4.0304251355.1c8130e4@posting.google.com>
> <b8e58rlvv1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
> <634e00e4.0305120605.420b6326@posting.google.com>
> <b9orur$h6o$0@pita.alt.net>
> <634e00e4.0305121937.63235319@posting.google.com>
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
>
>
> Herb, aka "Old No Balls" aka "The Suspected President of the
> Man-Boy-Love-Association," aka "Queenie," retorted in a typically
> effeminate and impotently emasculated fashion: "Threats are in
> violation of virtually any ISP TOS."
>
> I don't know what Pez dispenser you received your legal training from,
> however, I do know that it is the duty of every American citizen to
> report suspected criminal activity to the proper authorities. In your
> case, as with your hero Glenn and his sidekick, the sycophantic cabin
> boy "No-Coq," the appropriate authority is probably the FBI.
>
> Pissing me off and defending that useless conjoined piece of shit in
> Maine is only going to shine the light of truth on your tawdry and
> pathetic existence. The difference between you and me (other than the
> fact that I possess brains, talent, a penis, and money) is that
> judging from your stupid response, you apparently have a great deal to

> hide. Now dry up and blow away Tinkerbell.
>
> -Chris

963. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 21:25:57 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@acnewsersee.net>
Message-ID: <b9rnt2$1fv$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67113

You really need to get your anger under control.

Herb

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305131255.67293845@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
>
> "Herb" <Herb@acnewsersee.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272
> Date: Tue, 13 May 2003 07:41:28 -0400
> Organization: Cable Modem Consults
> Lines: 37
> Message-ID: <b9qll7prd0@pita.alt.net>
> References: <3ea8162b_3@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
> <20030425134156.26434.00000060@mb-m19.aol.com>
> <634e00e4.0304251355.1c8130e4@posting.google.com>
> <b8e58rlvv1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
> <634e00e4.0305120605.420b6326@posting.google.com>
> <b9orur$h6o$0@pita.alt.net>
> <634e00e4.0305121937.63235319@posting.google.com>
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
>
>
> Herb, aka "Old No Balls" aka "The Suspected President of the
> Man-Boy-Love-Association," aka "Queenie," retorted in a typically
> effeminate and impotently emasculated fashion: "Threats are in
> violation of virtually any ISP TOS."
>
> I don't know what Pez dispenser you received your legal training from,
> however, I do know that it is the duty of every American citizen to
> report suspected criminal activity to the proper authorities. In your
> case, as with your hero Glenn and his sidekick, the sycophantic cabin
> boy "No-Coq," the appropriate authority is probably the FBI.
>
> Pissing me off and defending that useless conjoined piece of shit in
> Maine is only going to shine the light of truth on your tawdry and
> pathetic existence. The difference between you and me (other than the
> fact that I possess brains, talent, a penis, and money) is that
> judging from your stupid response, you apparently have a great deal to
> hide. Now dry up and blow away Tinkerbell.

>
> -Chris

964. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 21:35:16 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0305131335.4c84339c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67114
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Henry" <henry@wsimconews.org> wrote in message news:<b9p79p$r71$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
> news:25eb70d7.0305121404.1581ad42@posting.google.com...
> >>
> > Sounds more like the local agents incompetence rather than the fcc as
> > a whole. They don't seem to have as much trouble here. We had a couple
> > of squirrels jamming a repeater here, and they did it from mobiles.
> > The fcc sure had no trouble locating them. They came up and tapped on
> > his window while he was talking sitting in a parking lot. I wasn't
> > there, but I wouldn't be surprised if he made a mess on his seats.
> > They also had no trouble tracking an "11m freebander" friend of mine.
> > Didn't take them long at all. I know "myself", I wouldn't have any
> > trouble tracking these people. If I can do it, the fcc should be able
> > to do it better. Being the air bands are VHF, and line of sight, if
> > they couldn't find that guy, they need to go back to "tracking
> > school". That should have been a piece of cake, as the other agency
> > apparently showed them. I would have been embarrassed too...:/
>
>
> And your "story" sounds like wishful thinking on your part,
> a fairy tale.

I got your "fairy" hanging.

> It doesn't take much to see how you deliberately
> left out any verifiable details. 11m freebander? Yeah right,
> like they're going to waste their time.

I left out his name because it's none of your damn business or anyone
else on here. BTW, this person was world famous when this happened.
Everyone and his sister heard about it. So fuck you, and the gimp
queer horse you rode in on. Don't get rectal with me. I'll slap the
shit of you. Your teeth will rattle around your skull. I hate a
fucking smartass like I would a case of herpes.

Ditto with amateur
> repeaters, they don't waste their time. Post proof. How
> about a news release reference for starters. And where did
> all this supposedly happen? Nice try, but your "story" is
> just a truck load of Bullshit.

Post proof? Again, crouch down and nurse my lizard you smartass
cocksucker. All the cases I've mentioned are in the F.C.C logs, RAIN
report, and every other frigging report on the net concerning fcc
busts. Do your own homework, you poster child for smartasses. I would

have posted links for these , if you didn't have such a smartass attitude. But being you do, fuck you and the horse you rode in on. I don't post lies, fibs, and other assorted horseshit on these NG's. If I say something like that, you can take it to the frigging bank. MK

965. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 21:54:52 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0305131354.3620f977@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67115
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Ken Wolinsky" <none@wckwconsults.com> wrote in message
news:<b9pnhc$pge$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "R274C" <r274c@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030512183720.13958.00000259@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Communications emergency declared
> > >From: "Henry" henry@wsimconews.org
> > >Date: 5/12/2003 5:30 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <b9p79p$r71$0@pita.alt.net>
> > >
> > >
> > >"Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
> > >news:25eb70d7.0305121404.1581ad42@posting.google.com...
> > >>>
> > >> Sounds more like the local agents incompetence rather than the fcc as
> > >> a whole. They don't seem to have as much trouble here. We had a couple
> > >> of squirrels jamming a repeater here, and they did it from mobiles.
> > >> The fcc sure had no trouble locating them. They came up and tapped on
> > >> his window while he was talking sitting in a parking lot. I wasn't
> > >> there, but I wouldn't be surprised if he made a mess on his seats.
> > >> They also had no trouble tracking an "11m freebander" friend of mine.
> > >> Didn't take them long at all. I know "myself", I wouldn't have any
> > >> trouble tracking these people. If I can do it, the fcc should be able
> > >> to do it better. Being the air bands are VHF, and line of sight, if
> > >> they couldn't find that guy, they need to go back to "tracking
> > >> school". That should have been a piece of cake, as the other agency
> > >> apparently showed them. I would have been embarrassed too...:/
> > >
> > >
> > > And your "story" sounds like wishful thinking on your part,
> > >a fairy tale. It doesn't take much to see how you deliberately
> > >left out any verifiable details. 11m freebander? Yeah right,
> > >like they're going to waste their time. Ditto with amateur
> > >repeaters, they don't waste their time. Post proof. How
> > >about a news release reference for starters. And where did
> > >all this supposedly happen? Nice try, but your "story" is
> > >just a truck load of Bullshit.
> > >
> > >Henry
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > I thought it sounded like bullshit too. The FCC is so undermanned they
> don't
```

> > have time to wipe thier own asses.....pretty much like all the
> government
> > agencies that W and Rummy don't favor.
> >
> >
> >
> Yup. The Commission reacts strictly to "Safety-of-Life"
> situations. Probably 99% of the clowns in this forum think that
> means interference to amateur radio repeaters and Riley's
> warning letters. Not up to me to educate the fools either, and
> it's more fun to see them post stupid statements. It was once
> estimated to a fairly accurate degree that 94% of all amateur
> radio operators believe the FCC's sole mission is to regulate
> amateur radio. Talk about tunnel vision and a limited view of
> life!
>
> 73 from ken w
> Houston Texas
> Toolin' down the E-highway at blazing super speed.

Being you are here in town, just go over to the 145.47 repeater and ask them about the "supposed phony" repeater squirrels I previously mentioned. Then come back and let these people in on what they told you. Also the 11m freebander I mentioned is here too. I almost bet $$$ you've heard about it. BTW, he did have a legal ham call, although the infraction was in the freeband and in between "channels" in the regular "CB" band. BTW, I could give a twinkled shit what the fcc does. But I do give a shit when a bunch of twinkle toed cocksuckers call me a liar. If I'm a liar, prove it first, before spouting horseshit. "this mainly to the other smartass that I've already replied to". And BTW, I do not fall in your "94%" bracket. I don't need the fcc to do my dirty work. Amateurs are for the most part "self policing". The only time the fcc needs to be involved is when we catch one, and need them to verify, and then an agent and a federal Marshall to serve the warrant. Going around to peoples houses trying to shut down squirrels is a good way to get shot if you don't use "legal" methods to do so. MK

966. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 21:58:46 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0305131358.24404efe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67116
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3EC10CB6.C4A727B7@crosslink.net>...
> Mark Keith wrote:
> >
> > "Richard W" <Sigs@nononnetanon.net> wrote
> > >
> > > ... The commission cannot "easily" find someone, ...
> > >
> > Sounds more like the local agents incompetence....
>
> Or lack of equipment and/or manpower. 15 years ago the Army had
> man-portable (backpack) scanner/DF rigs (AN/PRD-12). Put out 3 of them
> and they'll automatically DF and triangulate to give you the
> transmitter's coord's in seconds. No doubt they have even better now.
> Does FCC have any? ????
>
> 73, K3DWW

I would surely think so. If not, they need to get with the program. MK

967. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-13 22:25:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513182555.18775.00000624@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67117

In article <3EC10CB6.C4A727B7@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>Or lack of equipment and/or manpower. 15 years ago the Army had
>man-portable (backpack) scanner/DF rigs (AN/PRD-12). Put out 3 of them
>and they'll automatically DF and triangulate to give you the
>transmitter's coord's in seconds. No doubt they have even better now.
>Does FCC have any? ????

If they do, do you think they're going to advertise?

Put it another way - FCC comes into town, makes a big hoopla, finds nothing, disappears. Violators think it's a big joke. Except they don't realize that the folks in the monogrammed hats and marked vehicles were all for show....

73 de Jim, N2EY

968. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 01:01:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513210130.18783.00000489@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67118

In article <20030513070438.16173.00000455@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>You certainly don't stick to the subject. Not a word about "ARS
>Advertisement" in your post.
>
>Try to stay focused.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still wasting everyone's time, eh? :-)

969. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 01:01:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513210130.18783.00000490@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67119

In article <3EC10D14.2050507@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
><some snippage>
>
>>> I could go on forever.
>>
>> Len Anderson (no license) does that.
>
> HAR! Good one Dave!
>
>>>or.............
>>>
>>>2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll
>>
>> I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
>> mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
>> reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
>> amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
>> so unpleasant.
>
>Absolutely! If he *is* seriously interested in the ARS, then he needs
>some instruction in the social graces. Coming into a room and calling
>the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>boring is a good way to get their attention. It is not a good way to get
>them to change their erring ways.

It isn't any better for amateurs to cast themselves as "superior"
to those with more experience in radio or are professionals in
that field or both.

Passing a few amateur tests and getting a callsign all your own
for your very own station may be a personal accomplishment,
perhaps a significant one in your life experience...but carrying on
in a pretense of being "superior" in everything, including the
"social graces," doesn't make such a pretense either acceptible
or superior. Look to the "socially graced" others in this news-
group as a microcosm of such "social" behavior.

970. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 01:35:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9s6h1$as2$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 67120

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> It isn't any better for amateurs to cast themselves as "superior"
> to those with more experience in radio or are professionals in
> that field or both.

Well, Gollies, Len, no doubt it really *does* burnish your tail when you think

that the very lowliest Novice (left over from the pre restructuring days)
is fully authorized to build, own, and operate at will his own personal radio
station, on a quite wide range of frequencies. You, on the other hand, are
relegated to nonstop reminiscing on your 50 year old military duties during
which you baby-sat some less-than-interesting routine circuits on a few
discrete frequencies. You are not, and never were, licensed to do anything real
in radio other than that which your employer directed.

No wonder your bowels are in a continuous state of uproar. I believe you have
every reason to suck on all that gall.

>
> Passing a few amateur tests and getting a callsign all your own
> for your very own station may be a personal accomplishment,
> perhaps a significant one in your life experience..

Well, you'll have to take someone else's word for it, won't you?

> .but carrying on
> in a pretense of being "superior" in everything, including the
> "social graces," doesn't make such a pretense either acceptible
> or superior.

We must always come back to that resounding fact, mustn't we? The most lowly,
unlearned Novice * is* your superior.

971. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 01:42:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513214210.18769.00000605@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67121

In article <3EC1157F.474544DF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>
>> > Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> > I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
>> > mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
>> > reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
>> > amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
>> > so unpleasant.
>>
>> Absolutely! If he *is* seriously interested in the ARS, then he needs
>> some instruction in the social graces.

You might want to reconsider that premise, Mike.

>> Coming into a room and calling
>> the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>> boring is a good way to get their attention.

If attention is all someone really wants, then the goal is achieved.

>> It is not a good way to get
>> them to change their erring ways.

Particularly when a rank beginner wants people to be convinced by his arguments
but will not or can not see the faults in his reasoning, no matter how they are
explained.
>
>Going to a club meeting and telling the members that they don't know
>anything technical except maybe about antennas is the sign of a socially
>unskilled individual. Letting them know that you think they ought to be
>homebrewing and designing circuits instead of operating is a mark of the
>socially inept. Referring to some members as "only coders" probably
>doesn't go over well. Showing up at Field Day and complaining bitterly
>about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers marks one as a social
>outcast.

But it does get attention...
>
>For a graphic illustration, fill a saucer with cold tap water. Sprinkle
>black pepper on the surface of the water. Let the black pepper

>represent the club members. Now place a drop of ordinary dishwashing
>detergent in the saucer. Let the drop of detergent represent Vipul's
>entrance. Observe carefully. (Thanks to Don Herbert in his "Mister
>Wizard" persona in the 1950's)
>
Except just the opposite happens here in rrap.

73 de Jim, N2EY

972. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:00:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513230017.13222.00000242@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67122

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Please prove that these are one-time exceptions. I'll be waiting for
>some solid fact from you. It will be a refreshing change of pace.

It is apparent from attending Hamfests and club meetings. Almost every one I attend seem to confirm this.

>> One can find exceptions in many groups.
>
>You've offered no proof for any of your rather silly claims.

Neither have you.

>> Just that a significantly higher percentage of Hams are overweight
>> than the general poplulation.
>
>...and you are offering what as proof of your statement?

One can see this at Hamfests. Also, note that I joined some <random> Hams. I had nothing to do with selecting them. I was on the email list. My reason for attending was that they had several radio modes I could use.

Random, therefore unbiased - do you understand?

>I'm pretty sure that after a half hour conversation with you, I'd be
>ready for a large pizza and a couple of milkshakes.

They clearly had their condition well before they met me.

>Going to a club meeting and telling the members that they don't know
>anything technical except maybe about antennas is the sign of a socially
>unskilled individual.

Your right. If I ask them "Why are most Hams fat?" first. I doubt, I will be able to ask any of the other questions.

I did say "I am not a Ham" in person. Also, I asked "What is the meaning of Ham radio, I dont get it?".

>Letting them know that you think they ought to be
>homebrewing and designing circuits instead of operating is a mark of the
>socially inept.

Aren't suggestions, on what people should be doing, done all the time at meetings? If so, why are my suggestions bad?

>Referring to some members as "only coders" probably
>doesn't go over well.

Never said that about any members.

>Showing up at Field Day and complaining bitterly
>about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers marks one as a social
>outcast.

The event I went to was last week. Last week was not Field Day.

I did not complain about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers. Actually, I never heard of them until then. The child said he was trying to get his 10-10 at the same time. Then, the adult told him not to try for that award.

At first, one can assume that it would slow down the contest. Then, the adult explained to ME that 10-10 numbers were not desirable in any situation, contest or not.

>Let the black pepper
>represent the club members. Now place a drop of ordinary dishwashing
>detergent in the saucer. Let the drop of detergent represent Vipul's
>entrance. Observe carefully.

Wrong. I got an email expressing that it was nice for me to attend, and I was invited to attend the next such event.

973. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:04:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513230459.13222.00000243@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67123

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>Coming into a room and calling
>the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>boring is a good way to get their attention.

Do you think I come into a room and say that stuff? Thats not what I do.
Although, I will bring this stuff up in person in the proper time.

974. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:15:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513231531.13222.00000244@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67124

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>There are some (many) hams who do not like the 10-10 number business.
>Larry Roll for one. There are some hams who will chew another ham out
>over not having one, and some won't even talk to another ham if they
>don't have one.I've heard a public dressing-down or two. I'm not overly
>wild about it myself, as while the idea sounds okay, the implementation
>has become one of exclusivity. So that may have been what the one ham
>was talking to the other about.

>I still think you are making your conclusions on some shaky evidence,
>Vipul.

Yes, actually this was not the main emphacis of the event. Also, when the child said the other child was "not good enough" for not learning Morse code, probably was something children say and not typical.

Overall, they were a nice group of people. I got to operate a few different modes and saw the area. It was pretty fun and I would attend the next one if I am not busy.

975. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:23:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513232327.13222.00000245@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67125

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>I'm not talking about chance correlation. I'm talking about skill
>building. I don't think you have enough experience in either contesting
>or emergency communications to put up a rational argument.

No, you are being irrational. Contesting is not skill building for emergency
comm.

976. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:32:16 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@anonxmanho.com>
Message-ID: <b9sdc3skh0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67126
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
news:25eb70d7.0305131354.3620f977@posting.google.com...
>
<<<plonk>>>

<<<flushed>>>

977. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:33:14 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@anonxmanho.com>
Message-ID: <b9sddtsmv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67127
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
news:25eb70d7.0305131335.4c84339c@posting.google.com...

<<<plonk>>>

<<<<flushed>>>>>

978. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:38:15 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@anonxmanho.com>
Message-ID: <b9sdn9$ta6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67128

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030513182555.18775.00000624@mb-m11.aol.com...
>
> Put it another way - FCC comes into town, makes a big hoopla, finds
nothing,
> disappears. Violators think it's a big joke. Except they don't realize
that the
> folks in the monogrammed hats and marked vehicles were all for show....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Wow! Sounds like Agent 007 Is Goldfinger in the
movie too?

Anon

979. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:47:55 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513234755.13222.00000247@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67129

From Mike KB3EIA

>When was the last time you heard something like "I put new RAM in my
>CPU, then defragg'ed my HD? And did you see my new USB CD/RW and Zip?"

I dislike IT types more than anyone. Unfortunately, they have taken over society and lowered the quality of life, meaning one's experiences.

Individual desires and aspirations are now less important than managing and being part of the infrastructure. Unfortunately, they have been made to believe they are superior because of this, when actually it is the opposite.

Also, some of them seem to apply their beliefs as to what everyone should do. Others try to draw people into their group. Still others end up there because of the overpowering of the system.

Like a black hole, some are forced there. Still others are often "lost" in the machine.

980. Re: Baghdad Baxter Makes QST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:48:42 UTC
From: Queenie <Queenie@herbieandqueenie.com>
Message-ID: <b9seau$un7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67130
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0305131535.1a1deb6e@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
>
> QST, June 2003, page 72. Bottom of the page (very apropos) under
> Amateur Enforcement. Looks like old Baghdad is about to be vigorously
> spanked by the commission. Vince Kajunski of the Boston FCC office
> wants Baghdad to give the names, phone numbers and locations of all
> his "control ops" (what control ops?). They also want to know about
> the Bag's pecuniary interests, AKA, the ways he attempts to profit
> from broadcasting on his ham radio station. I see they also heard his
> bogus 2 hour long CQ on 14.275 last February! It's about time the Feds
> took serious interest in this radio creep. Look for the 'Bag' to lose
> his license before the snow flies.
>
> Chris

Don't hold your breath!

Queenie

981. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 03:49:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030513234928.13222.00000248@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67131

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.

> This of course is a contradiction of terms.

Only if you don't understand it.

982. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 04:17:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC1C309.BE46B203@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67132

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EC10D14.2050507@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > >
> > ><some snippage>
> > >
> > >>> I could go on forever.
> > >>
> > >> Len Anderson (no license) does that.
> > >
> > > HAR! Good one Dave!
> > >
> > >>>or.....
> > >>>
> > >>>2. He enjoys baiting Hams. That sounds like a troll
> > >>
> > >> I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
> > >> mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
> > >> reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
> > >> amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
> > >> so unpleasant.
> > >
> > >Absolutely! If he *is* seriously interested in the ARS, then he needs
> > >some instruction in the social graces. Coming into a room and calling
> > >the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
> > >boring is a good way to get their attention. It is not a good way to get
> > >them to change their erring ways.
> >
> > It isn't any better for amateurs to cast themselves as "superior"
> > to those with more experience in radio or are professionals in
> > that field or both.

Nobody went to Vipul's place of business or his home or to the place
where he gathers with friends in order to cast aspersions on him. You
seem to think that their is a rash of incidents where radio amateurs are
seeking out electronics or communications professionals and letting it
be known that the world of amateur radio considers them lesser beings.
Don't base everything on what you experience. You're special.

> Passing a few amateur tests and getting a callsign all your own
> for your very own station may be a personal accomplishment,
> perhaps a significant one in your life experience...but carrying on

> in a pretense of being "superior" in everything, including the
> "social graces," doesn't make such a pretense either acceptible
> or superior. Look to the "socially graced" others in this news-
> group as a microcosm of such "social" behavior.

You're the gnome who came to a newsgroup where radio amateur congregate in order to tell them what is wrong with amateur radio and to make certain that all are aware that you know what's best for amateur radio. Your attitude doesn't seem to have won you many supporters in the past seven years. A smart fellow would have changed his tactics.

Dave K8MN

983. Re: Defining CB vs "Land Mobile" Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 04:26:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b9upoh$nabpl$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67183

Nomex makes for a better insulating/protecting layer. That's why
firefighting turnout gear is made from that....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:7X%va.6309$VR.985@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> Just wear your asbestos long johns :)
>
> 73,
> Jim
>
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030512233111.18769.00000514@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > In article <FvTva.6348$DO5.6222@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim
> Hampton"
> > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
> >
> > >Thanks for a pleasant trip down memory lane. I appreciated your
thoughts
> > >even though some flames apparently had to appear :)
> > >
> > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > >Jim
> > >ps - you are correct about the UHF. Good add to the thread.
> >
> > You are welcome.
> >
> > Brush Fire Season is 12 months out of the year in here, always
> > a lot of flames. :-)
> >
> > We can always see ham sizzling on an open fire after he
> > (or she) opens fire. :-)
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/03
>

>

984. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 04:31:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC1C703.608E47CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67133

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >Please prove that these are one-time exceptions. I'll be waiting for
> >some solid fact from you. It will be a refreshing change of pace.
>
> It is apparent from attending Hamfests and club meetings. Almost every one I
> attend seem to confirm this.

So you have seen the people I mention but no others who would be
different than the claims you've made? Maybe you've never seen anyone
who is other than fat, old, etc. Maybe you've attended only one or two
club meetings or hamfests.

> >> One can find exceptions in many groups.
> >
> >You've offered no proof for any of your rather silly claims.
>
> Neither have you.

I offered specific callsigns and names. Would you like a list of others?

> >> Just that a significantly higher percentage of Hams are overweight
> >> than the general poplulation.
> >
> >...and you are offering what as proof of your statement?
>
> One can see this at Hamfests. Also, note that I joined some <random> Hams.

I'll bet I attend a lot more hamfests and club meetings than you. I
have seen nothing to support your nonsense.

> I
> had nothing to do with selecting them. I was on the email list. My reason for
> attending was that they had several radio modes I could use.

How does that prove that they were heavier than the general population?

>
> Random, therefore unbiased - do you understand?

I undertand that you believe that you have a random and unbiased
scenario. I reject your premise.

>
> >I'm pretty sure that after a half hour conversation with you, I'd be

> >ready for a large pizza and a couple of milkshakes.
>
> They clearly had their condition well before they met me.

Did they know in advance that you were showing up?

> >Going to a club meeting and telling the members that they don't know
> >anything technical except maybe about antennas is the sign of a socially
> >unskilled individual.
>
> Your right. If I ask them "Why are most Hams fat?" first. I doubt, I will be
> able to ask any of the other questions.
>
> I did say "I am not a Ham" in person.

I don't understand the reasoning behind your untruth.

> Also, I asked "What is the meaning of Ham
> radio, I dont get it?".

So you realized that if they knew you were also a ham, your question
would make it sound as if you were a bit thick.

> >Letting them know that you think they ought to be
> >homebrewing and designing circuits instead of operating is a mark of the
> >socially inept.
>
> Aren't suggestions, on what people should be doing, done all the time at
> meetings? If so, why are my suggestions bad?

In forty years, no one has ever come up to me at a radio club meeting
and told be that I shouldn't be DXing but that I should be designing
circuits. Not once.

> >Referring to some members as "only coders" probably
> >doesn't go over well.
>
> Never said that about any members.

You've said it here.

> >Showing up at Field Day and complaining bitterly
> >about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers marks one as a social
> >outcast.
>
> The event I went to was last week. Last week was not Field Day.

Try to accept that it doesn't matter what contest was going on unless it
was a 10-10 contest.

> I did not complain about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers. Actually, I
> never heard of them until then.

You're a man of vast experience and an extreme depth of knowledge.

> The child said he was trying to get his 10-10
> at the same time. Then, the adult told him not to try for that award.
>
> At first, one can assume that it would slow down the contest. Then, the adult
> explained to ME that 10-10 numbers were not desirable in any situation, contest
> or not.

Have you gotten this scenario pretty well set up as you'd like? The
facts seem to come in dibs and dabs and there is invariably a new twist
on what you say took place.

> >Let the black pepper
> >represent the club members. Now place a drop of ordinary dishwashing
> >detergent in the saucer. Let the drop of detergent represent Vipul's
> >entrance. Observe carefully.
>
> Wrong. I got an email expressing that it was nice for me to attend, and I was
> invited to attend the next such event.

Those are some exceptionally polite people in that club.

Dave K8MN

985. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 04:33:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC1C773.21FF5CDD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67134

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
> >Coming into a room and calling
> >the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
> >boring is a good way to get their attention.
>
> Do you think I come into a room and say that stuff? Thats not what I do.

Why on earth would you write it here?

> Although, I will bring this stuff up in person in the proper time.

That's probably not a good idea but you do what you think best.

Dave K8MN

986. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 04:36:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC1C836.D0AD2766@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67135

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >I'm not talking about chance correlation. I'm talking about skill
> >building. I don't think you have enough experience in either contesting
> >or emergency communications to put up a rational argument.
>
> No, you are being irrational.

It would seem that you don't have sufficient information on either
activity to build a reasoned opinion.

> Contesting is not skill building for emergency
> comm.

How is it that you would know? You won't listen to anyone who has more
experience at both contesting and emergency communications than
yourself.

Dave K8MN

987. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 04:40:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC1C94A.2117DF83@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67136

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
> >> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
>
> > This of course is a contradiction of terms.
>
> Only if you don't understand it.

It must make sense if one's inner spirit has transcended this plane.

Dave K8MN

988. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 05:31:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514013154.11803.00000472@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67138

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/13/2003 10:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030513230459.13222.00000243@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>>Coming into a room and calling
>>the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>>boring is a good way to get their attention.
>
>Do you think I come into a room and say that stuff? Thats not what I do.
>Although, I will bring this stuff up in person in the proper time.

But you do it here, Vipul! Why? How does one's dietary or aging demographics impact Amateur Radio policy?

Is there some metabolic dysfunction that I am unaware of that predisposes men to one thought on radio policy, but predisposes women to another based SOLELY on age/gender/weight?

And since when is there a "proper time" to be rude, obtuse and irresponsible?

Steve, K4CAP

989. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 05:32:52 UTC
From: rocko <rocko@modernlife.com>
Message-ID: <3EC1D50A.2050804@modernlife.com>
Source record: 67137
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

One word. "Quickfix".

Usually deployed on Blackhawk helicopters to simultaneously track and / or jam radio sources in the battlefield. Very fast, linked to AWACs aircraft. Worked on them during conception, build and deployment in the late '80's - early '90's. I imagine they have much better stuff now.

-rocko

Vito wrote:
> Mark Keith wrote:
>
>>"Richard W" <Sigs@nononnetanon.net> wrote
>>
>>> ... The commission cannot "easily" find someone, ...
>>
>>Sounds more like the local agents incompetence....
>
>
> Or lack of equipment and/or manpower. 15 years ago the Army had
> man-portable (backpack) scanner/DF rigs (AN/PRD-12). Put out 3 of them
> and they'll automatically DF and triangulate to give you the
> transmitter's coord's in seconds. No doubt they have even better now.
> Does FCC have any? ????
>
> 73, K3DWW

990. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 05:56:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514015638.11803.00000477@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67139

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/13/2003 10:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030513230017.13222.00000242@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>>Please prove that these are one-time exceptions. I'll be waiting for
>>some solid fact from you. It will be a refreshing change of pace.
>
>It is apparent from attending Hamfests and club meetings. Almost every one I
>attend seem to confirm this.

"Solid facts", Vippy. Names...dates...photographs...places...???

>>You've offered no proof for any of your rather silly claims.
>
>Neither have you.

Dave hasn't made any "silly claims" that need to be proven, Vipul.

>Going to a club meeting and telling the members that they don't know
>>anything technical except maybe about antennas is the sign of a socially
>>unskilled individual.
>
>Your right. If I ask them "Why are most Hams fat?" first. I doubt, I will be
>able to ask any of the other questions.

You'd be lucky to not sustain some blunt trauma to the orifice from which
teh comments emminated.

>I did say "I am not a Ham" in person. Also, I asked "What is the meaning of
>Ham radio, I don't get it?".

In other words you intentionally lied.

Uh huh...

> >Letting them know that you think they ought to be
>>homebrewing and designing circuits instead of operating is a mark of the
>>socially inept.
>
>Aren't suggestions, on what people should be doing, done all the time at
>meetings? If so, why are my suggestions bad?

Suggestions are one thing. If you present your "suggestions" even half as
rudely or arrogantly as you do in here, it's a wonder you are not

personna-non-grata on all the local repeaters. Perhaps you are?

>>Referring to some members as "only coders" probably
>>doesn't go over well.
>
>Never said that about any members.

Sure you have, Vippy! You've done it repeatedly in this forum when whining about how "only coders" somehow control and "force" their way on other club members.

If theya re NOT "members", how is it they ahve any sway with the club...?!?!

>>Showing up at Field Day and complaining bitterly
>>about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers marks one as a social
>>outcast.
>
>The event I went to was last week. Last week was not Field Day.

It's been more than last week, Vippy...You've been whipping this pony for two weeks already, and your comments have all placed the "event" past tense. Ergo whatEVER contest you allege this happened in was at least a month ago.

I say it never happened. You refuse to name the contest, the name of the club you were allegdly participating with and the callsign that you operated under.

In other words, you are making it up...You use emotion-grabing fodder of a "child" being verbally taunted by a tradition-laden elder, then try to make it believeable.

>I did not complain about not being able to exchange 10-10 numbers. Actually,
>I
>never heard of them until then. The child said he was trying to get his 10-10
>at the same time. Then, the adult told him not to try for that award.

I still think you are making it up or quoting it out of context. I am willing to bet the kid tried to exchange a 10-10 number inappropriately and was redirected by the "adult". You still do not cite the contest, other operating parameters, etc...

Without this, your story is nothing more than that...a story.

>At first, one can assume that it would slow down the contest. Then, the adult
>explained to ME that 10-10 numbers were not desirable in any situation,
>contest
>or not.

I see...One man's opinions on HIS interests (obviously NOT award chasing) now shape all of YOUR opinions on what Amateur Radio is all about...?!?! GET A LIFE!

>Wrong. I got an email expressing that it was nice for me to attend, and I was
>invited to attend the next such event.

No doubt from The Lighthouse for the Blind.

Steve, K4CAP

991. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 06:02:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514020204.11803.00000478@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67140

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/13/2003 10:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030513232327.13222.00000245@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>>I'm not talking about chance correlation. I'm talking about skill
>>building. I don't think you have enough experience in either contesting
>>or emergency communications to put up a rational argument.
>
>No, you are being irrational. Contesting is not skill building for emergency
>comm

Yes, it is. You have had it explained to you why. Do you need to have it explained to you again?

Steve, K4CAP

992. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 06:10:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514021025.11803.00000479@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67141

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/13/2003 10:47 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030513234755.13222.00000247@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>From Mike KB3EIA
>
>>When was the last time you heard something like "I put new RAM in my
>>CPU, then defragg'ed my HD? And did you see my new USB CD/RW and Zip?"
>
>I dislike IT types more than anyone. Unfortunately, they have taken over
>society and lowered the quality of life, meaning one's experiences.

Lowered the quality of life...?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

>Individual desires and aspirations are now less important than managing and
>being part of the infrastructure. Unfortunately, they have been made to
>believe
>they are superior because of this, when actually it is the opposite.

If they are working and you are not, who's more important than who?

>Also, some of them seem to apply their beliefs as to what everyone should do.
>Others try to draw people into their group. Still others end up there because
>of the overpowering of the system

And this is different from any other avocation, occupation, religion,
etc...HOW...?!?!

>Like a black hole, some are forced there. Still others are often "lost" in
>the
>machine

And some just never fit in in the first place.

Steve, K4CAP

993. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 06:11:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514021134.11803.00000480@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67142

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/13/2003 10:49 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030513234928.13222.00000248@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>>> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
>
>> This of course is a contradiction of terms.
>
>Only if you don't understand it.

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !
!

Steve, K4CAP

994. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 11:19:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514071907.17796.00000001@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67143

In article <3EBF94F1.8F50992@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I think that seven years of observation of Len's behavior toward others
>is sufficient time to allow as the basis for forming an opinion. Len
>doesn't play well with others.
>
Agreed. Note how Len blames his uncivil behavior today on the long-absent Jim
Kehler. Sounds like the old worn-out kid's excuses of "but he made me do it!"
and "everybody else did it!" How immature.

Perhaps it would be interesting to go back to his posts on this day, say, six
or seven years ago and see how much or how little things have changed....

73 de Jim, N2EY

995. Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 11:40:43 UTC
From: Al <alan@yokzfix.net>
Message-ID: <b9ta01$2ho$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67144

Anybody monitor nightly net on 3860? Many call
signs being used are unassigned. Several call signs
being used are legit but not being used by the assigned
licensee. What gives? QSOs always revolve around
politics. Up to 30 or more stations check in, probably
20 bogus calls. Where is FCC? Riley? OOs?
Where is the much vaunted FCC locating technology?
Why is this allowed to continue?

Al

996. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 11:47:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAE7A52B.1A60E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 67145

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> An Honorable Discharge is NOT the same as a
> Medical Discharge.
>
> If they were the same then there would not
> be two different documents.

Unless there are other factors involved that would warrant a discharge other than honorable, a medical discharge is an honorable discharge, Len. The DD Form 214 says "Honorable" with a code describing the reason for discharge. My wife was discharged for medical reasons. Her DD-214 says "Honorable."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

997. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 16:21:15 UTC
From: Al <alan@yokzfix.net>
Message-ID: <b9tqe6$2oc$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67147

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EC284EA.869A8085@crosslink.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Put it another way - FCC comes into town, makes a big hoopla, finds
nothing,
> > disappears. Violators think it's a big joke. ...
>
> Not all of them. I liked to tell CBrs that I'd seen an FCC van. They'd
> panic and hide all their "killer-watt" linears and mod'd CBs for a day
> or so. So, in that sense FCC put them off the air, albiet very
> temporarily. "What's that FCC van doing parked down the block from you?"
> gets great responses.
>
> (c: K3DWW

They haven't used vans in years, actually decades, cept for a microwave
van. Another hint. The vehicles they DO use, contrary to popular
belief among hams, do not have antennas sprouting out all over. And
don't look for government license tags. There's more, but I will
leave that to the active imagination hams have. I am an engineer
at a TV station and was afforded the opportunity to examine
one of their vehicles at a trade show.

Al

998. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 16:25:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514122512.16581.00000007@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 67148

In article <b9ta01$2ho$0@pita.alt.net>, "Al" <alan@yokzfix.net> writes:

>Anybody monitor nightly net on 3860?

Not me.

>Many call
>signs being used are unassigned. Several call signs
>being used are legit but not being used by the assigned
>licensee. What gives?

Waddya think?

>QSOs always revolve around
>politics. Up to 30 or more stations check in, probably
>20 bogus calls. Where is FCC? Riley? OOs?
>Where is the much vaunted FCC locating technology?
>Why is this allowed to continue?
>
FCC is complaint-driven. No complaints=no enforcement action.

FCC wants tapes of alleged violations with time, date, frequency, mode and any other available info such as direction and signal strength before they investigate.

Have you or anyone else complained to the FCC and sent them tapes?

73 de Jim, N2EY

999. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 16:47:41 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514124741.20069.00000013@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67149

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>Date: 5/14/03 7:47 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BAE7A52B.1A60E%stewart@say.net>
>
>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> An Honorable Discharge is NOT the same as a
>> Medical Discharge.
>>
>> If they were the same then there would not
>> be two different documents.
>
>
> Unless there are other factors involved that would warrant a discharge
>other than honorable, a medical discharge is an honorable discharge, Len.
>The DD Form 214 says "Honorable" with a code describing the reason for
>discharge. My wife was discharged for medical reasons. Her DD-214 says
>"Honorable."

How can this be?

If true, it means that Len is WRONG!

Which, as Len keeps telling us, is impossible.

1000. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 17:03:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC276D6.5010106@psu.edu>
Source record: 67150

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3EC1157F.474544DF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>
>>>>I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
>>>>mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
>>>>reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
>>>>amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
>>>>so unpleasant.
>>>
>>>Absolutely! If he *is* seriously interested in the ARS, then he needs
>>>some instruction in the social graces.
>>
>>
> You might want to reconsider that premise, Mike.

Maybe I should state it a little different, Jim. If he wants to effect
some change in what he sees as deficiencies in the ARS, he should do it
in a manner that doesn't insult the people he is trying to influence.

Social graces are always recommended.

>>>Coming into a room and calling
>>>the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>>>boring is a good way to get their attention.
>>
>>
> If attention is all someone really wants, then the goal is achieved.

Attention for it's own sake is something that should be outgrown by
the time a person is six y.o. IMO. Obviously the profliferation of hair
dyed with Kool-Aid, pierced tongues and tatoos tell us that that isn't
always the case. It does not mak it untrue however! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1001. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 17:06:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC277A1.6060205@psu.edu>
Source record: 67151

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>
>>Coming into a room and calling
>>the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>>boring is a good way to get their attention.
>
>
> Do you think I come into a room and say that stuff? Thats not what I do.
> Although, I will bring this stuff up in person in the proper time.

That is *exactly* what you did here in this newsgroup, Vipul.

There are real people, real hams behind the keyboards in the newsgroup.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1002. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 17:18:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC27A78.40103@psu.edu>
Source record: 67153

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>
>>There are some (many) hams who do not like the 10-10 number business.
>>Larry Roll for one. There are some hams who will chew another ham out
>>over not having one, and some won't even talk to another ham if they
>>don't have one.I've heard a public dressing-down or two. I'm not overly
>>wild about it myself, as while the idea sounds okay, the implementation
>>has become one of exclusivity. So that may have been what the one ham
>>was talking to the other about.
>
>
>>I still think you are making your conclusions on some shaky evidence,
>>Vipul.
>
>
> Yes, actually this was not the main emphacis of the event. Also, when the child
> said the other child was "not good enough" for not learning Morse code,
> probably was something children say and not typical.

Kids often say bitter and unkind things to other children. I didn't
know that's where the not good enough thing came from. I thought it was
from another adult.

> Overall, they were a nice group of people. I got to operate a few different
> modes and saw the area. It was pretty fun and I would attend the next one if I
> am not busy.

You might even change your mind about us!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1003. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 17:22:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC27B50.1070901@psu.edu>
Source record: 67152

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/13/2003 10:49 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030513234928.13222.00000248@mb-m14.aol.com>
>>
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>>
>>
>>>>Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
>>>
>>> This of course is a contradiction of terms.
>>
>>Only if you don't understand it.
>
>
> BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

Now THAT I understand! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1004. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 18:03:22 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC284EA.869A8085@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67146

N2EY wrote:
>
> Put it another way - FCC comes into town, makes a big hoopla, finds nothing,
> disappears. Violators think it's a big joke. ...

Not all of them. I liked to tell CBrs that I'd seen an FCC van. They'd
panic and hide all their "killer-watt" linears and mod'd CBs for a day
or so. So, in that sense FCC put them off the air, albiet very
temporarily. "What's that FCC van doing parked down the block from you?"
gets great responses.

(c: K3DWW

1005. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 18:36:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514143626.00486.00000004@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67154

In article <b9s6h1$as2$0@208.207.71.173>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> It isn't any better for amateurs to cast themselves as "superior"
>> to those with more experience in radio or are professionals in
>> that field or both.
>
> Well, Gollies, Len, no doubt it really *does* burnish your tail when you
>think that the very lowliest Novice (left over from the pre restructuring
days)
>is fully authorized to build, own, and operate at will his own personal radio
>station, on a quite wide range of frequencies.

Not a problem today or 20 years ago for me. All one needs is money
and some place to put an antenna. Many, many businesses around the
country and the world sell ready-made radios for most any radio
service, professional or amateur. One can buy the antenna, even hire
someone to assemble and erect it...the only stoppage may be some
local zoning laws and codes.

I've already owned, operated, and licensed three different two-way
radios not in amateur radio. One of them AS "employer" in a
partnership. Operating takes special talent, knowledge, or
experience? Hardly. Turn up the volume, listen, push a switch
button and talk.

"Build" a problem? Certainly not. I can DESIGN electronic
equipment all the way from conceptual ideas on paper through all
the required details of circuit and component selection, assembly,
alignment, testing of everything to more and tighter regulations
than is found in amateur radio. I've done that. I had a whole
working career doing that, got paid fairly well by corporations to
do that on a regular basis. I'm still doing that for myself.

"Wide range of frequencies?" US amateur radio is LIMITED to
certain bands above 1.6 MHz. US amateur radio constrains
itself primarily to just the HF bands where the olde-tymers hang
out playing contest games and hanging out with their olde-tymer
buddies. VHF, UHF amateur bands are occupied overwhelmingly
by ready-made equipment users who barely venture into the
microwave bands unless they can get ready-made equipment to
work there. I've already worked from VLF on up to Ku-band at
24 GHz on R&D for both commercial and government contracts.

US amateur radio MAY be granted a "new" HF band near 5 MHz
and one small slice of a band at LF in the future. That's not yet
accomplished. Europeans have had a LF band(s) to play with
for amateur use for years. ARRL pestered the FCC for a limited
number of amateurs to "test" the proposed 5 MHz band in the
1990s...as if that band is "new frequency territory" never explored
before in the 60 year past of HF radio propagation by all the other
HF radio service users.

Tens of thousands of US telephone subscribers use 2.4 GHz
cordless telephones every day...hundreds of thousands (perhaps
even millions) of US cellular telephone subscribers use cellular
telephones at the 1 GHz cellular band every day...all without any
FCC license or training in two-way radio use or special education
or practice in the gracious, noble art of morsemanship. Tens of
thousands of radio clocks automatically tune to 60 KHz WWVB
time signals in the US every day and correct themselves to the
exact second, even automatically adjusting for time zone and
daylight savings time.

There are tens of thousands of WLANs operating every day in the
USA plus hundreds of thousands of short-range transceivers
operating on three bands that extend on up to 5 GHz. None need
special licensing from FCC to operate and certainly not any skills
of morsemanship. Keyless automobile locks operate every day in
the USA to lock and unlock vehicles through little UHF key-fob
transmitters. No driver needs an FCC license or morsemanship
to do that.

>You, on the other hand, are
>relegated to nonstop reminiscing on your 50 year old military duties during
>which you baby-sat some less-than-interesting routine circuits on a few
>discrete frequencies.

"Nonstop reminiscing?" :-) I tried to make a point that the entire
US military was NOT using morse code for long-distance radio
communications message traffic a half century ago. Carroll would
not listen...he never had such an experience, didn't do any such
regular HF radio communications during his short, conscripted
military service days...never explored HF radio fully with his amateur
equipment, didn't know anything other than amateur radio and some
alleged Missouri state police "CW nets."

"Baby-sitting?" :-) Each operating team at ADA was responsible
for the continuing operation of 36 (at first) to 43 transmitters ranging
from 1 KW to 40 KW in power output at HF operating 24/7, using
a two square mile antenna "farm." Each transmitter, all the exciters,
every bit of communications equipment received periodic
maintenance done by team members and a handful of Department
of the Army civilians. There was an average of about 3 frequency
changes per transmitter per 24 hour period, each QSY requiring
confirmation of exact frequency as measured by the receiver site
frequency standard over 20 miles away...reported over the closed

TTY net linking all nets. QSYs were required to be as short as possible to minimize downtime in a 24/7 environment. Average time of QSYs was less than 3 minutes from initial written TTY command to final frequency standards confirmation on the same TTY net. Each QSY required a change of crystals in the exciter, retuning the transmitters (heavy-duty tank coil link changing in 10 KW BC-340s and 15 KW PW-15s), setting the Mark and Space frequencies to beat with frequency standards' separate audio line using temporary "Fox Test" keying from Control, waiting for frequency standards' final confirmation on the TTY.

"Less than interesting routine circuits?" The whole purpose of the 24/7 worldwide communications network of the US Army and other branches in the 1950s was to make communications as reliable as possible regardless of propagation conditions around the clock. I've never added up the total of all communications channels carried by ADA at that time...off the cuff estimation is over 100 TTY, voice channels and a once-in-a-while FAX, all transmitted at the same time. Majority was TTY and about a fifth of those were encrypted, not monitorable by standard TTY machines. The bulk of communications traffic was "routine" for all the various necessary communications of a very large army that had to take care of itself and be available for any military action at any time. The "Cold War" had begun.

From 1952 to 1956 was not a "routine" time in the US military. The permanent truce condition in Korean War was not reached until July 1953. The French lost their colonial war in French Indochina despite US material aid (ADA had multiple RF circuits to the US Saigon MAG at the time). Sporadic fighting between Communist China on the mainland and Nationalist China in Taiwan kept occurring over the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. The civil war in Indonesia between communists there and everyone else was just beginning...that would kill over 6 million Indonesians. The USSR had acquired nuclear bomb capability and Joseph Stalin died, creating a temporary vacuum in that regime. The Berlin airlift was over but the communists isolated the two Germanys. SAC had begun the regular loiter flights up to the USSR border, armed, but never had to follow through on final mission orders.

At ADA we got to learn a few details of that behind the scenes, so to speak while monitoring circuits for operation (required to insure reliability). We got bits and pieces of information as it was communicated. Not a great deal of it...too many circuits to keep a constant check of everything.

"A few discrete frequencies?" ADA, like all large military transmitter stations then, had a large choice of frequencies, all of them crystal controlled. There were about 150 separate quartz crystals in a floor-standing tall cabinet with warming lamps inside for all the non-SSB transmitter exciters. That was vacuum tube

days and the insides of radio equipment was hotter than free air. SSB transmitters were all preset-tuned, servoed, with their own quartz crystals, about 6 out of 10 possible frequencies loaded, separate from the TTY and voice transmitter exciters. The first frequency synthesizers would not be around until about 1965 after the USAF took over ADA from the US Army in 1963. ADA had two exciters built by Northern Electric which could "VFO" to frequencies not yet lockable by crystals. ADA also had equipment to do minor regrinding of quartz units if that was necessary...only done twice that I know of, not done by me.

Did I mention the USAF HF station at Funabashi? :-) Army had some equipment up there, also beside Tokyo Bay, some personnel from the 71st Sig Svc Bn were TDY there. USAF closed that down around 1965, moved over to the old ADA site at Kashiwa with its antenna farm built over a former airfield. That closed down in 1978, HF no longer needed in the US military for a primary radio communications medium. Who knows, maybe the State Department got some "surplus" gifts of radios to use in African embassies? :-)

>You are not, and never were, licensed to do anything real
>in radio other than that which your employer directed.

I was my own employer for one of my licensed radios. :-) Directed myself.

Define "real radios," Dickie. Are ready-built HF ham transceivers the only "real radios" in your mind?

I'd already converted, modified two separate HF rigs out of ARC-5 military surplus in 1948-1949, tested them as best I could with equipment at hand and knowledge available then. Sold them both to local radio amateurs at a tiny profit, never used them on HF.

I figured out a VFO modification for a friend of mine for his new Gonset G-76 in 1961. G-76 wasn't designed for VFO on the top band then. Strictly a hobby activity, Dickie.

I could talk about some CB activity and having all 23 channels under crystal control before there was ready-build CB gear to do that...but I doubt you call CB as "real radio." :-)

> No wonder your bowels are in a continuous state of uproar.

Only when I drive down to Mexico and drink the water. :-)

>I believe you have every reason to suck on all that gall.

That depends. Ever have an all-day sucker, Dickie? :-)

>> Passing a few amateur tests and getting a callsign all your own
>> for your very own station may be a personal accomplishment,

>> perhaps a significant one in your life experience..
>
> Well, you'll have to take someone else's word for it, won't you?

Right! But I don't "have to take" fish stories, exaggerations, lies,
and snow jobs as "truth," do I? :-)

> We must always come back to that resounding fact, mustn't we? The most
>lowly, unlearned Novice * is* your superior.

Hmmm...I know only one Novice licensee now. He's run a part-time
computer sales and consultation business since around 1985 or so.
Not quite "unlearned." Was one of the 10 first BBSs in the USA,
starting with his own-built PC and own-written software. Full time
work in the entertainment industry as a TV Director, winner of two
Emmys for TV Direction. He is my superior in general PC skills.

I'll call any skilled morseman my superior BUT ONLY IN
morsemanship. No other skill, Dickie, except mean-spirited
name calling which you sporadically show as your masterwork in
here. I'll acknowledge you as my superior in mean-spiritdness.

Somebody in here used the quote, "it ain't bragging if ya done it."
I've done what I say I done, Dickie, have the proof. Now go work
some DX on HF with CW, leave the mean-spirited messaging to
your PCTA buddies...they are YOUR superior in that department.

1006. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151145.28806.00000009@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67162

In article <BAE7A52B.1A60E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

> Unless there are other factors involved that would warrant a discharge
>other than honorable, a medical discharge is an honorable discharge, Len.
>The DD Form 214 says "Honorable" with a code describing the reason for
>discharge. My wife was discharged for medical reasons. Her DD-214 says
>"Honorable."

Must be the "New Beaurocracy" then. MY DD-214 only says it is
for separation from active duty. MY Honorable Discharge didn't
arrive as a "DD-214" but as another certificate and then four years
later by mail in 1960.

Keep up the good work on that SSB VHF transceiver design...

1007. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151147.28806.00000010@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67158

In article <20030514071907.17796.00000001@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Perhaps it would be interesting to go back to his posts on this day, say, six >or seven years ago and see how much or how little things have changed....

Including yourself, Mr. Peabody? :-)

1008. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151149.28806.00000011@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67159

In article <3EC27A78.40103@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Kids often say bitter and unkind things to other children.

Please don't bring in your family squabbles here...

1009. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151150.28806.00000012@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67156

In article <3EC27B50.1070901@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

\>BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !
\>!
\>
\>
\> Now THAT I understand! ;^)

Birds of a feather? How tweet! :-)

1010. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151153.28806.00000013@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67155

In article <20030514021025.11803.00000479@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, aka Air Ace K4CAP) writes:

> And some just never fit in in the first place.

Good luck, square peg...

1011. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151155.28806.00000014@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67157

In article <3EC1C94A.2117DF83@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>It must make sense if one's inner spirit has transcended this plane.

Missed your connection at the airport again?

1012. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151157.28806.00000015@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67161

In article <20030514013154.11803.00000472@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, aka Air Ace K4CAP) writes:

> And since when is there a "proper time" to be rude, obtuse and
>irresponsible?

Any time you are on line? :-)

1013. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:11:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514151158.28806.00000016@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67160

In article <3EC1C309.BE46B203@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>A smart fellow would have changed his tactics.

Why haven't you? :-)

1014. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 19:58:13 UTC
From: Al <alan@yokzfix.net>
Message-ID: <b9u752$5dh$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67163

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030514122512.16581.00000007@mb-m17.aol.com...
> In article <b9ta01$2ho$0@pita.alt.net>, "Al" <alan@yokzfix.net> writes:
>
> >Anybody monitor nightly net on 3860?
>
> Not me.
>
> >Many call
> >signs being used are unassigned. Several call signs
> >being used are legit but not being used by the assigned
> >licensee. What gives?
>
> Waddya think?

Illegal Activiy.

>
> >QSOs always revolve around
> >politics. Up to 30 or more stations check in, probably
> >20 bogus calls. Where is FCC? Riley? OOs?
> >Where is the much vaunted FCC locating technology?
> >Why is this allowed to continue?
> >
> FCC is complaint-driven. No complaints=no enforcement action.

Many complaints already filed.

>
> FCC wants tapes of alleged violations with time, date, frequency, mode and
any
> other available info such as direction and signal strength before they
> investigate.

All that already sent & More.

>
> Have you or anyone else complained to the FCC and sent them tapes?

See above.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1015. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174534.09580.00000044@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67170

In article <20030514071907.17796.00000001@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Perhaps it would be interesting to go back to his posts on this day, say, six >or seven years ago and see how much or how little things have changed....

Including yourself, Mr. Peabody? :-)

1016. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174534.09580.00000043@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67171

In article <BAE7A52B.1A60E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

> Unless there are other factors involved that would warrant a discharge
>other than honorable, a medical discharge is an honorable discharge, Len.
>The DD Form 214 says "Honorable" with a code describing the reason for
>discharge. My wife was discharged for medical reasons. Her DD-214 says
>"Honorable."

Must be the "New Beaurocracy" then. MY DD-214 only says it is
for separation from active duty. MY Honorable Discharge didn't
arrive as a "DD-214" but as another certificate and then four years
later by mail in 1960.

Keep up the good work on that SSB VHF transceiver design...

1017. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174535.09580.00000045@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67164

In article <3EC27A78.40103@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Kids often say bitter and unkind things to other children.

Please don't bring in your family squabbles here...

1018. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174535.09580.00000046@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67165

```
In article <3EC27B50.1070901@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !
>!
>
>
> Now THAT I understand! ;^)

Birds of a feather? How tweet! :-)
```

1019. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174536.09580.00000048@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67167

In article <3EC1C94A.2117DF83@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>It must make sense if one's inner spirit has transcended this plane.

Missed your connection at the airport again?

1020. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174536.09580.00000047@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67168

In article <20030514021025.11803.00000479@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, aka Air Ace K4CAP) writes:

> And some just never fit in in the first place.

Good luck, square peg...

1021. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174537.09580.00000049@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67166

In article <20030514013154.11803.00000472@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, aka Air Ace K4CAP) writes:

> And since when is there a "proper time" to be rude, obtuse and
>irresponsible?

Any time you are on line? :-)

1022. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 21:45:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514174537.09580.00000050@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67169

In article <3EC1C309.BE46B203@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>A smart fellow would have changed his tactics.

Why haven't you? :-)

1023. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:28:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514192831.27394.00000041@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67172

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>So you have seen the people I mention but no others who would be
>different than the claims you've made?

> Maybe you've never seen anyone
>who is other than fat, old, etc.

No, I've seen a few exceptions.

>Maybe you've attended only one or two
>club meetings or hamfests.

I have been to 4+ Ham radio clubs, Hamfests in MA,NH,CT. Also, I've heard Hams
in many states while on long weekend trip.

>I offered specific callsigns and names. Would you like a list of others?

Surveys have been done. Eham survey indicated high percentage of fat Hams.
Interest surveys show Hams are more interested in antennas and Morse code than
electronics.

QST articles represent what most Hams are interested. This is further confirmed
when attending Ham club meetings or in Hamfest topics.

>I'll bet I attend a lot more hamfests and club meetings than you.

You probably have been to more such events than me.

>I
>have seen nothing to support your nonsense.

I can tell you what I saw. Perhaps you are more like the typical Ham so you
don't see that.

>> I
>> had nothing to do with selecting them. I was on the email list. My reason
>for
>> attending was that they had several radio modes I could use.
>
>How does that prove that they were heavier than the general population?
>

Because I saw them.

>> Random, therefore unbiased - do you understand?
>
>I undertand that you believe that you have a random and unbiased
>scenario. I reject your premise.

Tell me how it is not random.

>> At first, one can assume that it would slow down the contest. Then, the
>adult
>> explained to ME that 10-10 numbers were not desirable in any situation,
>contest
>> or not.
>
>Have you gotten this scenario pretty well set up as you'd like? The
>facts seem to come in dibs and dabs and there is invariably a new twist
>on what you say took place.

There is a painting. Up close, it looks like several blotches. You look at one, then you look at another. I presented one, then another. The picture dosen't look like anything.

However the artist made the painting such that if you looked at it from a distance, you would see the picture.

>> Wrong. I got an email expressing that it was nice for me to attend, and I
>was
>> invited to attend the next such event.
>
>Those are some exceptionally polite people in that club.

Yes, they were nice people. Also, I was polite to them throughout the event. It was a fun event at a very low cost. I would attend the next one, if possible.

1024. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:32:34 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514193234.27394.00000042@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67173

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP):

> But you do it here, Vipul! Why? How does one's dietary or aging
>demographics impact Amateur Radio policy?

Ham radio must lead to these conditions if more Hams have them. If more people were interested in radio direction finding or electronics, there would be less overwieght Hams.

1025. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:37:34 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514193734.27394.00000043@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67174

From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.

> This of course is a contradiction of terms.

One example is gangs that spray paint grafitti. This is a group-supported anti-social activity.

Making radio contacts through the night at a vacation spot, while others are socializing is another <group supported> anti-social activity.

1026. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:41:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hew85f2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67176

On 14 May 2003 05:56:38 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

Congrats on your new call sign.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1027. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:41:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hew9a73.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67175

On 14 May 2003 16:25:12 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>FCC is complaint-driven. No complaints=no enforcement action.
>
>FCC wants tapes of alleged violations with time, date,
>frequency, mode and any other available info such as direction
>and signal strength before they investigate.

>Have you or anyone else complained to the FCC and sent them tapes?

And who has used some political leverage to get the existing
roadblocks to proper FCC field enforcement functioning removed?

The critics here and elsewhere ridicule the FCC for not doing
anything or not doing it right or not using the latest
whiz-bang gadgets that DoD and the spook services have.

It's certainly not the fault of today's field agents who want
to do a good job and are not allowed to.

Can't do anything about those problems with no money, no
authority to hire any more agents, a Congress that thinks that
the FCC exists only at The Portals Office Complex and should
ask "how high" on the way up when it tells them to jump, and an
FCC executive management that grins and says "yessir" "yessir"
to them and does nothing about getting more field staff, more
and better equipment, and the cojones that it once had.

I'm glad that I retired when I did - the slide downhill had
already started. They can call me and the rest of the 1995
exodus back as willing consultants when the "Eighth Floor" gets
serious about being an enforcement agency again. Right now the
"Eighth Floor" is more concerned about giving its authority
away than strengthening it.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1028. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:44:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514194439.15427.00000021@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67178

In article <3EBA7AF2.6010403@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: "Phil Kane"

>>>And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
>>> the expertise to make the statement above?

>> None. And proud of it.

Why in the world are you proud of it, Vipul?

>> Also, its common sense that they would normally pay
>> someone a small fee to do these events.

Tell ya what - look into what it costs and then tell us how small the fee
really is.
>
> Being proud of not helping people is nothing to be proud of.
>
AMEN!

>>>And how many of these events have YOU participated in to claim
>>> the expertise to make the statement above?

>> I've seen it in their ads that they "train" you the same day.
>
> They are assuming you have the basic skills needed to do the work. I
>took a short training course in SkyWarn recently. It only took an hour
>or so. But the other skills were acquired long befor this.

I have a list.....
>
> Time for the old story about the computer repairman:
>
> A person brought in a computer monitor to be repaired. The repairman
>took a look at the monitor, removed the cover, and looked around for a
>moment. After about a minute, he removed a fuse, and put in a new one.
>This fixed the monitor.
>
> He then handed the owner a bill for 100 dollars. The owner was angry
>because he saw that the repairman only replaced a cheap fuse. The owner
>demanded an itemized reciept.
>
> The repairman made one up that read:
>
> Fuse $0.50

>
> Knowing where to look: $99.50
>
> Total $100.00
>
It's a much older story than that! Goes back to the 1930s at least. Version I first heard had the owners of a power plant bringing in an expert from far away to fix an engine that wouldn't run. Expert listens to the symptoms, asks for a ball pein hammer, descends into the innards of the great machine and hammers for a few seconds.

Comes out, they try the engine, runs perfectly. Bill is for $5000 - $1 for hammering, $4999 for knowing where to hammer.

Although it's an old story, it's still very relevant. Just like Morse code ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1029. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:44:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514194440.15427.00000022@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67177

In article <3EC276D6.5010106@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <3EC1157F.474544DF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>
>>>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>>
>>>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>I think this is more likely because Vipul has been corrected on his
>>>>>mistaken claims any number of times. That hasn't stopped him from
>>>>>reiterating them. You have to ask yourself why anyone would continue in
>>>>>amateur radio or bother to post about amateur radio here if he found it
>>>>>so unpleasant.
>>>>
>>>>Absolutely! If he *is* seriously interested in the ARS, then he needs
>>>>some instruction in the social graces.
>>>
>>
>> You might want to reconsider that premise, Mike.
>
> Maybe I should state it a little different, Jim. If he wants to effect
>some change in what he sees as deficiencies in the ARS, he should do it
>in a manner that doesn't insult the people he is trying to influence.

> Social graces are always recommended.

Agreed!

What I'm saying is that maybe his goal is not to effect some change in what he
sees as deficiencies in the ARS. Maybe he has other goals.
>
>>>>Coming into a room and calling
>>>>the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>>>>boring is a good way to get their attention.

>> If attention is all someone really wants, then the goal is achieved.
>
> Attention for it's own sake is something that should be outgrown by
>the time a person is six y.o. IMO.

Sure. But it often isn't.

>Obviously the profliferation of hair
>dyed with Kool-Aid, pierced tongues and tatoos tell us that that isn't
>always the case.

Exactly!

Consider adding insulting newsgroup postings to that list....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1030. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:46:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514194615.27394.00000044@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67179

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Dave hasn't made any "silly claims" that need to be proven, Vipul.

Yes he has. He claimed contesting is useful for emergency comm skill build'g.

Making those radio contacts is not the only thing an emergency requires.
Contesting could only cover a fraction of the skills required in a real
emergency.

1031. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-14 23:57:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514195717.27394.00000045@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67180

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Why in the world are you proud of it,

I am not proud of not doing public service. That event is hardly a public service.

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>They are assuming you have the basic skills needed to do the work. I
>>took a short training course in SkyWarn recently. It only took an hour
>>or so. But the other skills were acquired long befor this.

Basic skills is not typically part of Ham radio. And how useful was this course an being able to actually apply what you learned?

From N2EY
>Although it's an old story, it's still very relevant. Just like Morse code
>;-)

The story has nothing to do with Morse code.

And Morse code is not "very" relevant.

1032. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 00:12:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9um25$7ck$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 67181

Al wrote:

> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EC284EA.869A8085@crosslink.net...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > Put it another way - FCC comes into town, makes a big hoopla, finds
> nothing,
> > > disappears. Violators think it's a big joke. ...
> >
> > Not all of them. I liked to tell CBrs that I'd seen an FCC van. They'd
> > panic and hide all their "killer-watt" linears and mod'd CBs for a day
> > or so. So, in that sense FCC put them off the air, albiet very
> > temporarily. "What's that FCC van doing parked down the block from you?"
> > gets great responses.
> >
> > (c: K3DWW
>
> They haven't used vans in years, actually decades, cept for a microwave
> van. Another hint. The vehicles they DO use, contrary to popular
> belief among hams, do not have antennas sprouting out all over. And
> don't look for government license tags. There's more, but I will
> leave that to the active imagination hams have. I am an engineer
> at a TV station and was afforded the opportunity to examine
> one of their vehicles at a trade show.

No matter. The mental image evoked at the mention of the 'white van' is more
than enough to cause the intended response.

1033. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 00:12:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9um28$7ck$1@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 67182

Len Over 21 wrote:

> I've already owned, operated, and licensed three different two-way
> radios not in amateur radio. One of them AS "employer" in a
> partnership. Operating takes special talent, knowledge, or
> experience? Hardly. Turn up the volume, listen, push a switch
> button and talk.

Yep, that's all there is to it. On-off, volume, squelch, PTT. Maybe you should join Vipul for a cold one and discuss strategy. You obviously are every bit as clueless. I sit here looking at an Icom 756 that has 65 knobs, pushbuttons and controls and three input/out ports on the FRONT panel, not beginign to consider what's behind the "menu" shifts, which number considerably more since a lot of them perform multiple functions. And that's only the FRONT panel. No wonder you're so farrrrr out in left field. You need a fieldglass to even recognize the subject, much less any detail thereof.

As noted previously, the most clueless novice (small n) has you bested buy a bunch. But regardless, you just troll on and on and on.
It's hardly surprising when some swimmer tires of it and bregins to stick firecrackers up your nose.

1034. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 01:17:11 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@heygoodsvc.com>
Message-ID: <b9uprb$gv3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67184

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hew9a73.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 14 May 2003 16:25:12 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >FCC is complaint-driven. No complaints=no enforcement action.
> >
> >FCC wants tapes of alleged violations with time, date,
> >frequency, mode and any other available info such as direction
> >and signal strength before they investigate.
>
> >Have you or anyone else complained to the FCC and sent them tapes?
>
> And who has used some political leverage to get the existing
> roadblocks to proper FCC field enforcement functioning removed?
>
> The critics here and elsewhere ridicule the FCC for not doing
> anything or not doing it right or not using the latest
> whiz-bang gadgets that DoD and the spook services have.
>
> It's certainly not the fault of today's field agents who want
> to do a good job and are not allowed to.
>
> Can't do anything about those problems with no money, no
> authority to hire any more agents, a Congress that thinks that
> the FCC exists only at The Portals Office Complex and should
> ask "how high" on the way up when it tells them to jump, and an
> FCC executive management that grins and says "yessir" "yessir"
> to them and does nothing about getting more field staff, more
> and better equipment, and the cojones that it once had.
>
> I'm glad that I retired when I did - the slide downhill had
> already started. They can call me and the rest of the 1995
> exodus back as willing consultants when the "Eighth Floor" gets
> serious about being an enforcement agency again. Right now the
> "Eighth Floor" is more concerned about giving its authority
> away than strengthening it.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
The FCC has more than adequate budget to do its job.

The single greatest problem in the commission today in a single word is GREED, Getting rich at the taxpayers' expense.

1035. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 01:57:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <_tCwa.7017$GZ1.2601@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67185

Wheeeeoooowieee. You'd best wake up and smell the coffee. The welfare folks have big budget cuts in staffing - guess what happens when errors are made? When you don't have enough budget for investigation, well ... dang! I am missing the fact that you might need an IQ over the modest two-digit range to figure that out. Well, I shouldn't flame, but you should be realistic and figure a few things out on your own. Without reasonable budgets for investigations (not just figuring out who or what should go where in the electromagnetic spectrum), don't expect enforcement. Cut more income and corporate taxes and enable companies to report more income than they make (since they won't get whacked too badly with taxes). Then let the stock run up a bit, forbid your employees to dump the stock, then dump your stock and run. Enron and many others. Heck, you'd get more time getting caught robbing a bank of $1000.00 than some executives cleaning out pensions and running off with hundreds of millions of dollars.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.478 / Virus Database: 275 - Release Date: 5/6/03

1036. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 02:25:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514222511.04554.00000013@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67186

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hew9a73.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 14 May 2003 16:25:12 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>FCC is complaint-driven. No complaints=no enforcement action.
>>
>>FCC wants tapes of alleged violations with time, date,
>>frequency, mode and any other available info such as direction
>>and signal strength before they investigate.
>
>>Have you or anyone else complained to the FCC and sent them tapes?
>
> And who has used some political leverage to get the existing
> roadblocks to proper FCC field enforcement functioning removed?

Besides you, Phil, hasn't the ARRL had a hand in that?
>
> The critics here and elsewhere ridicule the FCC for not doing
> anything or not doing it right or not using the latest
> whiz-bang gadgets that DoD and the spook services have.

I hope you do not think I was being critical, Phil. The point I was trying to
make is simply that if we want enforcement we have to ask for it in the
appropriate way. Complaining to each other doesn't get the FCC's attention.
>
> It's certainly not the fault of today's field agents who want
> to do a good job and are not allowed to.
>
Agreed.

> Can't do anything about those problems with no money, no
> authority to hire any more agents, a Congress that thinks that
> the FCC exists only at The Portals Office Complex and should
> ask "how high" on the way up when it tells them to jump, and an
> FCC executive management that grins and says "yessir" "yessir"
> to them and does nothing about getting more field staff, more
> and better equipment, and the cojones that it once had.

> I'm glad that I retired when I did - the slide downhill had
> already started. They can call me and the rest of the 1995
> exodus back as willing consultants when the "Eighth Floor" gets
> serious about being an enforcement agency again. Right now the
> "Eighth Floor" is more concerned about giving its authority
> away than strengthening it.
>

The proposed new rules - actually lack of rules - on media conglomerates are one example. Philly Inquirer had a pretty good story on it. PLC? Another scary thought.

"Bricks without straw" isn't exactly a new idea. And the White House wants a big tax cut, while many states are going in the red....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1037. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 02:28:01 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <RWCwa.327442$Si4.278107@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 67187

Hello Al ..... don't get your blood pressure up ....get on CW and discover what ham radio without aggravation is about .... 73 Tom Popovic KI3R nr Pittburgh
"Al" <alan@yokzfix.net> wrote in message news:b9ta01$2ho$0@pita.alt.net...
> Anybody monitor nightly net on 3860? Many call
> signs being used are unassigned. Several call signs
> being used are legit but not being used by the assigned
> licensee. What gives? QSOs always revolve around
> politics. Up to 30 or more stations check in, probably
> 20 bogus calls. Where is FCC? Riley? OOs?
> Where is the much vaunted FCC locating technology?
> Why is this allowed to continue?
>
> Al
>
>

1038. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 02:47:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514224724.14837.00000014@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67188

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hew85f2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 14 May 2003 05:56:38 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> Congrats on your new call sign.

Congratulations on filling out some forms correctly? :-)

Well, I suppose that's a Major Accomplishment In Life for
some folks... :-)

1039. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 02:47:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514224725.14837.00000015@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67189

In article <20030514071907.17796.00000001@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Agreed. Note how Len blames his uncivil behavior today on the long-absent Jim >Kehler. Sounds like the old worn-out kid's excuses of "but he made me do it!" >and "everybody else did it!" How immature.

I blame Jim Kehler's uncivil behavior squarely on Jim Kehler.

Kehler isn't absent from the world. He has a website. He is still criticizing folks for not thinking like he does. You are starting to sound like what KH2D calls "brain-dead old farts."

>Perhaps it would be interesting to go back to his posts on this day, say, six >or seven years ago and see how much or how little things have changed....

Go back to your home, Jimmie. Past messages are your thing.

Live with them, roll around in them, eat them all up and spit out the ones you think will vindicate your immature behavior over losing message points. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

1040. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 02:47:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030514224728.14837.00000016@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67190

In article <b9um28$7ck$1@208.206.142.101>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> I've already owned, operated, and licensed three different two-way
>> radios not in amateur radio. One of them AS "employer" in a
>> partnership. Operating takes special talent, knowledge, or
>> experience? Hardly. Turn up the volume, listen, push a switch
>> button and talk.
>
> Yep, that's all there is to it. On-off, volume, squelch, PTT. Maybe you
should
>join Vipul for a cold one and discuss strategy. You obviously are every bit as
>clueless. I sit here looking at an Icom 756 that has 65 knobs, pushbuttons and
>controls and three input/out ports on the FRONT panel, not beginign to
consider
>what's behind the "menu" shifts, which number considerably more since a lot of
>them perform multiple functions. And that's only the FRONT panel. No wonder
you're
>so farrrrr out in left field. You need a fieldglass to even recognize the
subject,
>much less any detail thereof.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHHAAAA!!!!!!!!

You really can't be serious!!!!!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never been in a modern electronics lab, have
you? You've never operated a DSO or a synthesized RF generator,
both used to test out radios. Poor baby...a little transceiver box
with ONLY 65 controls...tsk, tsk, tsk.

> As noted previously, the most clueless novice (small n) has you bested buy a
>bunch. But regardless, you just troll on and on and on.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHHAAAA!!!!!!!!

> It's hardly surprising when some swimmer tires of it and bregins to stick
>firecrackers up your nose.

"Swimmer?!?" "Firecrackers?!?"

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHHAAAA!!!!!!!!

Dickie, you've been under water so long you've got water on
the brain...soggy neurons won't fire, you little cracker...

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHHAAAA!!!!!!!!

Poor baby.

Ever get that outboard DSP unit working yet? You know, the
one you said was so complicated about 3 years or so ago?

1041. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 03:53:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b9v2vf$a1p$0@208.206.142.100>
Source record: 67191

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <b9um28$7ck$1@208.206.142.101>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> I've already owned, operated, and licensed three different two-way
> >> radios not in amateur radio. One of them AS "employer" in a
> >> partnership. Operating takes special talent, knowledge, or
> >> experience? Hardly. Turn up the volume, listen, push a switch
> >> button and talk.
> >
> > Yep, that's all there is to it. On-off, volume, squelch, PTT. Maybe you
> should
> >join Vipul for a cold one and discuss strategy. You obviously are every bit as
> >clueless. I sit here looking at an Icom 756 that has 65 knobs, pushbuttons and
> >controls and three input/out ports on the FRONT panel, not beginign to
> consider
> >what's behind the "menu" shifts, which number considerably more since a lot of
> >them perform multiple functions. And that's only the FRONT panel. No wonder
> you're
> >so farrrrr out in left field. You need a fieldglass to even recognize the
> subject,
> >much less any detail thereof.
>
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
> HAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHHAAAA!!!!!!!!
>
> You really can't be serious!!!!!

Wanta bet? All you're licensed to do is FRS,MURS and CB.Which is
nowheresville. Like you said, volume squelch and PTT.

>
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never been in a modern electronics lab, have
> you?

As a matter of fact, I've spent a good bit of time in more than one, going
back to the late 50's. But pray tell what does that have to do with ham radio
and hams? You just HAD to shift to something "professional" to cover your
short tail, er shortcomings again, did ya?

> You've never operated a DSO or a synthesized RF generator,
> both used to test out radios.

Oh, I could find one to describe on the net just as easily as you could, Putzie.
Only *I* know they're out of place on a HAM RADIO newsgroup.
I sometimes wonder what your ISP might do if a bunch of us complained about
your trolling and spamming this NG. By every measure you're no more than a
troublemaking horses ass of the first magnitude. ISP's generally don't like to
condone such activity. Maybe that'd be something that needs looking in to.

> Poor baby...a little transceiver box
> with ONLY 65 controls...tsk, tsk, tsk.

That does beat volume, squelch and PTT by a bit, doesn't it? And without resorting
to
some professional electronics shop's test gear, too. My, my!

>
>
> > As noted previously, the most clueless novice (small n) has you bested buy a
> >bunch. But regardless, you just troll on and on and on.
>
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
> HAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHHAAAA!!!!!!!!
>

Get it all out, you'll feel better. Shame you can't actually come up with a
retort.

>
> > It's hardly surprising when some swimmer tires of it and begins to stick
> >firecrackers up your nose.
>
> "Swimmer?!?" "Firecrackers?!?"
>

Here, have another. Snort away!

>
> Ever get that outboard DSP unit working yet?

Problem was, it *was* working, just so poorly it it was a big disappointment. I'd
heard those things were supposed to be of some benefit. Guess that's what one gets
from
listening to dingalings like you! It found a new home long ago.

What's your excuse today?

1042. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:09:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC312AB.B5DCB9C8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67192

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EC1C309.BE46B203@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >A smart fellow would have changed his tactics.
>
> Why haven't you? :-)

I'm not the guy attempting to have the FCC adopt a minimum age for
amateur radio licensing. I'm not the fellow who claims himself a
self-appointed advocate for the removal of morse code testing in a radio
service in which he is not involved in any way. :-)

Dave K8MN

1043. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:11:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC3134E.43CCBB70@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67193

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EC1C309.BE46B203@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >A smart fellow would have changed his tactics.
>
> Why haven't you? :-)

Is this part of another Averylabels cleverly laid trap or just another
mishap in the Anderson home comm center?

Dave K8MN

1044. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:11:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EC3138A.5050708@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 67311
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Anon wrote:
> "Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
> news:25eb70d7.0305131354.3620f977@posting.google.com...
>
> <<<plonk>>>
>
> <<<flushed>>>
>

Anon knows how to flush a toilet, now isn't that an accomplishment.

1045. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:26:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC316D7.E4331A8C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67194

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >So you have seen the people I mention but no others who would be
> >different than the claims you've made?
>
> > Maybe you've never seen anyone
> >who is other than fat, old, etc.
>
> No, I've seen a few exceptions.

...and only a few?

> >Maybe you've attended only one or two
> >club meetings or hamfests.
>
> I have been to 4+ Ham radio clubs, Hamfests in MA,NH,CT.

You may have discovered some interesting problems which exist only in
the Northeast.

> Also, I've heard Hams
> in many states while on long weekend trip.

What can you tell about their weight from the way they sound? I heard
many hams in many states this morning without leaving my home. I
couldn't tell from their CW or SSB signals, how much they weighed.

> >I offered specific callsigns and names. Would you like a list of others?
>
> Surveys have been done. Eham survey indicated high percentage of fat Hams.

Eham surveys? Geez, Vipul.

> Interest surveys show Hams are more interested in antennas and Morse code than
> electronics.

Do they?

> QST articles represent what most Hams are interested. This is further confirmed
> when attending Ham club meetings or in Hamfest topics.

When I open QST, I find articles on building equipment, antennas, fox
hunting, contesting, DXing, Public Service, general operating, Q&A,
vintage equipment, VHF/UHF and more. You apparently see only what you
want to see.

> >I'll bet I attend a lot more hamfests and club meetings than you.
>
> You probably have been to more such events than me.

There is no doubt in my mind.

> >I
> >have seen nothing to support your nonsense.
>
> I can tell you what I saw. Perhaps you are more like the typical Ham > so you don't see
that.

...and perhaps you are quite like a lonely geek so you don't see other
lonely geeks.

> >> I
> >> had nothing to do with selecting them. I was on the email list. My reason
> >for
> >> attending was that they had several radio modes I could use.
> >
> >How does that prove that they were heavier than the general population?
> >
>
> Because I saw them.

You saw the American public? You saw hams across the U.S.? What did
you see.

> >> Random, therefore unbiased - do you understand?
> >
> >I undertand that you believe that you have a random and unbiased
> >scenario. I reject your premise.
>
> Tell me how it is not random.

Tell me how you've sampled the American adult population and maybe we'll
talk.

> >> At first, one can assume that it would slow down the contest. Then, the
> >adult
> >> explained to ME that 10-10 numbers were not desirable in any situation,
> >contest
> >> or not.
> >
> >Have you gotten this scenario pretty well set up as you'd like? The
> >facts seem to come in dibs and dabs and there is invariably a new twist
> >on what you say took place.
>
> There is a painting. Up close, it looks like several blotches. You look at one,
> then you look at another. I presented one, then another. The picture dosen't
> look like anything.
>
> However the artist made the painting such that if you looked at it from a
> distance, you would see the picture.

If you fancy yourself an artist, you may be in for a sudden let down.
Your blotches, at a distance, still appear to be blotches.

> >> Wrong. I got an email expressing that it was nice for me to attend, and I
> >was
> >> invited to attend the next such event.
> >
> >Those are some exceptionally polite people in that club.
>
> Yes, they were nice people. Also, I was polite to them throughout the > event.

So you decided to use this "private venue" to talk about their eating
habits and the like.

> It
> was a fun event at a very low cost. I would attend the next one, if > possible.

I'm certain they'd be delighted to tar and feather you if they knew what
a sweety you really are.

Dave K8MN

1046. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:28:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC31751.E3A53E07@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67195

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP):
>
> > But you do it here, Vipul! Why? How does one's dietary or aging
> >demographics impact Amateur Radio policy?
>
> Ham radio must lead to these conditions if more Hams have them. If more people
> were interested in radio direction finding or electronics, there would be less
> overwieght Hams.

Oh, I get it now! Those electrons don't weigh very much. Electronics
is the secret to weight control! Have you finished that painting yet?

Dave K8MN

1047. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:31:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC31802.C8DDB4FA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67196

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
> >> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
>
> > This of course is a contradiction of terms.
>
> One example is gangs that spray paint grafitti. This is a group-supported
> anti-social activity.

Nope. Hold it! This is another of your bogus artworks, Picasso.

> Making radio contacts through the night at a vacation spot, while others are
> socializing is another <group supported> anti-social activity.

Making radio contacts through the night doesn't deface public property
nor does it harm others. There is no requirement for socializing to be
done according to your peculiar whims.

Dave K8MN

1048. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:40:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC31A12.3AF548DE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67197

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >Dave hasn't made any "silly claims" that need to be proven, Vipul.
>
> Yes he has. He claimed contesting is useful for emergency comm skill build'g.

I stated it because it happens to be true. Don't discount something
just because your knowledge base isn't complete.

> Making those radio contacts is not the only thing an emergency requires.

> Contesting could only cover a fraction of the skills required in a > real emergency.

You haven't even defined a real emergency or described what you believe
amateur radio's role in an emergency to be. Good contesters send and
receive information clearly and accurately at speed regardless of mode.

Hams are not emergency medical technicians. Radio amateurs provide
communications. Don't give me gobbledy-gook about setting up a station
or putting up an antenna. You aren't much of a ham if you can't set up
a station and put up an antenna. Contesters regularly do those things.

Dave K8MN

1049. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 04:46:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC31B8D.3A89E4C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67198

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hew85f2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On 14 May 2003 05:56:38 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >
> > Congrats on your new call sign.
>
> Congratulations on filling out some forms correctly? :-)
>
> Well, I suppose that's a Major Accomplishment In Life for
> some folks... :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.

Tell you what, Len. Just fill out some forms, submit them and see if
the Commission sends you an amateur radio license :-) :-)

Dave K8MN

1050. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:17:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515011756.00486.00000006@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67200

In article <b9v2vf$a1p$0@208.206.142.100>, "Vacuous of Borg;"
<dixie@townsqr.com> writes:

>Wanta bet? All you're licensed to do is FRS,MURS and CB.Which is
>nowheresville. Like you said, volume squelch and PTT.

Nope. I'm not licensed in any of those three radio services.

No license required in them...with one exception. Which one
is it, Vacuous?

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never been in a modern electronics lab, have
>> you?
>
> As a matter of fact, I've spent a good bit of time in more than one, going
>back to the late 50's.

Yes, in an electrician's cubbyhole with a Simpson 260 being
your most complicated test instrument...1950s to the 2000s.

What's a DSO? Define it. Anything like an LSO?

>But pray tell what does that have to do with ham radio and hams?

You brought up the PhD-like mental superiority of knowing all
about 65 knobs, switches, and push-buttons on a 765. :-)

Gosh! That's so terribly IMPRESSIVE! :-) :-) :-)

Ever get your VCR to quit blinking "12:00" ? :-)

>You just HAD to shift to something "professional" to cover your
>short tail, er shortcomings again, did ya?

I've been a professional in electronics for over half a century.

No shortcomings at the bank as a result of that.

>> You've never operated a DSO or a synthesized RF generator,
>> both used to test out radios.
>
>Oh, I could find one to describe on the net just as easily as you could,
>Putzie.

Ah, but I've OPERATED them, Vacuous. Also TDRs, slab lines,
slotted lines, vector voltmeters, spectrum analyzers, many kinds
of oscilloscopes, noise sources, RF generators of many kinds,
Arbitrary Waveform Generators, BER Anayzers, VSWR meters,
Power meters, and minicomputers (used with the first H-P

network analyzers, model HP-2116), plus all sorts of specialized
test equipment. Nearly ALL of the newer test equipment has
embedded microcontrollers with "menu" selection through a
shuttle...HP, Tektronix, LeKroy, Bruel & Kjaer, Anritsu, etc.

Everyone who uses such things learns to use them correctly,
don't get any fancy certificates or awards for such mental-giant
tasks as using all 65 buttons for a ham QSO! :-)

>Only *I* know they're out of place on a HAM RADIO newsgroup.

Well, there you go... :-)

>I sometimes wonder what your ISP might do if a bunch of us complained about
>your trolling and spamming this NG.

Go ahead and complain, senior. America On Line is my ISP.

Complain to the newsgroup moderator, have him/her lock out
my access.

No problem with me. :-)

>By every measure you're no more than a
>troublemaking horses ass of the first magnitude.

I take it you don't like my opinions? :-)

>ISP's generally don't like to condone such activity.

AOL didn't like the "Never Trust Lennie" home page. Had it
axed after being notified.

>Maybe that'd be something that needs looking in to.

Maybe you ought to look in the yellow pages for some
good mental therapist?

>> Poor baby...a little transceiver box
>> with ONLY 65 controls...tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
>That does beat volume, squelch and PTT by a bit, doesn't it? And without
>resorting to some professional electronics shop's test gear, too. My, my!

So, you use ALL 65 controls in a single QSO? :-)

Wowee! You must be the Mensa Master of all time...

> Get it all out, you'll feel better. Shame you can't actually come up with a
>retort.

A retort is a piece of glassware in a chemical lab. Do you need
one of those to analyze? What kind of substance are you
analyzing? :-)

>> Ever get that outboard DSP unit working yet?
>
> Problem was, it *was* working, just so poorly it it was a big disappointment.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Did it have more than 65 controls?

>I'd heard those things were supposed to be of some benefit.

They usually are...if operated properly. Of course, with less than
65 controls to play with, you may not have learned the proper
settings?

>Guess that's what one gets from listening to dingalings like you!

I never recommended anything to you.

Were you forced to get one by threats?

Or were you seduced by the Dark side of the Force, Dart?

>It found a new home long ago.

Awwww...that's sweet.

Have you found a good retirement home yet?

1051. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:18:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515011800.00486.00000007@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67199

In article <3EC312AB.B5DCB9C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I'm not the guy attempting to have the FCC adopt a minimum age for
>amateur radio licensing.

No kidding! :-)

Why are you so worried about that subject, senior?

>I'm not the fellow who claims himself a
>self-appointed advocate for the removal of morse code testing in a radio
>service in which he is not involved in any way.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...better talk to the FCC then...they don't "work"
ham radio, don't need ham licenses, aren't required to get
ham licenses...and aren't required to be morsemen, either.

Come to think of it, the FCC said about 13 years ago that it
didn't think a morse code test served its purpose of determining
whether or not an examinee should be licensed. But, what does
the FCC know? They just regulate all of US civil radio.

On the other hand, Dave Heil thinks the morse test should
remain because he IS ham radio. HE is the lawgiver!

Ok, let's all give old Dave our support...or a supporter...
because he IS INVOLVED 24/7!

1052. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:41:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515014146.28957.00000032@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67301

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 9:47 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514224725.14837.00000015@mb-m03.aol.com>

>Live with them, roll around in them, eat them all up and spit out
> the ones you think will vindicate your immature behavior over
> losing message points. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Up until now this little twerp's just been a game.

He's so pitiful I don't even know if I have the heart to keep after him.
He's such a loser all by himself. This has to have been about the silliest
display of childish playground ranting I ahve ever seen from a "man" of his
years.

Steve, K4CAP

1053. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:44:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515014452.28957.00000033@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67302

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 2:11 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514151145.28806.00000009@mb-m02.aol.com>

>Must be the "New Beaurocracy" then. MY DD-214 only says it is
> for separation from active duty. MY Honorable Discharge didn't
> arrive as a "DD-214" but as another certificate and then four years
> later by mail in 1960.

Too bad for you, Lennie. I got a DD214 AND a Certificate of Honorable Discharge (suitable for framing) all on the same day.

By the way, after I complete 2 more years of federal service, I STILL get to draw my federal pension.

Sucks, huh Lennie?

Steve, K4CAP

1054. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:47:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515014723.28957.00000034@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67303

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 4:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514174534.09580.00000043@mb-m13.aol.com>

>Must be the "New Beaurocracy" then. MY DD-214 only says it is
> for separation from active duty. MY Honorable Discharge didn't
> arrive as a "DD-214" but as another certificate and then four years
> later by mail in 1960.

"Beaurocracy", Lennie?

You got a seperation in your DD214 because you were not yet Honorably Discharged. That happened in 1960.

It's the same today for anyone who is released (under Honorable conditions) with less than 6 years of Active service.

Steve, K4CAP

1055. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:50:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515015054.28957.00000035@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67304

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 4:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514174537.09580.00000049@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030514013154.11803.00000472@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com

>> And since when is there a "proper time" to be rude, obtuse and
>>irresponsible?
>
> Any time you are on line?

This would pretty well summate the "civility" of Lennie the Liar.

Steve, K4CAP

1056. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:52:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515015221.28957.00000036@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67305

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/14/2003 6:37 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514193734.27394.00000043@mb-m24.aol.com>

>Making radio contacts through the night at a vacation spot, while others are
>socializing is another <group supported> anti-social activity.

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

WHAT an IDIOT!

Steve, K4CAP

1057. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:53:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515015345.28957.00000037@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67306

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 2:11 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514151153.28806.00000013@mb-m02.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030514021025.11803.00000479@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steamy
>Stalker, aka Air Ace K4CAP) writes:
>
>> And some just never fit in in the first place.
>
> Good luck, square peg...

Hmmmmm...Seems I am the one that fits here, Lennie.

What was YOUR call again?

Steve, K4CAP

1058. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 05:58:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515015837.28957.00000038@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67307

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/14/2003 6:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514193234.27394.00000042@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP):
>
>> But you do it here, Vipul! Why? How does one's dietary or aging
>>demographics impact Amateur Radio policy?
>
>Ham radio must lead to these conditions if more Hams have them. If more
>people
>were interested in radio direction finding or electronics, there would be
>less
>overwieght Hams.

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

WHAT an IDIOT!

I can RDF from the front seat of a CAR, Vipul. How can RDF'ing change my weight? I can also RDF from the left seat of a Cessna 182. Hasn't lost me a pound yet.

As for electronics, I have been involved in both Amateur Radio and military avionics the better part of my adult years. Still hasn't lsot me a pound!

If you are TRYING to look silly, you're doing a good job.

Steve, K4CAP

1059. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 06:03:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515020349.28957.00000039@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67308

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/14/2003 6:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hew85f2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
>
>On 14 May 2003 05:56:38 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> Congrats on your new call sign.

Thank-you, Kind Sir!

Several folks asked me if I regretted letting a 1 x 2 go. It feels a bit weird, howevr I can get the 1 x 2 back anytime in the next 2 years...of course it will cost me another fee, but hey...I've spent more on less before!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1060. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 06:05:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515020536.28957.00000040@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67309

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 9:47 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514224724.14837.00000014@mb-m03.aol.com>
>
>In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hew85f2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
><Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
>>On 14 May 2003 05:56:38 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>> Congrats on your new call sign.
>
> Congratulations on filling out some forms correctly?

At least I was ELIGIBLE to fill those forms out, Lennie.

> Well, I suppose that's a Major Accomplishment In Life for
> some folks...

Nope...Just a fun thing to do.

You don't know about fun, do you, Your Scumminess?

Steve, K4CAP

1061. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 06:09:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515020950.28957.00000041@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67310

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/14/2003 6:46 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514194615.27394.00000044@mb-m24.aol.com>

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>Dave hasn't made any "silly claims" that need to be proven, Vipul.
>
>Yes he has. He claimed contesting is useful for emergency comm skill build'g.

Too lazy to put that "in" in the word "building"...?!?!

Contesting IS useful for sharpening those skills. It requires the
operator to be attentive copy the exchanges accurately under pressure.

>Making those radio contacts is not the only thing an emergency requires.
>Contesting could only cover a fraction of the skills required in a real
>emergency.

How would YOU know? I don't see KB1HMW in any contest results in QST or
CQ.

That tells me ZERO EXPERIENCE.

On the otherhand you may go to the results of the 2000 Sweepstakes and
find K4YZ in both phone and CW results with clean sweeps.

Steve, K4CAP

1062. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 06:36:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515023615.28809.00000042@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67312

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 1:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514143626.00486.00000004@mb-m25.aol.com>

>> Well, Gollies, Len, no doubt it really *does* burnish your tail when you
>>think that the very lowliest Novice (left over from the pre restructuring
>days)
>>is fully authorized to build, own, and operate at will his own personal
>radio
>>station, on a quite wide range of frequencies.
>
> Not a problem today or 20 years ago for me. All one needs is money
> and some place to put an antenna....(SNIP)

And a license to operate it.

In this case, and ESPECIALLY in the case of Amatuer Radio, you fail in
this requirement.

>I've already owned, operated, and licensed three different two-way
> radios not in amateur radio. One of them AS "employer" in a
> partnership. Operating takes special talent, knowledge, or
> experience? Hardly. Turn up the volume, listen, push a switch
> button and talk.

We're (not) impressed.

> "Build" a problem? Certainly not. I can DESIGN electronic
> equipment all the way from conceptual ideas on paper through all
> the required details of circuit and component selection, assembly,
> alignment, testing of everything to more and tighter regulations
> than is found in amateur radio....(SNIP)

And it eats at you that we are not the least bit impressed with you, huh?

>"Wide range of frequencies?" US amateur radio is LIMITED to
> certain bands above 1.6 MHz.

Those "certain bands" represent a sampling of all aspects of the
electromagnetic spectrum from MF to daylight. No other radio service offers
that. None.

>US amateur radio constrains
> itself primarily to just the HF bands where the olde-tymers hang
> out playing contest games and hanging out with their olde-tymer
> buddies.

OH?

YOU are the one who claims that the No Code Technician has "saved" Amateur Radio, yet in making such a claim, you can NOT claim that "US amateur radio contrains itself >>primarily<< (my emphasis) to jsut the HF bands"...(SNIP).

This would mean that all those NCT are NOT active on 30Mhz and above. I can most assuredly state that the bands are QUITE alive above 30Mhz!

>US amateur radio MAY be granted a "new" HF band near 5 MHz
> and one small slice of a band at LF in the future. That's not yet
> accomplished.

YOU "may" be granted an Amateur Radio license in the future too, Lennie. So what?

>>You, on the other hand, are
>>relegated to nonstop reminiscing on your 50 year old military duties during
>>which you baby-sat some less-than-interesting routine circuits on a few
>>discrete frequencies.
>
> "Nonstop reminiscing?"

Exactly. I am sooooooooo tired of your chastising others about "living in the past" and being allegedly "mired in the traditions of the 30's" by you, only to have you lapse into yet another rant about your rear-area radio clerk days in Japan and how SINCGARS saved the military community from certain doom.

What a putz.

>"Baby-sitting?" Each operating team at ADA was responsible
> for the continuing operation of 36 (at first) to 43 transmitters ranging
> from 1 KW to 40 KW in power output at HF operating 24/7, using
> a two square mile antenna "farm."

See what I mean...?!?!

>"Less than interesting routine circuits?" The whole purpose of
> the 24/7 worldwide communications network of the US Army and
> other branches in the 1950s was to make communications as
> reliable as possible...(SNIP)

Which it was even without your help. Wonder how THAT happened...?!?!

>At ADA we got to learn a few details of that behind the scenes,
> so to speak while monitoring circuits for operation (required to
> insure reliability). We got bits and pieces of information as it was
> communicated. Not a great deal of it...too many circuits to keep
> a constant check of everything.

So in otherwords you were reading traffic that was NOT addressesd to you...

>"A few discrete frequencies?" ADA, like all large military
> transmitter stations then, had a large choice of frequencies, all
> of them crystal controlled. There were about 150 separate quartz
> crystals in a floor-standing tall cabinet with warming lamps inside

> for all the non-SSB transmitter exciters.

And now all YOU have to do is snip a diode in a CB PLL and have just as
many frequencies available to you, Lennie...And I doubt you'll ever have more
than that...

>Did I mention the USAF HF station at Funabashi?

Is it pertinent to Amateur Radio policy?

No?

Then you probably HAVE "mentioned" it.

>I was my own employer for one of my licensed radios. :-)
> Directed myself.

The blind leading the blind.

>I could talk about some CB activity and having all 23 channels
> under crystal control before there was ready-build CB gear to
> do that...but I doubt you call CB as "real radio."

Oooooo-eeeeeeeee, Lennie! Yo ganged together a rotary switch and a box
full of crystals! ! !

How impressive!

>Only when I drive down to Mexico and drink the water.

Or open your newsbrowser and begin yet another RRAP rant cycle.

>I'll call any skilled morseman my superior BUT ONLY IN
> morsemanship. No other skill, Dickie, except mean-spirited
> name calling which you sporadically show as your masterwork in
> here. I'll acknowledge you as my superior in mean-spiritdness.

Oh, Lennie..don't shy away! Yo are so prolific at those very skills, and
you manifest them almost every day right here! Don't be bashful now!

>Somebody in here used the quote, "it ain't bragging if ya done it."
> I've done what I say I done, Dickie, have the proof.

Which, if we accept that at face value, means you have ZERO experience in
AMATEUR Radio...which we already knew...So what???

Steve, K4CAP

1063. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 12:26:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC3876C.9080704@psu.edu>
Source record: 67313

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>>Dave hasn't made any "silly claims" that need to be proven, Vipul.
>
>
> Yes he has. He claimed contesting is useful for emergency comm skill build'g.

No, he has made the case. You do not accept the claims.

> Making those radio contacts is not the only thing an emergency requires.
> Contesting could only cover a fraction of the skills required in a real
> emergency.

I've stated the case, Dave has stated the case. All we have recieved
from you is one line refutations. Why don't *you* tell *us* what *is*
good training for emergency comms?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1064. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 12:50:19 UTC
From: Lets Roll <American@letsrollnet.net>
Message-ID: <ba02fh$r41$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67314

"Al" <alan@yokzfix.net> wrote in message news:b9ta01$2ho$0@pita.alt.net...
> Anybody monitor nightly net on 3860? Many call
> signs being used are unassigned. Several call signs
> being used are legit but not being used by the assigned
> licensee. What gives? QSOs always revolve around
> politics. Up to 30 or more stations check in, probably
> 20 bogus calls. Where is FCC? Riley? OOs?
> Where is the much vaunted FCC locating technology?
> Why is this allowed to continue?
>
> Al
>
>
Perhaps FCC employees are too busy surfing the net for
child pornography, while on the public payroll. Read about
how FCC employees downloaded child pornography to
government computers, while they were on official time.

http://ftp.fcc.gov/bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar398.txt

Disgusting!

1065. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 12:53:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC38DC6.4050002@psu.edu>
Source record: 67315

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>>>Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
>>
>
>> This of course is a contradiction of terms.
>
>
> One example is gangs that spray paint grafitti. This is a group-supported
> anti-social activity.

Its a good example of an illegal activity.

You surely do like to insult Hams, donchya?

One could make the argument that even though these gangs are indeed
engaging in social activity, if only with each other.

But let's operate on your premise. What specifically is socializing? Is
it hobnobbing with the hoipolli? Is it the "popular" kids in high school
sort of thing? Is it popular culture?

Fact is, hams getting together to hang out with each other, in person
or on the air, is indeed socializing. It is enjoyable to the
participants, and harms no one.

Whereas your comparing hams to gangs who ehgage in vandalism is just
another proof of your deep seated antagonism for Amateur Radio.

> Making radio contacts through the night at a vacation spot, while others are
> socializing is another <group supported> anti-social activity.

I know many people(mostly women), socially well adjusted and "normal",
who during vacation, will sit on the beach under an umbrella and read a
book. A large part of their vacation is taken up this way. They enjoy it
very much, and find it relaxing. They come back from their vaction
refreshed.

Are they anti-social also? Let's make a real good example:

We have the above mentioned woman reading her book on the beach. Beside
her sits her husband, using his HT to talk to some Ham in Europe via an
Echolink repeater.

What's the difference?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1066. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 12:57:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515085749.00191.00000062@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67316

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 5/15/2003 7:26 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EC3876C.9080704@psu.edu>

(Mike said in response to yet another silly VShah ranting...)

>Why don't *you* tell *us* what *is*
>good training for emergency comms?

For him? Knowing which type string and cans work best over what
distances. Preety fems love a man with a long sting and can.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1067. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 12:58:17 UTC
From: Lets Roll <American@letsrollnet.net>
Message-ID: <ba02u9rth0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67317

"Lets Roll" <American@letsrollnet.net> wrote in message
news:ba02fh$r41$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Al" <alan@yokzfix.net> wrote in message news:b9ta01$2ho$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Anybody monitor nightly net on 3860? Many call
> > signs being used are unassigned. Several call signs
> > being used are legit but not being used by the assigned
> > licensee. What gives? QSOs always revolve around
> > politics. Up to 30 or more stations check in, probably
> > 20 bogus calls. Where is FCC? Riley? OOs?
> > Where is the much vaunted FCC locating technology?
> > Why is this allowed to continue?
> >
> > Al
> >
> >
> Perhaps FCC employees are too busy surfing the net for
> child pornography, while on the public payroll. Read about
> how FCC employees downloaded child pornography to
> government computers, while they were on official time.
>
> http://ftp.fcc.gov/bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar398.txt
>
> Disgusting!
>
>
If you have trouble accessing the link, go to the FCC web site,
fcc.gov and do a search for FCC OIG Report 97-4-C-08

Lets Roll

1068. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 15:51:53 UTC
From: Kevin Muenzler <wb5rue@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ec3b7a7_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 67319

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EC3134E.43CCBB70@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3EC1C309.BE46B203@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >A smart fellow would have changed his tactics.
> >
> > Why haven't you? :-)
>
> Is this part of another Averylabels cleverly laid trap or just another
> mishap in the Anderson home comm center?
>
> Dave K8MN

I think Len lives for one liner insults. That's probably as much of a
single thought that his brain can handle. Anything else would be too
complicated.

Kevin, WB5RUE
If two people agree on everything then one of them is not thinking.
If two people disagree on everything then one of them is not trying.

1069. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 16:05:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305150805.2343b1fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67320

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of May 14, 2003:

Novice - 34,564 (decrease of 14,765)
Technician - 254,786 (increase of 49,392)
Technician Plus - 68,978 (decrease of 59,882)
General - 140,997 (increase of 28,320)
Advanced - 83,599 (decrease of 16,183)
Extra - 103,995 (increase of 25,245)
Total - 686,919 (increase of 12,127)

For historical comparison, as of May 14, 2002:

Novice - 38,344 (decrease of 10,985)
Technician - 240,510 (increase of 35,116)
Technician Plus - 79,744 (decrease of 49,116)
General - 139,023 (increase of 26,346)
Advanced - 85,556 (decrease of 14,226)
Extra - 100,733 (increase of 21,983)
Total - 683,910 (increase of 9,118)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1070. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 16:11:02 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <q_Owa.7044$HZ4.825@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67321

I'm glad you guys don't do public service. I think emergency comms should be
like Pay Toilets and "volunteer" ambulance groups.
You call on radio geeks for help, you get help and a $5000 bill in the mail
to cover the callout.

--

>> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<

"Kevin Muenzler" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ec3b7a7_6@spamkiller.newsgroups.com...
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EC3134E.43CCBB70@earthlink.net...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3EC1C309.BE46B203@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >A smart fellow would have changed his tactics.
> > >
> > > Why haven't you? :-)
> >
> > Is this part of another Averylabels cleverly laid trap or just another
> > mishap in the Anderson home comm center?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I think Len lives for one liner insults. That's probably as much of a
> single thought that his brain can handle. Anything else would be too
> complicated.
>
> Kevin, WB5RUE
> If two people agree on everything then one of them is not thinking.
> If two people disagree on everything then one of them is not trying.
>
>

1071. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 16:15:20 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC3BD18.EB24A7D1@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67318

Al wrote:
>
> They haven't used vans in years, actually decades, ...

Teasing CBing buddys dates to the mid 70's .... kid (c:.

K3DWW

1072. 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 16:29:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ba0fb2dul1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67322
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)

Dan/W4NTI

The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373, and 5405 kHz--at 60 meters was less of a surprise given opposition expressed last fall by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). The NTIA had cited a possible need for the requested band by federal government users and proposed the five specific frequencies for amateur use on a secondary basis. The FCC has granted operation on USB (2K8J3E emission) only, with a maximum effective radiated power limit of 50 W relative to a 0 dB gain antenna--a half-wave dipole. The channels--each with a maximum permissible bandwidth of 2.8 kHz--will be available to General and higher class licensees.

''While the new amateur privileges at 5 MHz are not as flexible as we had hoped, we recognize that much has changed since the ARRL petition for rulemaking was submitted to the FCC in the summer of 2001,'' Sumner said. ''Federal agencies with homeland security responsibilities have renewed interest in HF radiocommunication.''

1073. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 16:43:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305150843.3bb9728c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67323

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030510202130.18775.00000686@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20030510104959.18769.00000567@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
>
> >And all of your misdirection above is a blatant attempt to avoid answering
> this
> >question: Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
> >AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>
> I don't recall any previous professional work in radio-electronics
> requiring ANY serious consideration of amateur radio activities.
> None of my work experience was with any professional amateur
> radio companies. :-)

Translation: No experience
>
> I have worked WITH several who also held amateur radio license
> grants. Some of those were given in here.

Translation: Attempted glory by association
>
> Amateur radios work with the same physics as all other radios.
> There's no distinction except in the minds of certain people
> who think that human beaurocracy redefines the laws of physics.

Translation: "Physics" is the only consideration in regulations to
Len.
>
> Some of my work experience has required communications by
> radio in various modes. That was never any problem on land,
> on the water, or in the air. I've done that since February 1953.
> I've done communications by radio in non-work related activities.
> No problem with that at all...all legal, too. :-)

Translation: Len has used a radio.
>
> I've had both formal and informal training and education about
> radio and electronics since about 1947 and that continues
> today. Electronics keeps increasing the state of the art in all
> such sub-disciplines, including HF radio where some amateur
> hearts and minds dwell constantly.

Translation: Len went to school.
>

> I've been required to study many kinds of specifications,
> regulations of law, industry standards, federal standards all my
> working life. Part 97 of Title 47 CFR is one of the smallest
> Parts of all US civil radio regulations, no real problem in
> understanding that...including the byzantine six-class structure
> that existed before restructuring.

Translation: Len has read some FCC rules and regs.
>
> At no time since 1953 was I ever required or forced to use any
> sort of on-off keyed morse code mode for radio communications
> work or recreation, on HF or any other part of the spectrum.
>
Translation: Len has little or no experience actually using Morse
code.

> So, in the loaded context of

(N2EY's)

> "question," since US
> amateur radio still requires morse code TESTING to obtain a
> license class having HF operating privileges, neither my work
> experience nor recreational experience "fits" the OLD US
> radio amateur regulations in the strict sense of the word. :-)

How is the question "loaded"? Here it is, again:

"Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?"

You rambled on for 8 paragraphs about your work experience but not one
word on how that non-amateur work experience means you know more about
how amateur radio should be regulated than anyone else.
>
> That really isn't the point, is it? :-)

Nope.

The point is that you keep bringing up all sorts of non-amateur-radio
work experience as some sort of proof or evidence that your arguments
are correct. At the same time, you deny the relevance of anyone else's
experience or education, if that person disagrees with you.
>
> >You avoid answering that question, for some reason.
>
> Is my answer here "avoiding" anything? :-)

Yep.
>
> My argument was that the morse code test is old, outmoded, of
> no practical value for civil radio regulation purposes,
> and serves

> no one except a minority group of elitists in a recreational/hobby
> radio activity who seem to think they are Rulers of Radio just by
> passing a high-rate on-off keying code test. :-)

The smiley means you don't mean any of it...

(N2EY)

> asked a very loaded question

How is the question "loaded"?

> but did not get the
> answer he wished.

No answer at all.
>
> >> That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
> >> radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
> >> deliberate public information on any answers.
> >
> >Tougher test? I don't think so. I have heard from those who took both tests
> >that the tests required for the Amateur Extra at that time were tougher than
> >those required for the First 'Phone.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...without taking such a test yourself in 1956, you have
> NO basis for judgement. Your "logic" fails.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk...without having ever taken any amateur radio test
yourself at any time, you have NO basis for judgement. Your "logic"
fails.

> >You cannot know it was "a tougher test" when you did not take the tests you
> >compare it to. Your logic fails.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...without taking such a test yourself in 1956, you have
> NO basis for judgement.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk....without having ever taken any amateur radio
test yourself at any time, you have NO basis for judgement. Your
"logic" fails.
>
> >What you're trying to sell us is the idea that your passing a single test for
> >a
> >COMMERCIAL license many years ago somehow proves that you know more about how
> >AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else. No sale.
>
> That wasn't offered for "sale." :-)

Good, because it's worthless.
>
> What you are attempting to prove in here is that any commercial radio
> license test is inferior to any amateur radio license test.

Not at all. Just that you have no basis for comparison since you have never taken any amateur radio license test.

> What you are implying is that "tests" represent a summation of
> knowledge of the examinee AFTER the test was taken.

Nope. Not at all. The tests are the entry point only. Minimum qualifications, that sort of thing.

> That is most
> assuredly false, ludicrous, and a bit insane.

Then why do you make such a big deal about your First 'Phone?
>
> Absolutely NO "test" is required to see the arrogance and self-
> righteous indignation of certain individuals who insist that Their
> testing in anything showed their "superiority" to any who did not
> take the test. Their "superiority" is a definite NO SALE.

Let's see - who wrote:

"That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no deliberate public information on any answers."

in an attempt to prove "superiority"? Ah - that would be you, Len.

> >There you go, living in the past and its standards and requirements.
>
> I'm in an arena of amateur radio policy arguments where the
> standards and practices of 1930s amateur radio represents the
> norm for the 2000s according to some olde-tyme hams.

What are you talking about? Was there no use of Morse code after 1940?
>
> >How does your passing such a license test so long ago somehow prove that you
> >know more about how AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?
>
> How does your passing an AMATEUR radio test so long ago
> prove you are judge, jury, and executioner qualified to speak
> of policy in amateur radio TODAY? :-)

"You cannot answer a question with another question" - your words, Len.
>
> >But the amateur radio experience of an active radio amateur DOES exceed the
> >experience of any unlicensed person. In other words, us licensed, active hams
> >have experience, knowledge and skills about AMATEUR RADIO that you do not,
> >Len. That's a plain, simple fact.
>
> No, that's just a self-righteous, self-important CLAIM.

No, it's a plain, simple fact. You don't like it because it's true.
>
> If your CLAIM had any merit to the FCC, or even to the government

> elsewhere, you should be the supreme arbiter of all who may
> exercise their First Amendment Rights on US federal law.

Not at all. Anyone may voice their opinion. Doesn't make them right.

> Your CLAIM only has merit in the closed-loop inbreeding of
> fraternal groups whose members think alike on their own
> self-importance. ARRL is such an organization.

Ah, the old ad-hominem from Len.
>
> Despite your CLAIMS of "experience, knowledge, and skills
> about amateur radio," YOU are not sitting in policy-making
> in the FCC nor in any enforcement office of the US
> government.

Neither are you, Len.

> YOU are just venting a cloud of frustration and
> pique for not being able to Rule and are unrecognized for
> the greatness and glory of your words of wisdom.

Not me. I'm not frustrated about the subject at all. I've made my
views known to the FCC on a number of issues, and will do so again.
>
> What's worse, the FCC's opinion on morse code testing for
> US amateur radio license examination is not in agreement
> with all your claimed "superiority" in amateur radio.

What ARE you going on about?
>
> All the other PCTAs seem to feel the same way and are
> whining about it through attempts at insulting all those who
> aren't PCTAs.

Len, nobody posts more insults here than you do. That's a plain,
simple fact.
>
>
> >> But, I've never been so obsessed
> >> with any particular message arguement to carry sore losing to
> >> such great lengths as:
> >>
> >> 1. Creating a special Home Page on an ISP deliberately
> >> designed to libel one individual so severely as did Robeson.
> >> That was an outrageous, sick act on his part.
> >
> >In your OPINION. Someone else would think it was funny. Me, I think it was in
> >bad taste.
>
> Awwww...really?

Yep.

> I'll bet you were hopping up and down with
> happiness on seeing it...vicariously enjoying "vindication"
> for non-agreement on morse code testing in the newsgroup!

Nope. I thought it was in bad taste.

I think much of what you write is in bad taste, too.
>
> :-)
>
> >Besides, that was over FOUR YEARS AGO, wasn't it? You live in the past too
> >much.
>
> I'm not the one touting B&W products of the 1950s.

No, you're touting licenses and experiences of the 1950s.
>
> I'm not the one touting morse code "superiority" after it
> began in commercial service in 1844.

No, you're denying that Morse Code played any real role in radio
communciations after 1940.
>
> I'm not the one demanding all amateurs to adhere to
> the standards and practices in amateur radio as it
> was in the 1930s.

No, you're the one who denies the need for any standards or practices.
>
> I'm not the one constantly going back to dear old
> GOOGLE to pull out old messages and try to beat
> dead horses of past arguments.

No, you're the one who wants people to forget the reputation you've
earned for yourself, and who wants people to ignore your errors and
self-contradictions.

> >> I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
> >> court lawsuit on grounds of libel. I can afford such things as
> >> attorney fees for a protacted period. Such a lawsuit would be
> >> almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
> >> clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are
> >> (and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
> >> lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
> >> such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
> >> money.
> >>
> >Sounds like you are threatening him.
>
> Awwww...gosh, I didn't let a "superior" ham run amuck with
> his petty libel!

Libel? What was libelous?
>

> >Here's a hint, Len: I'm not him.
>
> No?

No.

1074. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 17:47:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hewefz4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67324

On Wed, 14 May 2003 21:17:11 -0400, Anon wrote:

> The FCC has more than adequate budget to do its job.

Mister Anon is incorrect. The money is misdirected into
projects like Spectrum Auctions, Powerline Internet, Wireline
Competition, and Media Conglomeration studies, not into field
enforcement.

The Congress and The Eighth Floor both wish that the field
enforcement obligation and functioning would vanish overnight.

>The single greatest problem in the commission today in a
>single word is GREED, Getting rich at the taxpayers'
>expense.

That doesn't even deserve a response, Mister Anonymous.

EOT

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1075. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 18:20:14 UTC
From: SammGreenn <nospamgreencats@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ec3da4d@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67325

"Al" <alan@yokzfix.net> wrote in message news:b9ta01$2ho$0@pita.alt.net...
> Anybody monitor nightly net on 3860? Many call
> signs being used are unassigned. Several call signs
> being used are legit but not being used by the assigned
> licensee. What gives? QSOs always revolve around
> politics. Up to 30 or more stations check in, probably
> 20 bogus calls. Where is FCC? Riley? OOs?
> Where is the much vaunted FCC locating technology?
> Why is this allowed to continue?
>
> Al

What you are hearing is likely the "Eastern Regional
Patriot Net". It's a net with past ties to Militia
political movements in Kentucky and Michigan.
Curiously also, this Net was started by noneother
than ex-AA8DP, Steve Anderson of
United Patriot Radio fame! He started it in 99 or
00 when he was booted off of the 3.950 Liberty
Net for being far too much of a loose-cannon.
(imagine that!) Later he was cited by k4zdh and
responded with a rambling and somewhat incoherent
diatribe about the FCC and R.H. were both "..foreign agents
of the United Nations and/or the British Admiralty Reagent".
(whatever the heck that is?) He even went so far as
to confront k4zdh on the air one evening, live on 3.860
of which I have a tape of the entire event. It is without doubt
a rare ham radio classic. It proved beyond any doubt (..and much
longer before Anderson's legal troubles with the KY State PD!)
that AA8DP was not only 2-bricks-short-of-a-full-load, in fact
he was balancing them red-clay bricks atop his tinfoil hat whilst he
was ascending the ladder to his roof to feed the pigeons..so to speak !

Shortly after his encounter with Hollingsworth, Col. Steve checked
ino the ERPN one night and relinquished his FCC license, with much
pomp, and fanfare, and farting, and bluster and paranoid rantings,
never to be heard of on 75 Meters - ever again....
How sad, cry me a river full of crocodile tears Stevie!

(Anderson later used his "now HF/Tx modified" Kenwood ham
radio rig as the primary transmitter for United Patriot Radio.
This actual piece of "radio history" is now rumored to be
residing in the FCC's glass "Trophy Case" in either Washington DC
or Gettysburg Pa) I bet a dozen Dunkin Doghnutz that if they ever
put Steve's UPR HF rig up on e-Bay, with the original FCC Evidence

Tags still attached, it would likely fetch 3 Grand before the auction
was over !

Steve is currently serving time in the Federal lockup and nuthouse
allegedly for acute manic depression and schizophrenia, besides
several other charges stemming from his much publicized
"lam-from-the-law". His ham radio legacy however still lives
on in the ERPN Net, which sadly for we SWL's, is now
a mere shell of it's former colorful self when "Ole Dr Pepper"
was a regular check-in.

It is also of note to SWL's is that one of Steve's
cohorts in the Ky. Militia used to check into the ERPN
using the callsign of 'Wolfman Jack'. Another station, now
also gone, used the callsign of 'Orange Blossom' and was
FCC DF'ed to be in the area of Central Michigan.
(both of these pirate tations have now vanished from HF)

Other stations were alleged to have established daytime
"nets" on one or two frequencies located in-between the
10 Meter Amateur and 11 Meter CB Band(s). The freqs
were once listed on a now-defunct militia Website
as a daytime watch freq.

Finally, keep an ear up on 75 Meters, especially if activity of
patriot groups on the more-popular domestic short-wave
call in talk-radio shows start to become more active.

It has been the trend in past times, that when the "paranoia level"
on the few "patriot type" short-wave broadcast station circuits
starts to heat up, that there is also a *notable increase* in transmitted
activity by those affiliated individuals who have access to ham gear
and operate on the 75 Meter ham band, and elsewhere outside
the ham bands, this regardless if they have legitimate callsigns
and/or are clandestine stations using bogus calls and identifiers.

more background info:

http://www.clandestineradio.com/press/cj_081801.htm

http://www.diymedia.net/feature/pirate/f052901.htm

http://www.adl.org/learn/news/kent_militia.asp

"Natives who beat drums to drive off evil spirits are objects
of scorn to 'smart' Americans who blow horns to break up traffic
jams."

- Mary Ellen Kelly

1076. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 18:43:16 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515144316.16546.00000067@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 67326

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/14/2003 6:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514195717.27394.00000045@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Why in the world are you proud of it,
>
>I am not proud of not doing public service. That event is hardly a public
>service.

In YOUR opinion.

>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>They are assuming you have the basic skills needed to do the work. I
>>>took a short training course in SkyWarn recently. It only took an hour
>>>or so. But the other skills were acquired long befor this.
>
>Basic skills is not typically part of Ham radio. And how useful was this
>course
>an being able to actually apply what you learned?

If he intends to participate in SKYWARN, it's imperitive, unless he
happens to already have some training in meterology.

>From N2EY
>>Although it's an old story, it's still very relevant. Just like Morse code
>>;-)
>
>The story has nothing to do with Morse code.
>
>And Morse code is not "very" relevant.

It is for the puposes of Amateur Radio licensing.

Steve, K4CAP

1077. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 18:53:14 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515145314.16546.00000068@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 67327

Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Date: 5/14/2003 2:11 PM Central Daylight Time
Message-id: <20030514151150.28806.00000012@mb-m02.aol.com>

In article <3EC27B50.1070901@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !
>>!
>>
>>
>> Now THAT I understand! ;^)
>
> Birds of a feather? How tweet!

Lennie was so impressed with his simplistic answer that he had to repeat
it two and a half hours later...

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/14/2003 4:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030514174535.09580.00000046@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>In article <3EC27B50.1070901@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !
>>!
>>
>>
>> Now THAT I understand! ;^)
>
> Birds of a feather? How tweet!

A mind is a terrible thing to waste. Yet there stands Lennie, pouring his
out by the bucketfull.

Steve, K4CAP

1078. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 18:56:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC3E2D9.8020709@psu.edu>
Source record: 67328

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>
>>Why in the world are you proud of it,
>
>
> I am not proud of not doing public service. That event is hardly a public
> service.

IIRC, the events were charity based events such as walkathons, races, etc in which the proceeds went to help people who were ill or crippled. I do March of Dimes, Habitat for Humanity, MS bike races and more every year.

If we took payment for our services, that would take money away from helping these people. We are volunteers and donate our time to help people who are less fortunate than us.

That is about as public service as you can get. If you don't want to do it, okay. But its hard to understand being proud of that.

>>Although it's an old story, it's still very relevant. Just like Morse code
>>;-)
>
>
> The story has nothing to do with Morse code.
>
> And Morse code is not "very" relevant.

So says a person who is proud of not doing public service!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1079. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 19:32:41 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@Thetruthweq.org>
Message-ID: <ba0q21$b71$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67329

Sad to say, but it is all the truth.
The commission has promoted a culture of greed for
years now.

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hewefz4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 14 May 2003 21:17:11 -0400, Anon wrote:
>
> > The FCC has more than adequate budget to do its job.
>
> Mister Anon is incorrect. The money is misdirected into
> projects like Spectrum Auctions, Powerline Internet, Wireline
> Competition, and Media Conglomeration studies, not into field
> enforcement.
>
> The Congress and The Eighth Floor both wish that the field
> enforcement obligation and functioning would vanish overnight.
>
> >The single greatest problem in the commission today in a
> >single word is GREED, Getting rich at the taxpayers'
> >expense.
>
> That doesn't even deserve a response, Mister Anonymous.
>
> EOT
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>

1080. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 19:33:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hexra96.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67330

On 15 May 2003 06:36:15 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>At ADA we got to learn a few details of that behind the scenes,
>>so to speak while monitoring circuits for operation (required to
>>insure reliability). We got bits and pieces of information as it was
>>communicated. Not a great deal of it...too many circuits to keep
>>a constant check of everything.
>
> So in otherwords you were reading traffic that was NOT
> addressesd to you...

And was the traffic so low-level that it wasn't encrypted?
RTTY cryptos did exist in those days, albeit rather crude by
today's standards......

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1081. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 19:33:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hexquk5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67331

On 15 May 2003 06:03:49 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>> Congrats on your new call sign.
>
> Thank-you, Kind Sir!
>
> Several folks asked me if I regretted letting a 1 x 2 go.
>It feels a bit weird, howevr I can get the 1 x 2 back anytime in
>the next 2 years...of course it will cost me another fee, but
>hey...I've spent more on less before!

When I reclaimed my original 1952 call sign the first day that
the "vanity" (how I hate that term) program started, I too gave
up an "original" 1x2 [N6SP]. My only regret was that a club
that I am trustee for got aced out of getting that call by
another club....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1082. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 20:04:40 UTC
From: The 3873 Gang <Vernon@theseventyfiveguys.net>
Message-ID: <ba0ru0$f1u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67332

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0305150805.2343b1fe@posting.google.com...
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of May 14, 2003:
>
> Novice - 34,564 (decrease of 14,765)
> Technician - 254,786 (increase of 49,392)
> Technician Plus - 68,978 (decrease of 59,882)
> General - 140,997 (increase of 28,320)
> Advanced - 83,599 (decrease of 16,183)
> Extra - 103,995 (increase of 25,245)
> Total - 686,919 (increase of 12,127)
>
>
> For historical comparison, as of May 14, 2002:
>
> Novice - 38,344 (decrease of 10,985)
> Technician - 240,510 (increase of 35,116)
> Technician Plus - 79,744 (decrease of 49,116)
> General - 139,023 (increase of 26,346)
> Advanced - 85,556 (decrease of 14,226)
> Extra - 100,733 (increase of 21,983)
> Total - 683,910 (increase of 9,118)
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Call ARRL managers whatever you want but don't call
them stupid. 240,510 Technicians will ensure ARRL
managers keep receiving pay checks for years to come.

Vern

1083. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 20:53:08 UTC
From: SammGreenn <nospamgreencats@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ec3fe25@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67333

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hewefz4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 14 May 2003 21:17:11 -0400, Anon wrote:
>
> > The FCC has more than adequate budget to do its job.
>
> Mister Anon is incorrect. The money is misdirected into
> projects like Spectrum Auctions, Powerline Internet, Wireline
> Competition, and Media Conglomeration studies, not into field
> enforcement.
>
> The Congress and The Eighth Floor both wish that the field
> enforcement obligation and functioning would vanish overnight.

Accurate points Phil. In fact it would not suprise me
in the least if you see in the near term the "farming out"
of several aspects of Field Enforcement to private
contractors. It also would not suprise me to hear someday
that some other aspects of the FCC be placed under the
control of the Office of Homeland Security. Had a lengthy
conversation with our Senator last week, he said the buzz-
word on Capitol Hill right now is "Privatization". You will
NOT be seeing Social Security privatized ANYTIME soon
as it would be political suicide, but much of everything
else, including many FCC aspects, are indeed On the Table.

Congress is afraid to raise taxes so they now in the process
of farming out as much work to Independent Contractors
so things it will: "...appear balanced and in budget on the
OMB books and other such works of fiction".

(that last quote was from my Senator !!!)

1084. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 22:54:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jUUwa.1795$sh5.1035343@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67334

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030514193234.27394.00000042@mb-m24.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP):
>
> > But you do it here, Vipul! Why? How does one's dietary or aging
> >demographics impact Amateur Radio policy?
>
> Ham radio must lead to these conditions if more Hams have them. If more
people
> were interested in radio direction finding or electronics, there would be
less
> overwieght Hams.
>
>

Ham radio does not lead to aging. Time alone does that.

The general US population as a whole gets overweight with age independent of their hobbies.

An interest in radio direction finding would not prevent anyone from becoming overweight. Even active participation in radio direction finding would not do so. For one thing, the normal person could not devote enough time to it (on foot or bicycle) to have any beneficial effect since it is not needed on any regular basis. For it to be effective, one must exercise a minimum of three days a week. There just isn't that much need for direction finding. Plus a lot of it could be done in a car.

An interest in electronics would have no preventative value in weight gain. It is basically a sedentary activity plus one can eat while doing electronics. Therefore making the situation even worse.

By the way, I looked out over our club from the officer's table last night. About 1/2 the members are on the slim side. This is much better than the general population that I see in the malls, etc.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1085. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 22:56:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZWUwa.1797$sh5.1036117@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67335

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030514194615.27394.00000044@mb-m24.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >Dave hasn't made any "silly claims" that need to be proven, Vipul.
>
> Yes he has. He claimed contesting is useful for emergency comm skill
build'g.
>
> Making those radio contacts is not the only thing an emergency requires.
> Contesting could only cover a fraction of the skills required in a real
> emergency.

Dave never claimed that it helped build ALL the skills you need. It does
build some of the skills.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1086. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 22:59:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <9ZUwa.1798$sh5.1036977@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67336

"Anon" <Anon@heygoodsvc.com> wrote in message
news:b9uprb$gv3$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> The FCC has more than adequate budget to do its job.
> The single greatest problem in the commission today in a
> single word is GREED, Getting rich at the taxpayers'
> expense.

Prove it. How much money does the FCC get annually and where does it go?
They can't keep it you know so who is getting rich??

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1087. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 23:21:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515192114.20212.00000013@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67337

In article <3EC1C94A.2117DF83@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>>
>> >> Not socializing. Its group supported,anti-social, activity.
>>
>> > This of course is a contradiction of terms.
>>
>> Only if you don't understand it.
>
>It must make sense if one's inner spirit has transcended this plane.

I am reminded of an old Moody Blues song about Timothy Leary and someone's
astral plane...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1088. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 23:21:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515192115.20212.00000014@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67339

In article <20030514195717.27394.00000045@mb-m24.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Why in the world are you proud of it,
>
>I am not proud of not doing public service. That event is hardly a public
>service.

Any communications service provided by hams to nonhams is "public service". For example, the New York City Marathon's radio communications is largely handled by hams. Ask any New Yorker if the Marathon is a public event...

>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>They are assuming you have the basic skills needed to do the work. I
>>>took a short training course in SkyWarn recently. It only took an hour
>>>or so. But the other skills were acquired long befor this.
>
>Basic skills is not typically part of Ham radio.

Sure they are. A big part of ham radio is skill development.

>And how useful was this course
>an being able to actually apply what you learned?
>
>From N2EY
>>Although it's an old story, it's still very relevant. Just like Morse code
>>;-)
>
>The story has nothing to do with Morse code.

Do you understand the meaning of the world "analogy"?

>
>And Morse code is not "very" relevant.
>
Guess you've never actually listened to the lower ends of the HF/MF amateur bands.

>

1089. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-15 23:21:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515192116.20212.00000015@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67338

In article <20030513230459.13222.00000243@mb-m14.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>>Coming into a room and calling
>>the occupants cult members, fat, old, antisocial, and what they do
>>boring is a good way to get their attention.
>
>Do you think I come into a room and say that stuff?

No, we know you do it.

>Thats not what I do.

You do it here. Same thing.

>Although, I will bring this stuff up in person in the proper time.

I wanna be there...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1090. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 00:43:04 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67290

```
"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:LpVva.860928$S_4.877248@rwcrnsc53...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b9oggr$3mo$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> > news:b9mrof$ik2$1@nd.eastky.net...
> > >
> > > "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
> > > news:tBgua.247575$Si4.196455@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> > > > Hello Vito .....
> > > >
> > > > Shelfish ...well some people are allergic to that stuff just like
they
> > are
> > > > not motivated to even try at 5 WPM a mode which offers a simple
> elegant
> > > > means of communication.
> > >
> > > Gee, why not also make 'em type on an old-fashioned
Kleinschmidt
> > and
> snip ......
>
> Hello Robert .... I couldn't even put this in the non-sequitur bin.

Because it's not. Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense as
requiring them to show proficiency at CW.

---
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003
```

1091. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 00:46:05 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <ba1cap$os6$2@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67292

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b9paad$h66$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> >
> > I'll be waiting ....God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr
> Pittsburgh
> >
> >
>
> Dont waste your breath trying to convert the unwashed Tom.

And people wonder why amateur radio has an ugly reputation. If I
were interested in code, I'd learn it. I'm not. If I operated HF, I'd do it
in digital modes, because that's what interests me and where my professional
communications skills lie.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1092. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 00:49:14 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515204914.04028.00000114@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67340

From (N2EY)

>>Do you think I come into a room and say that stuff?
>
>No, we know you do it.

I want to, but its hard to work that into the conversation. It has to fit what they are talking about.

>>Although, I will bring this stuff up in person in the proper time.
>
>I wanna be there...
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

How about next week?

1093. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 00:52:22 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <ba1cku$p33$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67291

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote

> Just because its old don't make it useless.

Well, if I had an old Baudot paper tape punch laying around, I'd
probably put it to use just for fun, but I see no point, or future, in
REQUIRING people to learn obsolete skills like typing on old vertical-key
Kleinschmidts, actually _using_ paper tape, or diddling about with CW keys.
You like it, fine. Have fun. If I owned old teletype gear like I used to
operate, like I said, I'd probably play with it, too. But requiring it, (or,
supposing it had been required), desiring the requirement to be maintained,
doesn't make logical sense. Far better to take that ridiculously easy
Technician test and double the size and difficulty of it. Putting time in
studying electronics and procedure would be a far better indicator of
somebody's seriousness about the hobby than CW testing.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1094. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 00:54:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EC43708.1060806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67341

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP):
>
>
>>But you do it here, Vipul! Why? How does one's dietary or aging
>>demographics impact Amateur Radio policy?
>
>
> Ham radio must lead to these conditions if more Hams have them. If more people
> were interested in radio direction finding or electronics, there would be less
> overwieght Hams.

What - like every day? If you want to keep your weight down, you need
more excercise than a fox hunt.

and ummm..... maybe just maybe..... people can have more than one
hobby!!! I sit on my kiester when I'm contesting. Other times, I'm
hiking, playing Ice hockey, and sleeping for maybe 4 hours a day.

Ham radio is not to blame for obesity.

If you want to troll us, you have to do better than that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1095. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 01:07:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515210706.04028.00000116@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67342

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Oh, I get it now! Those electrons don't weigh very much. Electronics
>is the secret to weight control!

Proper behavior and meditation leads to weight loss is some diets.

Focus on contesting and random contacts, antenna setups require less physical activity. The idle activity that follows, making random contacts, takes little activity.

Furthermore, these activities lead to "celebrating" afterwards with food. Often, the food is not healthy.

Many Hams that attend Hamfest are very overweight. I have not seen this in other types of events I have been to.

1096. Off to Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 01:10:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EC43AB2.2020500@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67343

Well, I'm off to Dayton soon, after catching a few hours zzzzz's!

Gonna see how many of Vipul's obese hams are there....

Everyone entertain themselves in the meantime....8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1097. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 01:11:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WUWwa.1937$sh5.1072591@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67344

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030515210706.04028.00000116@mb-m01.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> Many Hams that attend Hamfest are very overweight. I have not seen this in
> other types of events I have been to.
>

I see this everyday in the general population on the streets and in the
stores. There are a lot of people less active than hams.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1098. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 01:13:47 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515211347.04028.00000118@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67345

>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>An interest in electronics would have no preventative value in weight gain.
>It is basically a sedentary activity plus one can eat while doing
>electronics. Therefore making the situation even worse.

There are some overweight EEs also. I have noticed there is a lower percentage
of EEs that are overweight than Hams.

>This is much better than the
>general population that I see in the malls, etc.

Not what I've seen.

1099. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 01:18:27 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <ba1e93$or4$0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 67346

N2EY wrote:

> Lennie the Lump writ.....
> > >> I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
> > >> court lawsuit on grounds of libel. I can afford such things as
> > >> attorney fees for a protacted period. Such a lawsuit would be
> > >> almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
> > >> clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are
> > >> (and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
> > >> lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
> > >> such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
> > >> money.
> > >>
> > >Sounds like you are threatening him.
> >
> > Awwww...gosh, I didn't let a "superior" ham run amuck with
> > his petty libel!
>
> Libel? What was libelous?
> >

Just more bluff and blustery BS from the Meistroll. I doubt even he is stupid enough to actually file such
a frivolous lawsuit, given the facts and his extensive posting record of longtime numerous effort to
agitate and annoy hams who posting on a ham radio newsgroup, when he is not a ham and clearly -both by his
own words and clearly evident results has no interest in ham radio beyond the trouble he can stir by
agitating others to anger here. Surely he's not so stupid that he doesn't know of the punitive costs placed
on deliberately agitating others to anger then trying to sue them for that which you yourself caused. If
not it's time he found out the hard way.

1100. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 01:25:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030515212530.04028.00000119@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67347

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>One could make the argument that even though these gangs are indeed
>engaging in social activity, if only with each other.

Yes - group-supported, anti-social activity.

>Fact is, hams getting together to hang out with each other, in person
>or on the air, is indeed socializing.

True. They are socializing in a group, in an anti-social way.

>Whereas your comparing hams to gangs who ehgage in vandalism is just
>another proof of your deep seated antagonism for Amateur Radio.

No, I was just giving another example of group-supported, anti-social activity.

>We have the above mentioned woman reading her book on the beach. Beside
>her sits her husband, using his HT to talk to some Ham in Europe via an
>Echolink repeater.
>

The woman must be a Ham if her husband is a Ham. Therefore she is probably
anti-social also.

If she is not a Ham, she is reading a book to pass time, while her husband
talks on the HT. In another situation, she may have asked her husband why he is
always on the radio.

However, in the situation you mentioned, neither is being anti-social.

1101. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 03:54:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC460F1.87EED301@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67348

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
> >One could make the argument that even though these gangs are indeed
> >engaging in social activity, if only with each other.
>
> Yes - group-supported, anti-social activity.

Vipul, I do hope you realize that folks are having a laugh at your
expense.

> >Fact is, hams getting together to hang out with each other, in person
> >or on the air, is indeed socializing.
>
> True. They are socializing in a group, in an anti-social way.

You mean sort of like a political party's convention?

> >Whereas your comparing hams to gangs who ehgage in vandalism is just
> >another proof of your deep seated antagonism for Amateur Radio.
>
> No, I was just giving another example of group-supported, anti-social activity.

You can't give "another" example until you first give an example. You
haven't come up with one yet.

> >We have the above mentioned woman reading her book on the beach. Beside
> >her sits her husband, using his HT to talk to some Ham in Europe via an
> >Echolink repeater.
> >
>
> The woman must be a Ham if her husband is a Ham.

There's a piece of faulty logic.

> Therefore she is probably
> anti-social also.

...and there's another piece of faulty logic.

> If she is not a Ham, she is reading a book to pass time, while her husband
> talks on the HT.

Maybe her husband is using the HT to pass the time while his wife is
finishing her book.

> In another situation, she may have asked her husband why he is
> always on the radio.

...or he may have asked her why she is always reading a book. She might have read her book and he might have used the HT without saying a word to each other.

> However, in the situation you mentioned, neither is being anti-social.

The same applies to your illustrations. Despite your desire to make it so, nobody is being anti-social.

Vipul, are you an adult?

Dave K8MN

1102. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 04:02:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC462E1.E01B0E33@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67349

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >Oh, I get it now! Those electrons don't weigh very much. Electronics
> >is the secret to weight control!
>
> Proper behavior and meditation leads to weight loss is some diets.

Just what is "proper behavior", Dr. Shah? I can understand how
meditation can lead to weight loss. The same thing can be true of radio
contesting. One gets so involved in either that one forgets to eat.

> Focus on contesting and random contacts, antenna setups require less > physical activity.

Oh! So random contacts have more calories than scheduled contacts?
I don't know how you do antenna setups but you're welcome to hike up and
down my 70 footer a few times. We'll check your opinion afterward.

The idle activity that follows, making random contacts, takes little
> activity.

Do you ever watch TV? Read a book?

> Furthermore, these activities lead to "celebrating" afterwards with > food.

I don't celebrate Id El Fitr, Diwali or antenna work.

> Often, the food is not healthy.

How often?

> Many Hams that attend Hamfest are very overweight.

You mean many hams attending the four hamfests in New England?

> I have not seen this in other types of events I have been to.

Try a tractor pull or a professional wrestling match. Visit a Wal-Mart
store.

Dave K8MN

1103. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 04:14:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC4651D.66B997A9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67350

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> No license required in them...with one exception. Which one
> is it, Vacuous?

> Yes, in an electrician's cubbyhole with a Simpson 260 being
> your most complicated test instrument...1950s to the 2000s.
>

> You brought up the PhD-like mental superiority of knowing all
> about 65 knobs, switches, and push-buttons on a 765. :-)
>
> Gosh! That's so terribly IMPRESSIVE! :-) :-) :-)
>
> Ever get your VCR to quit blinking "12:00" ? :-)

It's about time to air out the N2EY profile.

> I've been a professional in electronics for over half a century.

Everyone here knows that, Len. You've told us countless times.

> No shortcomings at the bank as a result of that.

Aren't you going to remind us of the two mortgage-free homes and the
fact that you're debt free?

> Maybe you ought to look in the yellow pages for some
> good mental therapist?

You know, it is often said that one of the first signs that your world
may be coming apart is when you start to believe that everyone else is
crazy.

So far you've suggested that Jim, Dick, Steve and I need therapy.

Dave K8MN

1104. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 10:24:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030516062433.04207.00000089@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67251

In article <20030514224725.14837.00000015@mb-m03.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030514071907.17796.00000001@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>Agreed. Note how Len blames his uncivil behavior today on the long-absent
>>Jim Kehler. Sounds like the old worn-out kid's excuses of "but he made me
>>do it!" and "everybody else did it!" How immature.
>
> I blame Jim Kehler's uncivil behavior squarely on Jim Kehler.

Yet you treat everyone who disagrees with you as if they were him.

The blame for your uncivil behavior falls squarely on you.
>
> Kehler isn't absent from the world. He has a website.

He's absent from this newsgroup.

> He is still criticizing folks for not thinking like he does.

So are you. Constantly.

>>Perhaps it would be interesting to go back to his posts on this day, say,
>>six or seven years ago and see how much or how little things have changed....
>
> Go back to your home, Jimmie. Past messages are your thing.

"Those who would forget the past are bound to repeat it."

Most people feel good when someone else quotes them. You get angry when your
words are quoted. Why? Are you ashamed of some things you've posted?
>
> Live with them, roll around in them, eat them all up and spit out
> the ones you think will vindicate your immature behavior over
> losing message points. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

What are you talking about, Len? It's your behavior here that is uncivil and
immature.

1105. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 13:18:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030516091855.28519.00000115@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67252

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/15/2003 8:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030515211347.04028.00000118@mb-m01.aol.com>

>>An interest in electronics would have no preventative value in weight gain.
>>It is basically a sedentary activity plus one can eat while doing
>>electronics. Therefore making the situation even worse.
>
>There are some overweight EEs also. I have noticed there is a lower
>percentage
>of EEs that are overweight than Hams.

Not where I worked there weren't. Every senior engineer was either
seriously overweight, a smoker or tipping the bottle! All the young guys were
in better shape, but not by much.

>>This is much better than the
>>general population that I see in the malls, etc.
>
>Not what I've seen.

How can you see anything with your head stowed away like that, Vipul?

Steve, K4CAP

1106. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 13:25:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030516092503.28519.00000116@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67253

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/15/2003 7:54 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EC43708.1060806@adelphia.net>

>and ummm..... maybe just maybe..... people can have more than one
>hobby!!! I sit on my kiester when I'm contesting. Other times, I'm
>hiking, playing Ice hockey, and sleeping for maybe 4 hours a day.

Like I said...Anyone is welcome to check the profile link below. I am 47, have been a Ham for over 30 years, and I don't think anyone can call me overweight! (Altho Lennie the Loser called me "pudgy" once...)

So, Vipul, if Amateur Radio leads to obesity, what happened?

Steve, K4CAP

http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/profile.html

1107. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 14:21:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC4F360.BDD18E6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67254

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EC312AB.B5DCB9C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I'm not the guy attempting to have the FCC adopt a minimum age for
> >amateur radio licensing.
>
> No kidding! :-)
>
> Why are you so worried about that subject, senior?

I'm only senior to you in experience in amateur radio. Chronologically, you are senior. In amateur radio, you'd be junior or a neophyte but only after taking the first step and actually obtaining a license. Take your pick. The subject concerns me because I don't want to see youngsters excluded from amateur radio. It doesn't appear that the FCC supports your view.

> >I'm not the fellow who claims himself a
> >self-appointed advocate for the removal of morse code testing in a radio
> >service in which he is not involved in any way.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...better talk to the FCC then...they don't "work"
> ham radio, don't need ham licenses, aren't required to get
> ham licenses...and aren't required to be morsemen, either.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby. You don't work for the FCC and don't regulate amateur radio. As a non-participant, you are irrelevant to amateur radio. As you well know, it is the FCC's job to regulate. One doesn't need to have a driving license to work at the DMV, doesn't need to fly an airplane to be an air traffic controller, doesn't need to be a fisherman to sell fishing rods. If, on the other hand, you'd like to drive a car, you'd need a driver's license. If you'd like to fly an airplane, you'd need a pilot's license. If you'd like to go fishing, you'll need a fishing license.

> Come to think of it, the FCC said about 13 years ago that it
> didn't think a morse code test served its purpose of determining
> whether or not an examinee should be licensed. But, what does
> the FCC know? They just regulate all of US civil radio.

Yes the Commission regulates amateur radio. You do not. The FCC staff is paid to regulate amateur radio. You are not. Try to keep those things in your mind. The morse issue is all but gone. Sorry you don't like it that it hasn't gone away but you do not regulate amateur radio.

The FCC will tell you when.

> On the other hand, Dave Heil thinks the morse test should
> remain because he IS ham radio. HE is the lawgiver!

I've been an active ham for forty years. You aren't involved in any capacity. Can you explain how your professional electronics career provided you with knowledge about how amateur radio should be regulated? How about explaining why we or the FCC should support your views? I am not amateur radio but I am a radio amateur. Like yourself, I've had a career in professional radio/communications/electronics but I don't claim that it provided me additional informaton on the regulation of the amateur radio service.

> Ok, let's all give old Dave our support...or a supporter...
> because he IS INVOLVED 24/7!

Nobody does anything much except breathe 24/7. Yes, I am involved in amateur radio. You, on the other hand, are not. You are not a participant. You are not a regulator. You are an onlooker.

Dave K8MN

1108. Dayton weekend.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 14:40:25 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <ba2t8p013f1@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 67255

Having lurked here and read all of the trash talk, it will be interesting to see what Dayton has in store. I'll be there bright and early Saturday morning. Will Babbling Brucie have his "CB plusser" t-shirts? Will there be a number of hams so fat that they need three-wheel carts to get around on? I'll have a full report later this weekend. Stay tuned to this newsgroup!

1109. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 15:10:36 UTC
From: Ray Bob <ray@cornshuckeenet.com>
Message-ID: <ba2v17$n9h$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67256

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:9ZUwa.1798$sh5.1036977@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > The FCC has more than adequate budget to do its job.
> > The single greatest problem in the commission today in a
> > single word is GREED, Getting rich at the taxpayers'
> > expense.
>
> Prove it. How much money does the FCC get annually and where does it go?
> They can't keep it you know so who is getting rich??
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Errr, in case you are not aware, this is not a court of law,
with the necessity of proving something. However, if you are
a motivated citizen, pick up the LL and call your local
congressperson's office. And please don't make a typical
ass of yourself by demanding to speak directly to the
congressperson. You ask for a staffer and tell the nice lady
answering the phone that your request is no rush, just some
info you want. The kids who are staffers in these offices are
smart, focused, and eager to help. And it is amazing what
info they can get their hands on! We learned things about the
FCC that the FCC does not want made public, especially in
the budget area.

Ray Bob
Corn Shuckers Net

1110. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 15:29:42 UTC
From: kuzen001@duke.edu
Message-ID: <ba3056dtf1@gargoyle.oit.duke.edu>
Source record: 67257

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote:
> This came up in a college LE course I took a few years ago. The prof
> disliked manditory sentancing because it forced release of more
> dangerous criminals and had many ancidotal examples. I do not have my

MandAtory. SentEncing. AnECdotal.

1111. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 16:34:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305160834.7d5eea43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67258

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030514143626.00486.00000004@mb-m25.aol.com>...

> I tried to make a point that the entire
> US military was NOT using morse code for long-distance radio
> communications message traffic a half century ago.

Let's see...that would be 1953.

You're telling us that from 1953 onwards, nobody in the US Army, Navy,
Air Force, Marine Corps or Coast Guard was using Morse Code for long
distance radio message traffic? Proof, please.

> Carroll would
> not listen...he never had such an experience, didn't do any such
> regular HF radio communications during his short, conscripted
> military service days...

or perhaps he knows that Morse use in the US military continued beyond
1953...

> Each operating team at ADA was responsible
> for the continuing operation of 36 (at first) to 43 transmitters ranging
> from 1 KW to 40 KW in power output at HF operating 24/7, using
> a two square mile antenna "farm."

How big was the team? How many personnel were employed full-time to
maintain all that equipment?

> >You are not, and never were, licensed to do anything real
> >in radio other than that which your employer directed.
>
> I was my own employer for one of my licensed radios. :-)
> Directed myself.

I've got a cell phone, too.

> I'll call any skilled morseman my superior BUT ONLY IN
> morsemanship. No other skill, Dickie, except mean-spirited
> name calling which you sporadically show as your masterwork in
> here. I'll acknowledge you as my superior in mean-spiritdness.

No, Len, you've earned the big brass fig newton for that.
>
> Somebody in here used the quote, "it ain't bragging if ya done it."

That was me, quoting Babe Ruth.

> I've done what I say I done, Dickie, have the proof.

So why are you so mean spirited? Why do you discredit and deny the accomplishments of others but insist and demand others accept and honor your alleged accomplishments?

1112. Re: Net on 3860 khz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-16 18:13:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hezj5t8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67259

On Thu, 15 May 2003 16:53:08 -0400, SammGreenn wrote:

>> The Congress and The Eighth Floor both wish that the field
>> enforcement obligation and functioning would vanish overnight.
>
>Accurate points Phil. In fact it would not suprise me
>in the least if you see in the near term the "farming out"
>of several aspects of Field Enforcement to private
>contractors.

Consider that in the past 15 years the following FCC functions
were "privatized" i.e. "farmed out" to the private sector:

Frequency coordination in almost all services
Amateur license examinations
Amateur-to-amateur interference resolution
Commercial license examinations
Ship radio safety inspections
Broadcast station compliance inspections
Land-mobile interference resolution

>It also would not suprise me to hear someday
>that some other aspects of the FCC be placed under the
>control of the Office of Homeland Security.

If that Office was run right, this would not be a bad thing.
It would give some muscle to the enforcement and investigative
functions that are currently held back by Congressional and
industry restraints on the FCC whom they see only as a license
awarding entity.

For decades I have been an advocate of separating the
license-issuing functions and the enforcement functions into
two separate agencies with separate funding, as is done in
Canada. The good analogy in the US is the Motor Vehicle
department(s) who grant the licenses and the Highway Patrol(s)
who enforce the laws.

However, I hear that the "Homeland Security" folks are as
rigidly controlled by Washington politicos as the FBI was under
Mister Hoover, and adding layers of top-heavy bureaucracy is
not what an effective law enforcement agency needs.

>Had a lengthy
>conversation with our Senator last week, he said the buzz-
>word on Capitol Hill right now is "Privatization". You will
>NOT be seeing Social Security privatized ANYTIME soon

>as it would be political suicide, but much of everything
>else, including many FCC aspects, are indeed On the Table.
>
>Congress is afraid to raise taxes so they now in the process
>of farming out as much work to Independent Contractors
>so things it will: "...appear balanced and in budget on the
>OMB books and other such works of fiction".
>
>(that last quote was from my Senator !!!)

He is right on target.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1113. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 00:05:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <u1fxa.7331$o92.470@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67260

Typical. We had an alleged IT professional who didn't know how to stop the
e-mail from a Yahoo group (either by changing preferences or unsubscribing).
We also had an alleged engineer with the same problem.

:)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

<kuzen001@duke.edu> wrote in message
news:ba3056dtf1@gargoyle.oit.duke.edu...
> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote:
> > This came up in a college LE course I took a few years ago. The prof
> > disliked manditory sentancing because it forced release of more
> > dangerous criminals and had many ancidotal examples. I do not have my
>
> MandAtory. SentEncing. AnECdotal.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/03

1114. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 03:58:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC5B374.BAC57751@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67261
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
> and 5405 kHz--at 60m

So when do we get to use them? Now?

To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and
5403.6 KHz That's (freq) -(2.8/2).

1115. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 08:05:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517040517.15389.00000142@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67262

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 5/16/2003 10:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EC5B374.BAC57751@ix.netcom.com>

>So when do we get to use them? Now?

Ninety days from whenever it appears in the Federal Register according to the ARRL website.

I'm not going to be in any bit hurry to throw up an antenna for five "channels".

73

Steve, K4CAP

1116. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 09:07:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517050733.15389.00000143@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67263

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 5/15/2003 11:43 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0305150843.3bb9728c@posting.google.com>

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030510202130.18775.00000686@mb-m02.aol.com>...

>> I don't recall any previous professional work in radio-electronics
>> requiring ANY serious consideration of amateur radio activities.
>> None of my work experience was with any professional amateur
>> radio companies. :-)
>
>Translation: No experience

Nothing new there.

>> I have worked WITH several who also held amateur radio license
>> grants. Some of those were given in here.
>
>Translation: Attempted glory by association

Seems Lennie is good at that. Especially in cases where the people he's
"associating" with aren't around to protest.

>> Amateur radios work with the same physics as all other radios.
>> There's no distinction except in the minds of certain people
>> who think that human beaurocracy redefines the laws of physics.
>
>Translation: "Physics" is the only consideration in regulations to
>Len.

You'd think a guy with as much education as Lennie claims would know the
difference between "policy" and "physics".

>> Some of my work experience has required communications by
>> radio in various modes. That was never any problem on land,
>> on the water, or in the air. I've done that since February 1953.
>> I've done communications by radio in non-work related activities.
>> No problem with that at all...all legal, too. :-)
>
>Translation: Len has used a radio.

But not AMATEUR Radio. Maybe allowed to handle a mike while being
supervised by a 10 year old control operator, but never one of his own.

>> At no time since 1953 was I ever required or forced to use any
>> sort of on-off keyed morse code mode for radio communications
>> work or recreation, on HF or any other part of the spectrum.
>>
>Translation: Len has little or no experience actually using Morse
>code.

Some people can hack it...some people can't.

Lennie's a non-hacker.

>> So, in the loaded context of
>
>(N2EY's)
>
>> "question," since US
>> amateur radio still requires morse code TESTING to obtain a
>> license class having HF operating privileges, neither my work
>> experience nor recreational experience "fits" the OLD US
>> radio amateur regulations in the strict sense of the word. :-)
>
>How is the question "loaded"? Here it is, again:
>
>"Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?"

It put Lennie on the spot. He had to answer a direct question with a
direct answer that, had he been honest with us AND himself, would have deflated
his rants AND his hatred. Lennie likes to jate. It's part and parcel of his
being.

>You rambled on for 8 paragraphs about your work experience but not one
>word on how that non-amateur work experience means you know more about
>how amateur radio should be regulated than anyone else.

Of course. There's no foxholes to jump into here...just smokescreens of
words. Lennie keeps thinking he's doing such a good job here, yet we keep
making such a fool out of him, and he's amazed at why he can't "get over" on
us...

>> >What you're trying to sell us is the idea that your passing a single test
>for
>> >a
>> >COMMERCIAL license many years ago somehow proves that you know more about
>how
>> >AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else. No sale.
>>
>> That wasn't offered for "sale."
>
>Good, because it's worthless.

Worthless in spades.

>> What you are attempting to prove in here is that any commercial radio
>> license test is inferior to any amateur radio license test.
>
>Not at all. Just that you have no basis for comparison since you have
>never taken any amateur radio license test.

This is part of his rant. Lennie thinks he's already done it all and
knows it all...he sholdn't "have" to take ANY Amateur exam "just because"....

>> What you are implying is that "tests" represent a summation of
>> knowledge of the examinee AFTER the test was taken.
>
>Nope. Not at all. The tests are the entry point only. Minimum
>qualifications, that sort of thing.
>
>> That is most
>> assuredly false, ludicrous, and a bit insane.
>
>Then why do you make such a big deal about your First 'Phone?

"Do As I Say, Not Do As I Do" Some call it "two-faced".

>> Absolutely NO "test" is required to see the arrogance and self-
>> righteous indignation of certain individuals who insist that Their
>> testing in anything showed their "superiority" to any who did not
>> take the test. Their "superiority" is a definite NO SALE.
>
>Let's see - who wrote:
>
>"That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
>radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
>deliberate public information on any answers."
>
>in an attempt to prove "superiority"? Ah - that would be you, Len.

OUCH! Nice job, Jim!

>> I'm in an arena of amateur radio policy arguments where the
>> standards and practices of 1930s amateur radio represents the
>> norm for the 2000s according to some olde-tyme hams.
>
>What are you talking about? Was there no use of Morse code after 1940?

The funny part is that we keep trying to discuss policy matters OTHER than
Morse Code, and Lennie always manages to pull it back to that. The FCC has
already dealt with it and done what it can do. Lennie refuses to accept that
this "issue" resides with them (the FCC) and not any one Amateur or
Amateur-related organization.

Everyone else has dealt with it and accepted it...Everyone EXCEPT Lennie.

>> How does your passing an AMATEUR radio test so long ago
>> prove you are judge, jury, and executioner qualified to speak
>> of policy in amateur radio TODAY? :-)

>
>"You cannot answer a question with another question" - your words,
>Len.

Sure we can, Jim! Here's one for Lennie: "How does passing a COMMERCIAL
radio test so long ago prove you are judge, jury and executioner qualified to
speak of policy in AMATEUR radio TODAY?"

Of course YOU already asked him that and he's refused to answer, so we can
add that to teh heap of questions still pending for him to answer.

>> >But the amateur radio experience of an active radio amateur DOES exceed
>the
>> >experience of any unlicensed person. In other words, us licensed, active
>hams
>> >have experience, knowledge and skills about AMATEUR RADIO that you do not,
>> >Len. That's a plain, simple fact.
>>
>> No, that's just a self-righteous, self-important CLAIM.
>
>No, it's a plain, simple fact. You don't like it because it's true.

Experience is really over-rated, Jim! Just ask Vipul and Brain!

>> YOU are just venting a cloud of frustration and
>> pique for not being able to Rule and are unrecognized for
>> the greatness and glory of your words of wisdom.
>
>Not me. I'm not frustrated about the subject at all. I've made my
>views known to the FCC on a number of issues, and will do so again.

It just amazes me how Lennie can make such outlandish claims in public and
not realize that we can see right through him!

>> What's worse, the FCC's opinion on morse code testing for
>> US amateur radio license examination is not in agreement
>> with all your claimed "superiority" in amateur radio.
>
>What ARE you going on about?

Lennie keeps claiming that you (and anyone else who enjoys CW) "claims
superiority" in Amater Radio. However I have yet to see such a claim uttered
by anyone. (other than by the anonymous "Know Code" blurbs that pop up, and who
cares about someone who can't put their name to a post?)

>> I'm not the one touting B&W products of the 1950s.
>
>No, you're touting licenses and experiences of the 1950s.

DING! Right betrween the eyes again.

>> I'm not the one demanding all amateurs to adhere to
>> the standards and practices in amateur radio as it
>> was in the 1930s.

>
>No, you're the one who denies the need for any standards or practices.

Why is it that all we suggest is that Lennie get a license initiated in
1991, yet he keeps insisting that we are adhering to some 1930's "standards"?
None of us were licensed before 1950-something, and most of us in the late
60's/early 70's.

>> I'm not the one constantly going back to dear old
>> GOOGLE to pull out old messages and try to beat
>> dead horses of past arguments.
>
>No, you're the one who wants people to forget the reputation you've
>earned for yourself, and who wants people to ignore your errors and
>self-contradictions.

I am sure Lennie goes to bed every night cursing Amateur Radio in general,
us in particular, and the egghead that created Google (and Deja before it...)

>> >> I can "take it" to the extent of having an attorney file for a civil
>> >> court lawsuit on grounds of libel. I can afford such things as
>> >> attorney fees for a protacted period. Such a lawsuit would be
>> >> almost a cakewalk since prima facie evidence of libel was
>> >> clearly evident that ANY AOL subscriber could view; there are
>> >> (and were then) millions of AOL subscribers. AOL would have
>> >> lost, without doubt. So would Robeson. In Robeson's case
>> >> such a financial loss would have been severe in both time and
>> >> money.
>> >>
>> >Sounds like you are threatening him.
>>
>> Awwww...gosh, I didn't let a "superior" ham run amuck with
>> his petty libel!

As I said...If Lennie REALLY thinks he was "libeled", he's at liberty to
file his suit. The REALITY will be that I will also present REAMS of copies of
posts from Lennie over YEARS with his wild assertions, addressing of others
with profanity in a public forum, etc etc etc, and we'll see whose "financial
loss (would) have been severe in both time and money".

I wonder how long he'd have to go back to work to make up what he might
lose in a civil suit? How long could he continue to afford to live on Lanark
Street if there was a lien against his home for court settlements?

Just his assertions of "professionalism" in communications followed by his
silly claim of a "mistake" in sending an offensive .jpeg in response to his
offer to show his "license" would get it dismissed.

I wonder how Mrs. Lennie would feel about her financial and domestic
security being surrendered to sate Lennie's ego vis-a-vis his hatred for a
"radio hobby...?!?!

Hmmmmmmmmmm...?!?!?!?!?

Steve, K4CAP

1117. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 10:23:54 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517062354.20074.00000245@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67264

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/15/2003 11:14 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EC4651D.66B997A9@earthlink.net>

>Len Over 21 wrote:

>> No shortcomings at the bank as a result of that.
>
>Aren't you going to remind us of the two mortgage-free homes and the
>fact that you're debt free?

Not if he keeps making irresponsible comments about who he's going to sue over an AOL post due to HIS ineptitude, Dave.

Wonder how Mrs. Lennie's gonna like the idea of her husband putting the rest of their retirement security on the line over that...?!?!

73

Seve, K4CAP

1118. LIVE webcam from Dayton Hamvention here

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 11:24:20 UTC
From: Moe <mynameismoe@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ec61bd6@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67265

here: http://tmedlin.com/hamvention.html

LIVE cam at Dayton - up and running!!!

1119. Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 14:09:19 UTC
From: white mouse <whitemouse@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ec64280@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67266
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Watching the live webcam feed from the
Dayton Hamvention right now at:

http://tmedlin.com/hamvention.html

Looks like it's raining at a pretty good clip
and I can see what looks like 2 or 3 buyers
at the most walking the flea market asile in
the live photo snapped just a minute ago.

Is this photographic confirmation that the
Dayton Hamvention, and hamfests in general
also, are going the way of the dinosaur?
Has e-Bay killed hamfests?
Did Wayne Green's "crystal ball" really
portent with accuracy and he got it right all along
in his editorials?

I recall Dayton as being so packed in past years
you felt like you were at the Indy-500. Now it looks
like our local junk weekend flea market pulls
more attendees. How sad. Time to stick a fork in it?

1120. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 14:14:49 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns937E683D75AD2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 67267
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:3EC5B374.BAC57751@ix.netcom.com:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>> This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
>> and 5405 kHz--at 60m
>
> So when do we get to use them? Now?
>
> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and
> 5403.6 KHz That's (freq) -(2.8/2).
>
>
>

Actually, NATO specify a 1.5 kHz offset for SSB to be on their 'assigned frequency', so you should be on nominal carrier frequencies ending in .5, not .6. I agree that Part 97 makes this as clear as mud, though. A stock wide filter should give you 300 Hz to 2.7 kHz audio, so if you tune 1.5 kHz low as per NATO rules your sig should extend -1.2 kHz/+1.2 kHz, which is centred as per Part 97, and within the permitted channel by 200 Hz on both sides.

1121. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 15:25:12 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <066cnXbBgP3AyVujXTWcog@crocker.com>
Source record: 67268
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

even big flea markets get emptied when it rains. if they had a picture inside it would probably be shoulder to shoulder right now. from the radar image out there it looks like they have had and will have some pretty good rain today.

"white mouse" <whitemouse@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3ec64280@snipnews.snip.net...
> Watching the live webcam feed from the
> Dayton Hamvention right now at:
>
> http://tmedlin.com/hamvention.html
>
> Looks like it's raining at a pretty good clip
> and I can see what looks like 2 or 3 buyers
> at the most walking the flea market asile in
> the live photo snapped just a minute ago.
>
> Is this photographic confirmation that the
> Dayton Hamvention, and hamfests in general
> also, are going the way of the dinosaur?
> Has e-Bay killed hamfests?
> Did Wayne Green's "crystal ball" really
> portent with accuracy and he got it right all along
> in his editorials?
>
> I recall Dayton as being so packed in past years
> you felt like you were at the Indy-500. Now it looks
> like our local junk weekend flea market pulls
> more attendees. How sad. Time to stick a fork in it?
>
>
>
>

1122. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 16:15:37 UTC
From: Larry <Larsee@larseebee.com>
Message-ID: <ba5n7f$e0e$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67269
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Did anyone attend the unofficial forum on
Freebanding in 21st Century? Was going to attend
but had an urgent business appointment. Heard I missed
a great forum. This event was not listed on any official
programs. Word was passed on the radio and via mouth,
as well as separate flyers.

Larry

1123. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 16:34:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517123442.23710.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67270

> Did anyone attend the unofficial forum on
>Freebanding in 21st Century?

Yea i was there, it was allright.

1124. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 17:08:20 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <LtudncJD4aYc8VujXTWcrg@crocker.com>
Source record: 67271

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030517123442.23710.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > Did anyone attend the unofficial forum on
> >Freebanding in 21st Century?
>
> Yea i was there, it was allright.

did you spot the hidden cameras?

1125. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 18:16:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC67BC1.395A83A9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67272

Steven Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 5/15/2003 11:14 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EC4651D.66B997A9@earthlink.net>
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >> No shortcomings at the bank as a result of that.
> >
> >Aren't you going to remind us of the two mortgage-free homes and the
> >fact that you're debt free?
>
> Not if he keeps making irresponsible comments about who he's going to sue
> over an AOL post due to HIS ineptitude, Dave.
>
> Wonder how Mrs. Lennie's gonna like the idea of her husband putting the
> rest of their retirement security on the line over that...?!?!

I'm surprised that he didn't go to Earthlink over my Foghorn Lenhor/RTTY wave file or the Foghorn Lenhorn jpeg. Both are parodies of Len. I may even be creative with the aircraft photo he sent you and put it up on my web site.

Now back to reliving the 1930's with the Ten-Tec Orion (which I neither designed nor built from a kit)...

Dave K8MN

1126. Re: Communications emergency declared

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 18:17:39 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <ba5vfd$2n9@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 67273

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:b9um25$7ck$0@208.206.142.101...
>
>
> Al wrote:
>
> > "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EC284EA.869A8085@crosslink.net...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Put it another way - FCC comes into town, makes a big hoopla, finds
> > nothing,
> > > > disappears. Violators think it's a big joke. ...
> > >
> > > Not all of them. I liked to tell CBrs that I'd seen an FCC van. They'd
> > > panic and hide all their "killer-watt" linears and mod'd CBs for a day
> > > or so. So, in that sense FCC put them off the air, albiet very
> > > temporarily. "What's that FCC van doing parked down the block from
you?"
> > > gets great responses.
> > >
> > > (c: K3DWW
> >
> > They haven't used vans in years, actually decades, cept for a
microwave
> > van. Another hint. The vehicles they DO use, contrary to popular
> > belief among hams, do not have antennas sprouting out all over. And
> > don't look for government license tags. There's more, but I will
> > leave that to the active imagination hams have. I am an engineer
> > at a TV station and was afforded the opportunity to examine
> > one of their vehicles at a trade show.
>
> No matter. The mental image evoked at the mention of the 'white van' is
more
> than enough to cause the intended response.
>

For you, Dick, I'm sure it is...

Kim W5TIT

1127. Have You Ever Noticed...???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 19:16:21 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517151621.01523.00000310@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67274

Anyone ever watch the SciFi/techno-thriller "Collossus: The Forbin Project"..??

Ever notice the "emblem" for the run-away computer system and it's similarity to AOL's...?!?!

Scary, eh?

Steve, K4CAP

1128. W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 19:17:08 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517151708.01523.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67275

Hey Kim...e mail me direct, please..?!?! I lost your direct address...

73

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

1129. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 20:24:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517162452.27503.00000048@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67276

In article <3ec64280@snipnews.snip.net>, "white mouse" <whitemouse@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Looks like it's raining at a pretty good clip
>and I can see what looks like 2 or 3 buyers
>at the most walking the flea market asile in
>the live photo snapped just a minute ago.

dang
>
>Is this photographic confirmation that the
>Dayton Hamvention, and hamfests in general
>also, are going the way of the dinosaur?

Not really. They're just changing with the times. The weather is a big factor
in any outdoor event.

>Has e-Bay killed hamfests?

Nope. But online commerce has had an effect, whether it be eBay or its clones,
reflectors, websites or newsgroups.

>Did Wayne Green's "crystal ball" really
>portent with accuracy and he got it right all along
>in his editorials?

Not really. Even a broken clock is right at least once a day.

>I recall Dayton as being so packed in past years
>you felt like you were at the Indy-500.

Even when it's pouring rain?

>Now it looks
>like our local junk weekend flea market pulls
>more attendees.

Even when it's pouring rain?

> How sad. Time to stick a fork in it?
>
See what things are like when the weather's good.

There are many factors affecting hamfest attendance and hobby activities in
general, not just the 'net. Among the married-with-kids folks, time for things
like ham radio often comes in bits and pieces, not big chunks.

In the past, it was typical for dad to work while mom stayed at home, at least
while the kids were too young to leave alone. Roles in the family were fairly

well defined. Most people lived in neighborhoods where the kids did not have to be chauffered around much. And most people had no idea what CC&Rs were. Yes, there were exceptions, but they were just that - exceptions.

Today both parents work, usually by necessity or perceived necessity. In many professions, things change so fast that not working in that profession for several years makes that person almost unemployable without re-training.

End result is that the idea of taking spending lots of time and $$ to go to a distant hamfest is not an option for many folks. Particularly when it does not involve the entire family. Sure they'd like to go, but it's not high on the list compared to a bunch of other things.

Until a few years ago, I was a regular at almost every hamfest within 2 hours' drive. Even after I got a computer and found eBay, I would go. Bought, sold, built up quite a pile of goodies for almost nothing.

But hamfesting took a lot of time. Load up the car Saturday afternoon, get up before dawn to do the 'fest on Sunday. By the time I got home and put the new treasures away it was almost dinnertime. Plus there was always the risk of bad weather.

Along came the 'net, with reflectors, newsgroups and eBay. Including "WTB" messages and much higher prices. End result is a 24/7 hamfest with no weather worries, low entry fees and you set your own schedule. Sure it takes a bit of time to wrap the stuff up and ship it, but that can be done in small bits of time rather than large chunks.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

. Particularly one that does not necessarily involve the entire family.

1130. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 21:25:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ba69b7$55i$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

No, not now. We have to wait until the final order is out from the FCC.

Dan/W4NTI

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EC5B374.BAC57751@ix.netcom.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
> > and 5405 kHz--at 60m
>
> So when do we get to use them? Now?
>
> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and
> 5403.6 KHz That's (freq) -(2.8/2).
>
>
>

1131. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 22:18:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517181827.28736.00000195@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67278

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 5/17/2003 4:25 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <ba69b7$55i$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>No, not now. We have to wait until the final order is out from the FCC.

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message

>> So when do we get to use them? Now?

Earlier I said I thought it was 90 days after the Federal Register reported it...that was wrong...it will only be >thirty< days after it appears in the FR that we can use the new assignments.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1132. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 22:27:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC6B75A.E3D8CAFF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67279

David Robbins wrote:

> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030517123442.23710.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > > Did anyone attend the unofficial forum on
> > >Freebanding in 21st Century?
> >
> > Yea i was there, it was allright.
>
> did you spot the hidden cameras?

The bad weather grounded the black helicopters, though.....

1133. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-17 22:30:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517183012.04207.00000122@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67280

In article <20030517050733.15389.00000143@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 5/15/2003 11:43 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0305150843.3bb9728c@posting.google.com>
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030510202130.18775.00000686@mb-m02.aol.com>...

>>> Amateur radios work with the same physics as all other radios.
>>> There's no distinction except in the minds of certain people
>>> who think that human beaurocracy redefines the laws of physics.
>>
>>Translation: "Physics" is the only consideration in regulations to
>>Len.
>
> You'd think a guy with as much education as Lennie claims would know the
>difference between "policy" and "physics".

Of course he knows the difference. His philosophy seems to be that the policy should derive from the "physics" only.

>
>>> Some of my work experience has required communications by
>>> radio in various modes. That was never any problem on land,
>>> on the water, or in the air. I've done that since February 1953.
>>> I've done communications by radio in non-work related activities.
>>> No problem with that at all...all legal, too. :-)
>>
>>Translation: Len has used a radio.
>
> But not AMATEUR Radio. Maybe allowed to handle a mike while being
>supervised by a 10 year old control operator, but never one of his own.

Perhaps that explains his opposition to the licensing of young people.

>
>>> At no time since 1953 was I ever required or forced to use any
>>> sort of on-off keyed morse code mode for radio communications
>>> work or recreation, on HF or any other part of the spectrum.
>>>
>>Translation: Len has little or no experience actually using Morse
>>code.
>
> Some people can hack it...some people can't.

>
> Lennie's a non-hacker.

No, just inexperienced.
>
>>> So, in the loaded context of
>>
>>(N2EY's)
>>
>>> "question," since US
>>> amateur radio still requires morse code TESTING to obtain a
>>> license class having HF operating privileges, neither my work
>>> experience nor recreational experience "fits" the OLD US
>>> radio amateur regulations in the strict sense of the word. :-)
>>
>>How is the question "loaded"? Here it is, again:
>>
>>"Does your employment somehow prove that you know more about how
>>AMATEUR radio should be regulated than anyone else?"
>
> It put Lennie on the spot. He had to answer a direct question with a
>direct answer that, had he been honest with us AND himself, would have
>deflated his rants AND his hatred.

When has he ever given a direct answer to a direct question that he did not
like?

>>You rambled on for 8 paragraphs about your work experience but not one
>>word on how that non-amateur work experience means you know more about
>>how amateur radio should be regulated than anyone else.
>
> Of course. There's no foxholes to jump into here...just smokescreens of
>words. Lennie keeps thinking he's doing such a good job here, yet we keep
>making such a fool out of him, and he's amazed at why he can't "get over" on
>us...

It's all just opinions, Steve. In Len's opinion, his work experience somehow
makes him more knowledgeable about what amateur radio regulations should be
than, say, me. Or you.

>>> What you are attempting to prove in here is that any commercial radio
>>> license test is inferior to any amateur radio license test.
>>
>>Not at all. Just that you have no basis for comparison since you have
>>never taken any amateur radio license test.
>
> This is part of his rant. Lennie thinks he's already done it all and
>knows it all...he sholdn't "have" to take ANY Amateur exam "just because"....

I've never seen Len claim that he shouldn't have to take ANY amateur radio
exam. Just the code test.

The point is that his claim that he took a "tougher" test is without basis
unless the tests can, in fact, be compared. Since he did not take any amateur
test, he is not qualified to compare them.

>>> What you are implying is that "tests" represent a summation of
>>> knowledge of the examinee AFTER the test was taken.
>>
>>Nope. Not at all. The tests are the entry point only. Minimum
>>qualifications, that sort of thing.
>>
>>> That is most
>>> assuredly false, ludicrous, and a bit insane.
>>
>>Then why do you make such a big deal about your First 'Phone?
>
> "Do As I Say, Not Do As I Do" Some call it "two-faced".

Well, there you have it.
>
>>> Absolutely NO "test" is required to see the arrogance and self-
>>> righteous indignation of certain individuals who insist that Their
>>> testing in anything showed their "superiority" to any who did not
>>> take the test. Their "superiority" is a definite NO SALE.
>>
>>Let's see - who wrote:
>>
>>"That license grant proved I took a tougher test than any amateur
>>radio test at an FCC Field Office at a time when there was no
>>deliberate public information on any answers."
>>
>>in an attempt to prove "superiority"? Ah - that would be you, Len.
>
> OUCH! Nice job, Jim!

It's just a plain, simple fact.
>
>>> I'm in an arena of amateur radio policy arguments where the
>>> standards and practices of 1930s amateur radio represents the
>>> norm for the 2000s according to some olde-tyme hams.
>>
>>What are you talking about? Was there no use of Morse code after 1940?
>
> The funny part is that we keep trying to discuss policy matters OTHER
>than
>Morse Code, and Lennie always manages to pull it back to that.

Of course. But the key (pun intended) point is to demonstrate that his claim of
"the standards and practices of 1930s amateur radio is the norm for the 2000s"
is simply without basis.

>The FCC has already dealt with it and done what it can do.

And they've let us know what the next step is, too.

>Lennie refuses to accept that this "issue" resides with them (the FCC) and not
>any one Amateur or Amateur-related organization.

What will he have to argue about if/when Element 1 is dumped?

>>> How does your passing an AMATEUR radio test so long ago
>>> prove you are judge, jury, and executioner qualified to speak
>>> of policy in amateur radio TODAY? :-)
>>
>>"You cannot answer a question with another question" - your words,
>>Len.
>
>>> >But the amateur radio experience of an active radio amateur DOES exceed
>>> >the experience of any unlicensed person. In other words, us licensed,
>>> >active hams have experience, knowledge and skills about AMATEUR
>>> >RADIO that you do not, Len. That's a plain, simple fact.
>>>
>>> No, that's just a self-righteous, self-important CLAIM.
>>
>>No, it's a plain, simple fact. You don't like it because it's true.
>
> Experience is really over-rated, Jim! Just ask Vipul and Brain!

If experience is over-rated, then Len's experience is also over-rated...
>
>>> YOU are just venting a cloud of frustration and
>>> pique for not being able to Rule and are unrecognized for
>>> the greatness and glory of your words of wisdom.
>>
>>Not me. I'm not frustrated about the subject at all. I've made my
>>views known to the FCC on a number of issues, and will do so again.
>
>It just amazes me how Lennie can make such outlandish claims in public
>and not realize that we can see right through him!

Why does anyhting Len posts amaze you, Steve? Have you not been reading his
stuff for years? Don;t you know what to expect by now? ;-)
>
>>> What's worse, the FCC's opinion on morse code testing for
>>> US amateur radio license examination is not in agreement
>>> with all your claimed "superiority" in amateur radio.
>>
>>What ARE you going on about?
>
> Lennie keeps claiming that you (and anyone else who enjoys CW) "claims
>superiority" in Amater Radio. However I have yet to see such a claim uttered
>by anyone. (other than by the anonymous "Know Code" blurbs that pop up, and
>who cares about someone who can't put their name to a post?)

For all we know, that "Know Code" guy lives in SoCal.......
>
>>> I'm not the one touting B&W products of the 1950s.
>>

>>No, you're touting licenses and experiences of the 1950s.
>
> DING! Right betrween the eyes again.
>
>>> I'm not the one demanding all amateurs to adhere to
>>> the standards and practices in amateur radio as it
>>> was in the 1930s.
>>
>>No, you're the one who denies the need for any standards or practices.
>
> Why is it that all we suggest is that Lennie get a license initiated in
>1991, yet he keeps insisting that we are adhering to some 1930's "standards"?

Do you realy want him to get an amateur license?
>
>None of us were licensed before 1950-something, and most of us in the late
>60's/early 70's.

1967, for me.
>
>>> I'm not the one constantly going back to dear old
>>> GOOGLE to pull out old messages and try to beat
>>> dead horses of past arguments.
>>
>>No, you're the one who wants people to forget the reputation you've
>>earned for yourself, and who wants people to ignore your errors and
>>self-contradictions.
>
> I am sure Lennie goes to bed every night cursing Amateur Radio in
>general, us in particular, and the egghead that created Google
>(and Deja before it...)

God bless Google.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1134. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 01:17:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305180115200.1646@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67281
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 16 May 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
> > and 5405 kHz--at 60m
>
> So when do we get to use them? Now?

No. We must wait until it becomes final. In this case, that means 30 days after this is published in the Federal Register (which hasn't happened yet - but should happen by the end of this month). Effectively, that will mean that it should be in effect by July 1, 2003 (if not earlier).

> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and
> 5403.6 KHz That's (freq) -(2.8/2).

1135. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 03:00:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030517230040.28957.00000220@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 67282

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/17/2003 5:30 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030517183012.04207.00000122@mb-m01.aol.com>

>> But not AMATEUR Radio. Maybe allowed to handle a mike while being
>>supervised by a 10 year old control operator, but never one of his own.
>
>Perhaps that explains his opposition to the licensing of young people.

She gave it up for a while, but my 11 year old has picked up the licensing guide again. If I ask her real nicely she might let Lennie have some third-party time. But only if she's close enough to manipulate the transmitter if he should do something wrong.

>> It put Lennie on the spot. He had to answer a direct question with a
>>direct answer that, had he been honest with us AND himself, would have
>>deflated his rants AND his hatred.
>
>When has he ever given a direct answer to a direct question that he did not
>like?

Point well taken.

>>It just amazes me how Lennie can make such outlandish claims in public
>>and not realize that we can see right through him!
>
>Why does anyhting Len posts amaze you, Steve? Have you not been reading his
>stuff for years? Don;t you know what to expect by now? ;-)

Point well taken again...But I am a Nurse and I always hold out hope for healing. Of course one has to WANT to heal, and that's not in Lennie's agenda right now, so at best we can just stand back and watch him flounder for a while.

>> Why is it that all we suggest is that Lennie get a license initiated in
>>1991, yet he keeps insisting that we are adhering to some 1930's
>"standards"?
>
>Do you realy want him to get an amateur license?

Heeeeeeeck NO! I'd choke on the spot!

>>None of us were licensed before 1950-something, and most of us in the late
>>60's/early 70's.
>
>1967, for me.

72 here.

>> I am sure Lennie goes to bed every night cursing Amateur Radio in
>>general, us in particular, and the egghead that created Google
>>(and Deja before it...)
>
>God bless Google.

A-MEN!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1136. Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 03:14:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030517231435.23307.00000070@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 67283

In article <3EC0F3F0.1080603@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
> There are some (many) hams who do not like the 10-10 number business.
>Larry Roll for one.

Mike:

I don't object to 10-10 numbers per se, just to the behavior of hams who are particularly single-minded in their pursuit thereof. It is virtually impossible to have a QSO on 10-10 these days (at least in SSB mode) without being pestered for a 10-10 number. I extreme situations, such as the one I was exposed to over 10 years ago, 10-10 participants indulge themselves in giving a lengthy rebuke to people who don't have one, or, in my case, had one but subsequently forgot it. This experience put me off to phone operation in a way from which I have yet to recover.

>There are some hams who will chew another ham out
>over not having one, and some won't even talk to another ham if they
>don't have one.I've heard a public dressing-down or two. I'm not overly
>wild about it myself, as while the idea sounds okay, the implementation
>has become one of exclusivity. So that may have been what the one ham
>was talking to the other about.

Indeed, it is. The 10-10 crowd has pretty much outlived it's usefulness, AFAIC. Oddly enough, I'm starting to think pretty much along the same lines with regard to FISTS and their ever-expanding program of dubious "awards" which require stringent number-crunching on the part of hams who just want to have a CW QSO! I think one of these days I may just conveniently "forget" my FISTS number just to see what happens!

I hope nobody starts some kind of inane "awards program" for PSK-31 and the other digital modes!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1137. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 03:24:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <ba6ue1ran0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 67284
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey wrote:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
> > and 5405 kHz--at 60m
>
> So when do we get to use them? Now?
>
> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and
> 5403.6 KHz That's (freq) -(2.8/2).

Huh? Since when do you "center" a SSB signal? When you dial up 5332
and transmit a 2.8 khz-wide USB signal, it's proper for it to be 2.8 khz
wide
above 5332. If it conforms to the proper signal bandwidth, that's
proper. The operating frequency is still 5332 khz.

Dick

1138. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 03:43:13 UTC
From: stevejfranklin <stevejfranklin@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3EC71D24.89C2FFC9@attbi.com>
Source record: 67285
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

That is the way I see it. 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373, and 5405 kHz USB,-
Doesn't sound hard to me. I just can't weight, my antenna is jumping up to
get tuned for this band.

1139. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 03:57:26 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns937EF3B4B6A89elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 67286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:ba6ue1ran0@208.207.71.149:

>
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
>> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>> > This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> > The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
>> > and 5405 kHz--at 60m
>>
>> So when do we get to use them? Now?
>>
>> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
>> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and 5403.6 KHz That's
>> (freq) -(2.8/2).
>
> Huh? Since when do you "center" a SSB signal? When you dial up 5332
> and transmit a 2.8 khz-wide USB signal, it's proper for it to be 2.8 khz
> wide
> *above* 5332. If it conforms to the proper signal bandwidth, that's
> proper. The operating frequency is still 5332 khz.
>
> Dick
>
>

Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to be
on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.

1140. Dayton '03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 06:01:53 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <ba77kh02168@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 67288
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Well, the rain Saturday made the flea market a bit of a waste. Outside venders got out the plastic to cover everything up, so you really couldn't see the outrageous prices they were asking for their junk.

The rain forced everyone inside. One character had chaser lights around his callsign badge and an antenna mounted on each shoulder. There were no fatsos on three-wheel carts, but I did see several that were top-heavy and looked like they were about to tip over.

I sat up in the stands of the main arena. This is always one of my favorite places to go at Dayton, just to watch people and get away from the crowds. Besides, with everyone inside because of the weather, I didn't want to get too close to them, since most don't know what a shower is. I noticed one guy that had two young boys with him. These kids looked like they were bored out of their mind, as their father (I assuming it was their father) looked at every piece of mundane junk that was to be found.

Oh well, better luck next year.

1141. Re: Have You Ever Noticed...???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 06:13:31 UTC
From: bucketmouth <313funniesretro@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ec72474@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67287

I think you may have been listening to the Liberty Net
and/or WWCR too much of late ..... grin :) :)

"Steven Robeson K4CAP" <k4cap@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030517151621.01523.00000310@mb-m28.aol.com...
> Anyone ever watch the SciFi/techno-thriller "Collossus: The Forbin
Project"..??
>
> Ever notice the "emblem" for the run-away computer system and it's
similarity
> to AOL's...?!?!
>
> Scary, eh?
>
> Steve, K4CAP

1142. Re: Dayton '03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 07:20:38 UTC
From: Reactance <24Volt@anon.com>
Message-ID: <ba7c89$s04$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67289
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Krell" <Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:ba77kh02168@enews3.newsguy.com...
Well, the rain Saturday made the flea market a bit of a waste. Outside venders
got out the plastic to cover everything up, so you really couldn't see the outrageous prices they were asking for their junk.

The rain forced everyone inside. One character had chaser lights around his callsign badge and an antenna mounted on each shoulder. There were no fatsos on
three-wheel carts, but I did see several that were top-heavy and looked like they were about to tip over.

I sat up in the stands of the main arena. This is always one of my favorite places to go at Dayton, just to watch people and get away from the crowds. Besides, with everyone inside because of the weather, I didn't want to get too
close to them, since most don't know what a shower is. I noticed one guy that
had two young boys with him. These kids looked like they were bored out of their mind, as their father (I assuming it was their father) looked at every piece of mundane junk that was to be found.

Oh well, better luck next year.
.....
Funny thing, Dayton. Every Ham should go there at least once just for the experience. I used to laugh up my sleeve at the goofy guys that were built like a bowling pin...they'd have a three inch wide belt with four or five HT's attached to it...rubber duckies on their hard hats, battery packs hanging out of their back pockets and four inch wide plastic plackards with their callsigns engraved on them.
They have no shame.
Then there are the guys who push a friggin' shopping cart around...take up aisle space and mosey along as though they have all day. Nothing in the cart but a few flyers. Ever try to get close to the vendors? Want to look at the new Yeasus? Forget it...the old fuddie-duddies crowd around the vendor and linger for hours...knowing full well that they aren't going to buy a darn thing from the vendor!
Oh, and every now and then you happen upon an old geezer who has a flatulance problem...he farts through his Relys and has not the sense of smell to know that he is passing malodorous methane to the bystanders.
Ever try to get into the rest rooms at Dayton? Forget it! Pee outside if you can...

The funniest part of attending Dayton was, to me, a standout when I saw a goon with an aluminum helmet complete with a chin strap on which was mounted a small three element beam! This bird took the cake! What was he doing? Moon bounce? Beams in an auditorium?
No wonder people laugh...

To Dayton I say once is enough. Every Ham should go there at least one time. The laughs almost outweigh the hassles. Almost.

1143. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 10:20:41 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <AnOdnR4rL7wIw1qjXTWcpQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 67293

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EC6B75A.E3D8CAFF@ix.netcom.com...
> David Robbins wrote:
>
> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030517123442.23710.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > > > Did anyone attend the unofficial forum on
> > > >Freebanding in 21st Century?
> > >
> > > Yea i was there, it was allright.
> >
> > did you spot the hidden cameras?
>
> The bad weather grounded the black helicopters, though.....
>
you only thought it grounded them, they were hiding in the clouds using
their microwave brain control devices to identify all freebanders.

1144. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 11:14:17 UTC
From: Merl Turkin <Terk@astroburp.net>
Message-ID: <aUJxa.4$e54.7389@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 67294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sat, 17 May 2003 23:43:13 -0400, stevejfranklin wrote:

> That is the way I see it. 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373, and 5405 kHz USB,-
> Doesn't sound hard to me. I just can't weight, my antenna is jumping up
> to get tuned for this band. ------

You mean you just can't WAIT.

1145. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 12:24:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030518082446.25052.00000057@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67295

In article <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
>manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense as
>requiring them to show proficiency at CW.
>
There's no way the current 5 wpm code test can be reasonably called a
demonstration of "proficiency". Basic skills, yes, but not proficiency.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1146. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 12:24:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030518082447.25052.00000058@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67296

In article <ba1cku$p33$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>
>> Just because its old don't make it useless.
>
> Well, if I had an old Baudot paper tape punch laying around, I'd
>probably put it to use just for fun, but I see no point, or future, in
>REQUIRING people to learn obsolete skills like typing on old vertical-key
>Kleinschmidts, actually _using_ paper tape, or diddling about with CW keys.

To each his own. However, note that there hasn't been a CW sending test for about 20 years now. And there are probably far more CW keys in use by hams today than there are Kleinschmidts or paper-tape equipment.

>You like it, fine. Have fun. If I owned old teletype gear like I used to
>operate, like I said, I'd probably play with it, too. But requiring it, (or,
>supposing it had been required), desiring the requirement to be maintained,
>doesn't make logical sense.

Even if it's the second-most-popular mode in use by amateurs on the bands where such a test is required?

>Far better to take that ridiculously easy
>Technician test and double the size and difficulty of it.

Why?

How many hams today actually build their own rigs from scratch?

Why require lots of technical knowledge in areas if the use of that technical knowledge is not required? For example, if a ham is primarily interested in, say, QRP HF CW, why require that ham to learn lots of stuff about VHF/UHF, voice modes, repeaters, complex impedances, satellites, etc.?

>Putting time in
>studying electronics and procedure would be a far better indicator of
>somebody's seriousness about the hobby than CW testing.

Is the test supposed to be a measure of seriousness or a basic entry level test of qualifications? I think the latter, not the former.

Consider this analogy: Should everyone who wants a driver's license be required to learn how to drive stick-shift?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1147. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 12:41:32 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <ba7vmf$c8p$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67298

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030518082446.25052.00000057@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
writes:
>
> >Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
> >manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense as
> >requiring them to show proficiency at CW.
> >
> There's no way the current 5 wpm code test can be reasonably called a
> demonstration of "proficiency". Basic skills, yes, but not proficiency.

Call it whatever you want, the logic's the same. Just substitute
"basic skills" for both above.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1148. Re: Dayton '03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 12:49:57 UTC
From: Aye Tahn Fer <Howboutcha@my.radio.org>
Message-ID: <ba7vhl$uj3$1@news.chatlink.com>
Source record: 67297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

An observation from a Dayton Local with over 30 years experience attending the Dayton Hamvention:

2 meters had very little outside the area radio traffic until Thursday PM - Extremely Unusual for Hamvention week
Did not see the usual large gathering of mobiles in the motel parking lots near where I work - Very unusual for Hamvention week
94 Talking-In station hecklers at a minimum - Just plain weird
94 Traffic slow every day Hamvention was open - Unusual
Little traffic 6 meter or 40 meter heard and 146.52 did not have any traffic until Saturday - Strange occurrence

Saturday I did talk with some out bound mobiles from the East and Midwest basically their complaints were
the rain and outrageous Shuttle service. They had to pay to wait for a 1 to 1-1/2 hour ride to Salem Mall and
back.

What was unusual about my conversations with these people was they took place at about 12 Noon. People were bailing out in
droves only after 4 hours after the Hamvention doors opened, this was a first in all my years of Hamventioning! One guy commented
the attendance was about of what he had seen in the past 10 years of attendance. I agree!

The Hamvention, as it is now called by the slick promoter DARA sold out to, is no longer the premier event it was 15 years ago. It
just like the Dayton Air and Trade Exposition, have been run into the ground for the almighty buck. Sure DARA had its problems running
the Hamvention during its tenure but, the original members made it a personal event not the commercial money making machine it is today.

One Ham on 6 meters commented, "The Hamvention like Ham radio itself has matured and is on its way to old age", he further explained
the changing technologies have drawn the younger generation to computers and the internet. Those that enter Ham Radio today are basically
an aging generation of people who when they were younger did not possess the knowledge or motivation to get a license until now. They
are dying off as fast as they enter Ham Radio hence an arrested grow rate compared to other hobbies.

I think the reason Krell did not see the addicted weirdo's always present during the last 30 years of the Hamvention, is they are passing away. Several I knew personally have died or mentally gone off the deep end from their indulgence in alcohol and drugs during the 60s and 70s.

The old organizers from DARA I knew when I was kid, are all with Barry Goldwater passing traffic in that great shack in the sky.

Hamvention has a terminal old age disease and will pass on to that great shack in the sky within the next 10 years!

73, to all those who put on great Dayton Hamvention in the past .*** -*-

PS: This is no longer the Dayton Hamvention, the new promoters along with their cronies in Trotwood call it The Hamvention
(now a registered trademark). So the Dayton Hamvention in reality has been dead for several.

"Krell" <Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:ba77kh02168@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Well, the rain Saturday made the flea market a bit of a waste. Outside
venders
> got out the plastic to cover everything up, so you really couldn't see the
> outrageous prices they were asking for their junk.
>
> The rain forced everyone inside. One character had chaser lights around
his
> callsign badge and an antenna mounted on each shoulder. There were no
fatsos on
> three-wheel carts, but I did see several that were top-heavy and looked
like
> they were about to tip over.
>
> I sat up in the stands of the main arena. This is always one of my
favorite
> places to go at Dayton, just to watch people and get away from the crowds.
> Besides, with everyone inside because of the weather, I didn't want to get
too
> close to them, since most don't know what a shower is. I noticed one guy
that
> had two young boys with him. These kids looked like they were bored out of
> their mind, as their father (I assuming it was their father) looked at
every
> piece of mundane junk that was to be found.
>
> Oh well, better luck next year.
>

1149. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 13:00:02 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <ba800bcfi1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67299

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030518082447.25052.00000058@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <ba1cku$p33$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
writes:
>
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
> >
> >> Just because its old don't make it useless.
> >
> > Well, if I had an old Baudot paper tape punch laying around, I'd
> >probably put it to use just for fun, but I see no point, or future, in
> >REQUIRING people to learn obsolete skills like typing on old vertical-key
> >Kleinschmidts, actually _using_ paper tape, or diddling about with CW
keys.
>
> To each his own. However, note that there hasn't been a CW sending test
for
> about 20 years now. And there are probably far more CW keys in use by hams
> today than there are Kleinschmidts or paper-tape equipment.

And most of those keys are a far cry from Mr. Morse's original, as
is the modern equipment used in digital modes.

> >You like it, fine. Have fun. If I owned old teletype gear like I used to
> >operate, like I said, I'd probably play with it, too. But requiring it,
(or,
> >supposing it had been required), desiring the requirement to be
maintained,
> >doesn't make logical sense.
>
> Even if it's the second-most-popular mode in use by amateurs on the bands
where
> such a test is required?

Well yes, obviously. CW operations aren't going to carry amateur
radio into the 21st century.

>
> >Far better to take that ridiculously easy
> >Technician test and double the size and difficulty of it.
>
> Why?

Because it's too short and too easy? Judging by some of the
questions that get asked by licensed operators in the r.r.a* hierarchy, the
basics aren't sinking in.

> How many hams today actually build their own rigs from scratch?

I'm not advocating going that far; I'm really not even advocating
changing the testing, not much. I'm just asking, if you're OK with the code
requirement, why don't you have a problem with the new tests? (Or do you? I
don't know.)

> Why require lots of technical knowledge in areas if the use of that
technical
> knowledge is not required?

Isn't increasing the pool of skilled technicians one of the purposes
of the amateur service?

>For example, if a ham is primarily interested in,
> say, QRP HF CW, why require that ham to learn lots of stuff about VHF/UHF,
> voice modes, repeaters, complex impedances, satellites, etc.?

Err, that's more operator material than the tech I'm thinking of.
I'm talking about pushing electrons through wires and components, having a
fundamental grasp of the metric system, etc. Very basic stuff.

> >Putting time in
> >studying electronics and procedure would be a far better indicator of
> >somebody's seriousness about the hobby than CW testing.
>
> Is the test supposed to be a measure of seriousness or a basic entry level
test
> of qualifications? I think the latter, not the former.

Well, that's sure not the impression one gets reading these
newsgroups - the most common argument put forward (in my experience) is that
it demonstrates the testee's motivations.

> Consider this analogy: Should everyone who wants a driver's license be
required
> to learn how to drive stick-shift?

But we'd still require people to learn CW, even if they have no
intention of driving a stick...err, operating CW.
I guess I should be thoroughly cowed by that logic, but it somehow
fails to impress me.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1150. Re: Dayton '03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 13:28:01 UTC
From: HoustonVoice <HoustonVoice@lopwrfmbcsters.org>
Message-ID: <ba81or$9qa$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate

I see the suitecase FM station gentleman has his self-contained FM broadcast stations for sale at Dayton. He's been making the rounds of hamfests in the Southeast but appears to be enlarging his territory for the last year. He and his lovely assistant had the real low power stuff on display out front and the larger higher powered stuff was sort of off to the side and back. When we got back to the hotel, I fired up my receiving gear and deteced what apparently was several people testing their newly purchased low power unlicensed FM broadcasting set ups. I can easily see these easy-on-the-air set ups starting to proliferate in every town and city. One guy was telling me his listening audience has grown by quantum leaps each week.

Larry from Houston
7257, 14300, & 3840
SOCARS

1151. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 14:29:35 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <jNMxa.643914$Zo.137806@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 67201

```
"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:ba800b$cfi$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030518082447.25052.00000058@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > In article <ba1cku$p33$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
> writes:
> >
> > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
> > >
> > >> Just because its old don't make it useless.
> > >
> > > Well, if I had an old Baudot paper tape punch laying around,
I'd
> > >probably put it to use just for fun, but I see no point, or future, in
> > >REQUIRING people to learn obsolete skills like typing on old
vertical-key
> > >Kleinschmidts, actually _using_ paper tape, or diddling about with CW
> keys.
> >
> > To each his own. However, note that there hasn't been a CW sending test
> for
> > about 20 years now. And there are probably far more CW keys in use by
hams
> > today than there are Kleinschmidts or paper-tape equipment.
>
> And most of those keys are a far cry from Mr. Morse's original, as
> is the modern equipment used in digital modes.

Huh ???? make and break was make and break at the big bang just as it will
be when we collapse back to that grain sized mass ....

> > >You like it, fine. Have fun. If I owned old teletype gear like I used
to
> > >operate, like I said, I'd probably play with it, too. But requiring it,
> (or,
> > >supposing it had been required), desiring the requirement to be
> maintained,
> > >doesn't make logical sense.
> >
> > Even if it's the second-most-popular mode in use by amateurs on the
bands
> where
> > such a test is required?
>
```

> Well yes, obviously. CW operations aren't going to carry amateur
> radio into the 21st century.

Good point ...what will carry amateur radio into the 21st century???
Perhaps it is something that isn't even on the horizon as yet. The present
modes are the only useful yardsticks we have. CW won't carry us into the
21st but neither will digital or phone exclusively .... we are not defined
by one mode nor should we be. It is however a shame how a useful elegant
mode can be "badmouthed" by a sector of ops or hopeful ops who have never
even tried. To those who have tried and have had their ritual backyard key
burial ...more power to you. Enjoy what ever mode this service offers. It
is a greater shame what our government did by eliminating the novice class.
I always felt that 5 WPM should have been the entry for ALL the CW subbands.
This would have assured growth for the mode but more importantly for the
service.
>
> >
> > >Far better to take that ridiculously easy
> > >Technician test and double the size and difficulty of it.
> >
> > Why?
>
> Because it's too short and too easy? Judging by some of the
> questions that get asked by licensed operators in the r.r.a* hierarchy,
the
> basics aren't sinking in.
>
> > How many hams today actually build their own rigs from scratch?
>
> I'm not advocating going that far; I'm really not even advocating
> changing the testing, not much. I'm just asking, if you're OK with the
code
> requirement, why don't you have a problem with the new tests? (Or do you?
I
> don't know.)

>
> >For example, if a ham is primarily interested in,
> > say, QRP HF CW, why require that ham to learn lots of stuff about
VHF/UHF,
> > voice modes, repeaters, complex impedances, satellites, etc.?
>
> Err, that's more operator material than the tech I'm thinking of.
> I'm talking about pushing electrons through wires and components, having a
> fundamental grasp of the metric system, etc. Very basic stuff.
>
> > >Putting time in
> > >studying electronics and procedure would be a far better indicator of
> > >somebody's seriousness about the hobby than CW testing.
> >
> > Is the test supposed to be a measure of seriousness or a basic entry

level
> test
> > of qualifications? I think the latter, not the former.

Is ham radio CW ???? ....dare I say that ham radio is electronics ????? I think that this is where we as a group generally fall into the trap of turf be it CW or Phone or digital or contests or DX or building or QRP or antennas or public service etc ....It is none of these things exclusively but the sum total. Should we hit the "unwashed" newcomer with a technical test that will challange a 1st year EE student. Yes why not ...give it to em ... make him worthy to put his rig on the air and kill ham radio as sure as increasing the CW test to 35 WPM. There is a real sense of elitism that I see from some hams regarding the next fellows "electronic savy". I look at the service and ticket as an entry to learn and grow.

> Well, that's sure not the impression one gets reading these
> newsgroups - the most common argument put forward (in my experience) is that
> it demonstrates the testee's motivation ..

No not really but it is a part of the situation .... The class that I am in charge of for our club has had roughly 50 percent going on into a higher class with the CW upgrade.
> > Consider this analogy: Should everyone who wants a driver's license be
> required
> > to learn how to drive stick-shift ..... snip

Here we go again with the old stick shift analogy ..... I am officially adding this to the "CW always gets through" crap bucket. I can't beat the feel of taking my Miata around a curve with a nice shift and letting the backside just come through .... I'd be laying in ditch if I tried that with my Sante Fe.

Take care fellows and ladies ...

God Bless ....Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh

1152. Re: W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 14:35:06 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <ba86uq$q0c@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 67203

Done!

"Steven Robeson K4CAP" <k4cap@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030517151708.01523.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com...
> Hey Kim...e mail me direct, please..?!?! I lost your direct address...
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

1153. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 14:49:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <ba86ur$q0c@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 67202

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030517231435.23307.00000070@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <3EC0F3F0.1080603@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >
> > There are some (many) hams who do not like the 10-10 number business.
> >Larry Roll for one.
>
> Mike:
>
> I don't object to 10-10 numbers per se, just to the behavior of hams who
> are particularly single-minded in their pursuit thereof.
>

And, what should be done about it, Larry? Isn't your "objection" to the
behavior virtually the same as an objection to 10-10?

>
> It is virtually
> impossible to have a QSO on 10-10 these days (at least in SSB mode)
> without being pestered for a 10-10 number. I extreme situations, such
> as the one I was exposed to over 10 years ago, 10-10 participants
> indulge themselves in giving a lengthy rebuke to people who don't have
> one, or, in my case, had one but subsequently forgot it. This experience
> put me off to phone operation in a way from which I have yet to
> recover.
>

You sure do enjoy the miseries you latch onto, don't you? You're bringing
up an event from over 10 years ago, reacting to it as though it happened
just yesterday, and rolling all 10-10 up into it. And, why is that you
don't enjoy a lengthy rebuke from someone about something when that is all
you have to offer--a majority of the time--here in this newsgroup?

From other posts I've seen from you along the lines of ham radio phone
conversations, I'm beginning to think more and more, Larry, that you must
carry the same personality into your personal/social life as you do here.
Consequently, I could certainly understand any reticence to be civil to you.
You aren't civil to others.

>
> >There are some hams who will chew another ham out
> >over not having one, and some won't even talk to another ham if they
> >don't have one.I've heard a public dressing-down or two. I'm not overly
> >wild about it myself, as while the idea sounds okay, the implementation
> >has become one of exclusivity. So that may have been what the one ham

> >was talking to the other about.
>
> Indeed, it is. The 10-10 crowd has pretty much outlived it's usefulness,
> AFAIC. Oddly enough, I'm starting to think pretty much along the same
> lines with regard to FISTS and their ever-expanding program of dubious
> "awards" which require stringent number-crunching on the part of hams
> who just want to have a CW QSO! I think one of these days I may just
> conveniently "forget" my FISTS number just to see what happens!
>

I think if you check into the history of hamming, a major part of the hobby side of it is, indeed, paper chasing. And, there's nothing wrong with it. Aren't you one the cluck-mouths I've seen about "majority rule"? If the majority of hamming is paper chasing, contesting, awards, etc., then sobeit. And, if you want to change it, then you'll have to start somewhere. A lecture from your own mouth to others, many times. So, lead by example, Larry. Get busy!

>
> I hope nobody starts some kind of inane "awards program" for PSK-31
> and the other digital modes!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Gosh, I'd be real surprised if it isn't already happening!

Kim W5TIT

1154. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 15:15:16 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <ba87u4fcu1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67228

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:jNMxa.643914$Zo.137806@sccrnsc03...
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:ba800bcfi1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030518082447.25052.00000058@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > > In article <ba1cku$p33$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
> > writes:
> > >
> > > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > >> Just because its old don't make it useless.
> > > >
> > > > Well, if I had an old Baudot paper tape punch laying around,
> I'd
> > > >probably put it to use just for fun, but I see no point, or future,
in
> > > >REQUIRING people to learn obsolete skills like typing on old
> vertical-key
> > > >Kleinschmidts, actually _using_ paper tape, or diddling about with CW
> > keys.
> > >
> > > To each his own. However, note that there hasn't been a CW sending
test
> > for
> > > about 20 years now. And there are probably far more CW keys in use by
> hams
> > > today than there are Kleinschmidts or paper-tape equipment.
> >
> > And most of those keys are a far cry from Mr. Morse's original,
as
> > is the modern equipment used in digital modes.
>
> Huh ???? make and break was make and break at the big bang just as it
will
> be when we collapse back to that grain sized mass ....
>
> > > >You like it, fine. Have fun. If I owned old teletype gear like I used
> to
> > > >operate, like I said, I'd probably play with it, too. But requiring

it,
> > (or,
> > > >supposing it had been required), desiring the requirement to be
> > maintained,
> > > >doesn't make logical sense.
> > >
> > > Even if it's the second-most-popular mode in use by amateurs on the
> bands
> > where
> > > such a test is required?
> >
> > Well yes, obviously. CW operations aren't going to carry amateur
> > radio into the 21st century.
>
> Good point ...what will carry amateur radio into the 21st century???
> Perhaps it is something that isn't even on the horizon as yet. The
present
> modes are the only useful yardsticks we have. CW won't carry us into the
> 21st but neither will digital or phone exclusively .... we are not defined
> by one mode nor should we be.

I agree, but you've got a situation where _this_ is happening, and
is fact codified as law by the CW requirement.

> It is however a shame how a useful elegant
> mode can be "badmouthed" by a sector of ops or hopeful ops who have never
> even tried.

In my spotty lurking, I've seen far more slandering of no-code techs
than I've seen of CW-bashing as a mode. The difference here is that the
argument _usually_ goes along the sequence: "Requiring CW is stupid." and
the reply is bunch of personal attacks about lazy, stupid no-code techs.

> To those who have tried and have had their ritual backyard key
> burial ...more power to you. Enjoy what ever mode this service offers. It
> is a greater shame what our government did by eliminating the novice
class.
> I always felt that 5 WPM should have been the entry for ALL the CW
subbands.
> This would have assured growth for the mode but more importantly for the
> service.

From what I've read, even the survival of a mode shouldn't be on
"our" radar, but keeping what spectrum we've got.

> > >
> > > >Far better to take that ridiculously easy
> > > >Technician test and double the size and difficulty of it.
> > >
> > > Why?
> >
> > Because it's too short and too easy? Judging by some of the

> > questions that get asked by licensed operators in the r.r.a* hierarchy,
> the
> > basics aren't sinking in.
> >
> > > How many hams today actually build their own rigs from scratch?
> >
> > I'm not advocating going that far; I'm really not even
advocating
> > changing the testing, not much. I'm just asking, if you're OK with the
> code
> > requirement, why don't you have a problem with the new tests? (Or do
you?
> I
> > don't know.)
>
> >
> > >For example, if a ham is primarily interested in,
> > > say, QRP HF CW, why require that ham to learn lots of stuff about
> VHF/UHF,
> > > voice modes, repeaters, complex impedances, satellites, etc.?
> >
> > Err, that's more operator material than the tech I'm thinking
of.
> > I'm talking about pushing electrons through wires and components, having
a
> > fundamental grasp of the metric system, etc. Very basic stuff.
> >
> > > >Putting time in
> > > >studying electronics and procedure would be a far better indicator of
> > > >somebody's seriousness about the hobby than CW testing.
> > >
> > > Is the test supposed to be a measure of seriousness or a basic entry
> level
> > test
> > > of qualifications? I think the latter, not the former.
>
> Is ham radio CW ???? ....dare I say that ham radio is electronics ????? I
> think that this is where we as a group generally fall into the trap of
turf
> be it CW or Phone or digital or contests or DX or building or QRP or
> antennas or public service etc ....It is none of these things exclusively
> but the sum total. Should we hit the "unwashed" newcomer with a
technical
> test that will challange a 1st year EE student. Yes why not ...give it to
> em ... make him worthy to put his rig on the air and kill ham radio as
sure
> as increasing the CW test to 35 WPM. There is a real sense of elitism
that
> I see from some hams regarding the next fellows "electronic savy". I look
> at the service and ticket as an entry to learn and grow.

My argument was put forth as an _option_, not a position. While I _believe_ the Tech test is both too easy and/or imbalanced, I presented this option as a better alternative to code testing. After all, all radios, regardless of spectrum use or mode, obey the laws of physics.

> > > Well, that's sure not the impression one gets reading these
> > > newsgroups - the most common argument put forward (in my experience) is
> that
> > > it demonstrates the testee's motivation ..
>
> No not really but it is a part of the situation .... The class that I am
in
> charge of for our club has had roughly 50 percent going on into a higher
> class with the CW upgrade.

But how many more would have been motivated to learn a little bit more and upgrade if they _didn't_ have to waste their time studying code? (I say "waste" because it's a safe bet that they're not interested in it - if they _were_, why, they'd be in the group that studied it, no?)

> > > > Consider this analogy: Should everyone who wants a driver's license be
> > > required
> > > > to learn how to drive stick-shift ..... snip
>
> Here we go again with the old stick shift analogy ..... I am officially
> adding this to the "CW always gets through" crap bucket. I can't beat the
> feel of taking my Miata around a curve with a nice shift and letting the
> backside just come through .... I'd be laying in ditch if I tried that
with
> my Sante Fe.

shrug it was offered by a pro-coder, actually. It's valid enough reasoning, though. When conditions are bad, good operators _can_ get through with CW. You get a good feeling driving your Miata. My reply to either point is a loud, obnoxious "So what?" "Packet Radio may very well enhance the survivability of digital communications and the internet in the event of catastrophe." Hurray, and "So what?" Should everybody be required to be able to set up a node? Hardly, no more than they should be required to fiddle about with CW.
You can require CW until the end of time, but if nobody's interested, it's irrelevant how grand it is, or how reliable it is, or anything else. Heck, you'd probably get more licensees working this question backwards. Let 'em get on HF and maybe _that'll_ give 'em the CW bug.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1155. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 15:53:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030518115320.20217.00000088@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67204

In article <ba86ur$q0c@library1.airnews.net>, "W5TIT"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Mike:
>>
>> I don't object to 10-10 numbers per se, just to the behavior of hams who
>> are particularly single-minded in their pursuit thereof.
>>
>
>And, what should be done about it, Larry? Isn't your "objection" to the
>behavior virtually the same as an objection to 10-10?

Kim:

Not necessarily; however, I don't expect *you* to be able to understand the
difference. That would require mature judgment.

>> It is virtually
>> impossible to have a QSO on 10-10 these days (at least in SSB mode)

Sorry, I should have said "…have a QSO on 10-meters…"

>> without being pestered for a 10-10 number. I extreme situations, such
>> as the one I was exposed to over 10 years ago, 10-10 participants
>> indulge themselves in giving a lengthy rebuke to people who don't have
>> one, or, in my case, had one but subsequently forgot it. This experience
>> put me off to phone operation in a way from which I have yet to
>> recover.

>You sure do enjoy the miseries you latch onto, don't you?

Don't look now, Kim, but I don't -- which is why I am writing in opposition
to the conditions which have brought them about.

>You're bringing
>up an event from over 10 years ago, reacting to it as though it happened
>just yesterday, and rolling all 10-10 up into it.

Human memory is long, Kim, and people tend not to forget significant
events in their lives that have had the effect of shaping their opinions.

>And, why is that you
>don't enjoy a lengthy rebuke from someone about something when that is all
>you have to offer--a majority of the time--here in this newsgroup?

Don't look now, Kim, but you have, in effect, answered your own question.
Nobody enjoys "lengthy rebukes," and I'm no different than anyone else.
Perhaps if my opinion and attitude toward SSB operation, and the 10-10

operation in particular, hadn't been shaped by such a "lengthy rebuke," then we wouldn't be having this discussion today.

>From other posts I've seen from you along the lines of ham radio phone
>conversations, I'm beginning to think more and more, Larry, that you must
>carry the same personality into your personal/social life as you do here.

How would you know that, Kim, if you have never conversed with me live and in person? The truth is, you can't -- but it is convenient for you to make specious assumptions about my personality when they serve your own agenda.

>Consequently, I could certainly understand any reticence to be civil to you.
>You aren't civil to others.

If it were true that I am not civil to others (which it is not), then you would merely be being disingenuous by not being civil to me. And you haven't been civil to me in a VERY long time, Kim! You can't use someone else's alleged "incivility" as an excuse for your own.

>> Indeed, it is. The 10-10 crowd has pretty much outlived it's usefulness,
>> AFAIC. Oddly enough, I'm starting to think pretty much along the same
>> lines with regard to FISTS and their ever-expanding program of dubious
>> "awards" which require stringent number-crunching on the part of hams
>> who just want to have a CW QSO! I think one of these days I may just
>> conveniently "forget" my FISTS number just to see what happens!
>>
>
>I think if you check into the history of hamming, a major part of the hobby
>side of it is, indeed, paper chasing.

A "major part" would be something like 20-percent. The 10-10 organization and FISTS have turned 10-meter SSB and most CW operation into a situation where "paper chasing" defines the operational imperative. Just getting on the air to enjoy a leisurely QSO is seemingly impossible these days -- except on the digital modes.

I participate in a few major contests each year, namely Field Day, the November Sweepstakes, and the Ten-Meter contest. I enjoy *occasional* competitive operation. However, I'm not interested in a steady diet of it. Unfortunately, organizations like 10-10 and FISTS are shoving this particular "diet" down my throat.

>And, there's nothing wrong with it.

I didn't say that there was something "wrong" with paper-chasing, Kim -- just that it should be an *optional* activity, not the widespread paradigm.

>Aren't you one the cluck-mouths I've seen about "majority rule"? If the
>majority of hamming is paper chasing, contesting, awards, etc., then sobeit.

Quite the contrary, Kim -- I definitely believe in the tyranny of the majority.

>And, if you want to change it, then you'll have to start somewhere. A
>lecture from your own mouth to others, many times. So, lead by example,
>Larry. Get busy!

Kim, I'm not the only one who objects to the proliferation of contests and
awards programs in amateur radio. You obviously don't read the Correspondence
column of QST magazine very often.

>> I hope nobody starts some kind of inane "awards program" for PSK-31
>> and the other digital modes!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Gosh, I'd be real surprised if it isn't already happening!

It very well could be. I'm presently coming out of my annual "operating
slump,"
which is usually brought on by my annual bout of allergies and bronchitis and
usually ends with Field Day. I haven't been on-the-air in ANY mode in over 3
months! Someone could have invented the PSK-31 Paper Chasers Club by now,
and I wouldn't know it! If they did, I'm not applying for a number!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1156. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 15:58:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <ba8airtbv0@208.206.142.106>
Source record: 67205

N2EY wrote:

> In article <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
>
> >Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
> >manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense as
> >requiring them to show proficiency at CW.
> >
> There's no way the current 5 wpm code test can be reasonably called a
> demonstration of "proficiency". Basic skills, yes, but not proficiency.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

More accurately, VERY basic skills.

1157. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 16:12:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <ba8bcqvbg0@208.206.142.106>
Source record: 67206
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Alun Palmer wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:ba6ue1ran0@208.207.71.149:
>
> > >
> > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > >
> > >> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >>
> > >> > This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
> > >> >
> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> >
> > >> > The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
> > >> > and 5405 kHz--at 60m
> > >>
> > >> So when do we get to use them? Now?
> > >>
> > >> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> > >> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and 5403.6 KHz That's
> > >> (freq) -(2.8/2).
> > >
> > > Huh? Since when do you "center" a SSB signal? When you dial up 5332
> > > and transmit a 2.8 khz-wide USB signal, it's proper for it to be 2.8 khz
> > > wide
> > > *above* 5332. If it conforms to the proper signal bandwidth, that's
> > > proper. The operating frequency is still 5332 khz.
> > >
> > > Dick
> > >
> > >
> >
> Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to be
> on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.

Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.
So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.
It's stupid.
Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of ignorance on FCC's
part.

1158. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 17:29:05 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <ba8foq$ig4$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67227

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:ba8airtbv0@208.206.142.106...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
writes:
> >
> > >Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
> > >manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense
as
> > >requiring them to show proficiency at CW.
> > >
> > There's no way the current 5 wpm code test can be reasonably called a
> > demonstration of "proficiency". Basic skills, yes, but not proficiency.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> More accurately, VERY basic skills.

So, do you guys have any reply to the _argument_, or are you just
going to split hairs over definitions?
You can call the requirement any skill level you like, I don't care.
Here, maybe you can wrap your brains around this:

"Requiring somebody to acquire incredibly low, rudimentary, most basic,
the least possible, familiarity and ability to manipulate a Kleinschmidt
teletype makes absolutely the same amount of sense as requiring them to
acquire incredibly low, rudimentary, most basic, the least possible,
familiarity and ability to copy CW."

Split away.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1159. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 18:24:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030518142454.24390.00000101@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67207

In article <20030518115320.20217.00000088@mb-m04.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>The 10-10 organization and FISTS have turned 10-meter SSB and most CW
>operation into a situation where "paper chasing" defines the operational
>imperative. Just getting on the
>air to enjoy a leisurely QSO is seemingly impossible these days -- except on
>the digital modes.

I don't operate much SSB or 10 meters these days, but I do operate quite a bit of conversational-QSO CW, mostly 80, 40 and 20 meters. I have not experienced ANY pressure towards "paper chasing". Sometimes a fellow FISTS member will give his/her number and ask for mine. Which I do without any fuss. Takes us less than a minute, numbers are logged and we go on with the QSO. Lots of great friendly chats.

>I participate in a few major contests each year, namely Field Day, the
>November Sweepstakes, and the Ten-Meter contest.

Yeah, me too. FD is a little over a month away, gonna do it low-key this year.

>I enjoy *occasional*
>competitive operation. However, I'm not interested in a steady diet of it.

Try 7035 kHz

>Unfortunately, organizations like 10-10 and FISTS are shoving this particular
>"diet" down my throat.

As I said before, I dunno about this 10-10 stuff, but I've never felt any pressure from FISTS folks

73 de Jim, N2EY

FISTS #4360

1160. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 20:24:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030518162454.16581.00000096@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 67208

In article <20030517230040.28957.00000220@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>> But not AMATEUR Radio. Maybe allowed to handle a mike while being
>>>supervised by a 10 year old control operator, but never one of his own.
>>
>>Perhaps that explains his opposition to the licensing of young people.
>
>She gave it up for a while, but my 11 year old has picked up the
>licensing guide again. If I ask her real nicely she might let Lennie have some
>third-party time. But only if she's close enough to manipulate the
>transmitter if he should do something wrong.

FCC says that would be required under the rules. FCC is the "expert agency"...
>
>>> It put Lennie on the spot. He had to answer a direct question with a
>>>direct answer that, had he been honest with us AND himself, would have
>>>deflated his rants AND his hatred.
>>
>>When has he ever given a direct answer to a direct question that he did not
>>like?
>
> Point well taken.

Well, there you have it.
>
>>>It just amazes me how Lennie can make such outlandish claims in public
>>>and not realize that we can see right through him!
>>
>>Why does anyhting Len posts amaze you, Steve? Have you not been reading
>>his stuff for years? Don;t you know what to expect by now? ;-)
>
> Point well taken again...But I am a Nurse and I always hold out hope for
>healing.

Good point!!

>Of course one has to WANT to heal, and that's not in Lennie's
>agenda right now,

Has it EVER been?

>so at best we can just stand back and watch him flounder for a while.

At the same time, we should not behave at his level.
>

>>> Why is it that all we suggest is that Lennie get a license initiated
>>> in 1991, yet he keeps insisting that we are adhering to some 1930's
>>>"standards"?
>>
>>Do you really want him to get an amateur license?
>
> Heeeeeeeck NO! I'd choke on the spot!
>
Exactly.

>>>None of us were licensed before 1950-something, and most of us in the late
>>>60's/early 70's.
>>
>>1967, for me.
>
> 72 here.

Doesn't seem like that long ago, does it? Only "regret" I have is not getting started earlier. Would have been a kick just have gotten First Phone and at least a Second Telegraph back then, just for grins.
>
>>> I am sure Lennie goes to bed every night cursing Amateur Radio in
>>>general, us in particular, and the egghead that created Google
>>>(and Deja before it...)
>>
>>God bless Google.
>
> A-MEN!
>
Yeah, verily. (It IS Sunday, y'know.)

Hey, you'll like this: My K2 developed some odd behavior. A few voltage checks, quick peek at the manual, a few voltage checks revealed the problem: Bad Q12 in the AGC/MGC circuit. Q12 is a PN2222. I popped in a recycled 2N3904 from a defunct 386 motherboard and all is well.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

1161. Re: Dayton '03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 20:53:01 UTC
From: Len or Linda? <baazeespla@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ec7f296@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67209
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

The suitcase low power FM stuff is VERY
POPULAR with people involved in the Militia
and the Patriot political movements. Many of them
set up these things in their trailer park or other
homes using an external antenna, then re-broadcast
"patriot" type programming from WWCR, WWFV
and other right-wing shortwave radio stations.
They feel doing this this is their 'duty' to 'inform' the
public about such things as chemtrails, bilderbergers,
planet-x and other such "conspiracy-kook" paranoid
bullshi+. It's a shame really, as if they'd put as much
effort into bettering their own lives as they do in
cross-pollenating the crazy BS on shortwave, they'd likely
have a much better existence than the one they
now have. Been watching these sad souls for years
and every one of em are either crazy, flat-broke or
lazy po-buckers, or a bit of all three. Alot of em goto
Dayton and other hamfests each year to buy up old
radio gear. Easy to spot em. Usually wearing old green
army jackets or goofy-message tee shirts and are almost always
missing several teeth. Smell like they could use a bath also.
Put 6 of em together and I bet they'd be hard pressed
to come up with $200 between em. They blame all their problems
on the "New World Order" or whatever Alex Jones says
is causing them their hurt, instead of lookin at the real problem
in their bathroom mirror in the morning. (should be real
fun when the FCC clamps down on these microbroadcasting
militialoons, alot like a re-hash of when they got Col Steve!)

HoustonVoice" <HoustonVoice@lopwrfmbcsters.org> wrote in message
news:ba81or$9qa$0@pita.alt.net...
> I see the suitecase FM station gentleman has his self-contained
> FM broadcast stations for sale at Dayton. He's been making the
> rounds of hamfests in the Southeast but appears to be enlarging
> his territory for the last year. He and his lovely assistant had the
> real low power stuff on display out front and the larger higher
> powered stuff was sort of off to the side and back. When we got
> back to the hotel, I fired up my receiving gear and deteced what
> apparently was several people testing their newly purchased low
> power unlicensed FM broadcasting set ups. I can easily see
> these easy-on-the-air set ups starting to proliferate in every town
> and city. One guy was telling me his listening audience has
> grown by quantum leaps each week.

>
> Larry from Houston
> 7257, 14300, & 3840
> SOCARS
>
>
>
>

1162. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 21:34:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305182132290.1846@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67210
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sun, 18 May 2003, Merl Turkin wrote:
> On Sat, 17 May 2003 23:43:13 -0400, stevejfranklin wrote:
>
> > That is the way I see it. 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373, and 5405 kHz USB,-
> > Doesn't sound hard to me. I just can't weight, my antenna is jumping up
> > to get tuned for this band. ------
>
> You mean you just can't WAIT.

Maybe for him, WEIGHT is more of an issue than waiting! :-)

--
Radio amateur = ham.
Ham comes from pigs. Pigs are fat.
Many amateur operators are fat.
Coincidence?

You be the judge! :-)

1163. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-18 21:36:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305182134460.1846@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67211
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sun, 18 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> >> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >> > The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
> >> > and 5405 kHz--at 60m
> >>
> >> So when do we get to use them? Now?
> >>
> >> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> >> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and 5403.6 KHz That's
> >> (freq) -(2.8/2).
> >
> > Huh? Since when do you "center" a SSB signal? When you dial up 5332
> > and transmit a 2.8 khz-wide USB signal, it's proper for it to be 2.8 khz
> > wide
> > *above* 5332. If it conforms to the proper signal bandwidth, that's
> > proper. The operating frequency is still 5332 khz.
>
> Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to be
> on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.

We'll find out either when:
1) The FCC decides to issue a clarification, or
2) Riley starts handing out pink tickets.

This is another perfect example of why certain things should be left to the
technical staff and out of the hands of politicians.

1164. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 00:33:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC82672.2CF9E20@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67212
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

>
> > > >> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> > > >> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and 5403.6 KHz That's
> > > >> (freq) -(2.8/2).
>
> Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
> assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.
> So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.
> It's stupid.
> Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of ignorance on FCC's
> part.

Well, QST will just have to tell us, along with the announcement of
our new secondary allocation (and when we get to use 'em) the
numbers we need to dial up on our rigs to get us where we need to
be. Seems that different radio services specify carrier frequencies
differently....

When time comes, I'll just program the 5 frequencies into my
rig's memory (like #51 for 5MHz band channel 1, #52 for 5
MHz band channel 2, etc.) and browse via memory mode
when I want to surf that band. My rig also stores what mode
(USB) goes with those frequencies.

1165. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 00:42:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC82859.2189A9F7@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67213
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

>
> > Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to be
> > on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.
>
> We'll find out either when:
> 1) The FCC decides to issue a clarification, or
> 2) Riley starts handing out pink tickets.
>
> This is another perfect example of why certain things should be left to the
> technical staff and out of the hands of politicians.

Or 3) hams educate each other about the strange way the frequencies
were expressed by the FCC on this band, and what we really need
to dial up on our rigs to be in the rules. We can handle it....

QST, packet radio, and the Internet will take care of it, and word of
mouth should take care of it.

1166. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 00:58:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC82C1F.62331C1F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67214
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

>
> The FCC has granted operation on USB (2K8J3E emission) only, with a
> maximum effective radiated power limit of 50 W relative to a 0 dB
> gain antenna--a half-wave dipole.

Sounds like most of our transceivers, coupled with somewhat lossy
coax and antennas cut for 40 and 80, should comply with this
power level restriction.

What about beams? Can I concentrate my effective radiated
power in one direction, or do the rules consider that to be
exceeding the max effective radiated power in that direction?
Like looking like 500W in that direction and 1 watt in all other
directions? As if I took the 50W that was spread all over
all directions and concentrated it in a narrow beam direction.
Or maybe I can only use a QRP rig with that beam?

1167. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 01:23:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EC8323C.4000403@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67215

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3EC0F3F0.1080603@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>
>> There are some (many) hams who do not like the 10-10 number business.
>>Larry Roll for one.
>
>
> Mike:
>
> I don't object to 10-10 numbers per se, just to the behavior of hams who
> are particularly single-minded in their pursuit thereof. It is virtually
> impossible to have a QSO on 10-10 these days (at least in SSB mode)
> without being pestered for a 10-10 number. I extreme situations, such
> as the one I was exposed to over 10 years ago, 10-10 participants
> indulge themselves in giving a lengthy rebuke to people who don't have
> one, or, in my case, had one but subsequently forgot it.

I've heard them do that. They are a disgrace to all hams.

<snippage>

> I hope nobody starts some kind of inane "awards program" for PSK-31
> and the other digital modes!

I can send at 31 baud!!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1168. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 01:28:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EC8335D.5000102@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67216

W5TIT wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030517231435.23307.00000070@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>>In article <3EC0F3F0.1080603@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>>>There are some (many) hams who do not like the 10-10 number business.
>>>Larry Roll for one.
>>
>>Mike:
>>
>>I don't object to 10-10 numbers per se, just to the behavior of hams who
>>are particularly single-minded in their pursuit thereof.
>>
>
>
> And, what should be done about it, Larry? Isn't your "objection" to the
> behavior virtually the same as an objection to 10-10?

Actually not, Kim. The 10-10 business sounds pretty good in theory. It is just that some people get over zealous and cranky about the whole business.

NO one deserves a public dressing down over the air. If a reg is being violated, a polite reminder is in order. If it continues, a recording to Hollingsworth is next. A 10-10 number is a voluntary and not all that important thing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1169. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 02:54:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EC84784.5000503@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67217

Dave Heil wrote:

> So far you've suggested that Jim, Dick, Steve and I need therapy.

Me Too! Me Too!

tho' I took it as a compliment, considering.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1170. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 03:39:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf3xrrb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67218
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 18 May 2003 03:57:26 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to be
>on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.

Depends on whether your rig reads "assigned frequency" which
is the center of the occupied bandwidth or the frequency of the
suppressed carrier which (theoretically) is the lower edge of
the occupied bandwidth.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1171. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 03:39:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf3yaac.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 18 May 2003 16:12:10 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
>assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.

Wrong. The FCC Rules (Sect. 2.1 - based on the International
Radio Regulations) define the "assigned frequency" as the
center of the occupied bandwidth, not the suppressed carrier.
If your rig reads the suppressed carrier frequency, -you- have
the make the mental adjustment to keep the center of the
occupied bandwidth where the FCC tells you to.

>So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.

The frequency you "use" is whatever your rig reads to put the
center of the occupied bandwidth where the FCC tells you to.

> It's stupid.

Not at all. It's the convention followed by the commercial
services all over the world. It's your rig that may be lying
to you.

> Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of ignorance on FCC's
>part.

Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of
ignorance on THEIR part.

The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1172. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 03:39:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf3yqkd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67220
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 18 May 2003 21:36:36 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>This is another perfect example of why certain things should be left to the
>technical staff and out of the hands of politicians.

I do believe that this was handled by the technical staff in
the International Bureau (the bureau that is the liaison with
NTIA) as well as by Bill Cross (who is an active ham) in the
Wireless Telecomm Bureau (the bureau that handles rulemaking in
the Amateur Radio Service).

The politicians in the FCC are too busy conglomerating
broadcast ownership, fostering wireline competition, auctioning
off gobs of spectrum to "wireless" carriers, and figuring how fast
they can put the internet on power line carriers to deal with any
Amateur Radio rulemaking.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1173. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 03:40:01 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <ba9jmh$18s$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 67221
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey (wa2ise@ix.netcom.com) writes:
>>
>> The FCC has granted operation on USB (2K8J3E emission) only, with a
>> maximum effective radiated power limit of 50 W relative to a 0 dB
>> gain antenna--a half-wave dipole.
>
> Sounds like most of our transceivers, coupled with somewhat lossy
> coax and antennas cut for 40 and 80, should comply with this
> power level restriction.
>
> What about beams? Can I concentrate my effective radiated
> power in one direction, or do the rules consider that to be
> exceeding the max effective radiated power in that direction?
> Like looking like 500W in that direction and 1 watt in all other
> directions? As if I took the 50W that was spread all over
> all directions and concentrated it in a narrow beam direction.
> Or maybe I can only use a QRP rig with that beam?

Reread the announcement; "effective radiated power". It is putting
the antenna into the picture, rather than specifying output power
or even input power. If you're antenna supplies gain (and due
to frequency relatively few have the space to put up some sort
of gain antenna at that frequency), then you'll have to reduce
power so the "effective radiated power" is still 50watts.

Reminds me of an article in 73 thirty years ago. Someone
describes an antenna with tremendous gain, despite being omnidirectional
and not looking any different than a 1/4 wave whip. The fine print,
of course, was using an antenna in the trunk of the car as the
reference antenna, so the whip put out a lot more power compared to it.
A ridiculous situation, but it does point out that gain and ERP
mean nothing without the reference being stated.

The quote does specify, over a 1/2 wave dipole, so if you're using
that you can't be outputing more than 50watts. If you've got
an antenna that actually provides gain over a dipole, then
you will have to reduce power further.

Michael VE2BVW

1174. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 04:09:58 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93801B05CA6Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 67222
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf3xrrb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com:

> On 18 May 2003 03:57:26 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to
>>be on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.
>
> Depends on whether your rig reads "assigned frequency" which
> is the center of the occupied bandwidth or the frequency of the
> suppressed carrier which (theoretically) is the lower edge of
> the occupied bandwidth.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>
>

All our rigs read nominal carrier frequency. Any textbook will tell you
that SSB frequency is normally reckoned as the nominal carrier frequency.
'Assigned frequency' is a miltary term, as per the primary users.

1175. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 04:14:41 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <ba9lnhogm0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 67223
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 18 May 2003 16:12:10 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
> >assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.
>
> Wrong. The FCC Rules (Sect. 2.1 - based on the International
> Radio Regulations) define the "assigned frequency" as the
> center of the occupied bandwidth, not the suppressed carrier.
> If your rig reads the suppressed carrier frequency, -you- have
> the make the mental adjustment to keep the center of the
> occupied bandwidth where the FCC tells you to.
>
> >So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.
>
> The frequency you "use" is whatever your rig reads to put the
> center of the occupied bandwidth where the FCC tells you to.
>
> > It's stupid.
>
> Not at all. It's the convention followed by the commercial
> services all over the world. It's your rig that may be lying
> to you.
>
> > Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of ignorance on FCC's
> >part.
>
> Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of
> ignorance on THEIR part.
>
> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.

Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.

A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.

1176. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 05:30:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC86BFA.390BF4B9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alun Palmer wrote:

>
> All our rigs read nominal carrier frequency. Any textbook will tell you
> that SSB frequency is normally reckoned as the nominal carrier frequency.
> 'Assigned frequency' is a miltary term, as per the primary users.

Looks like new VEC questions for the general and extra pools will be
like:

On the 60m amateur allocation of "5332 KHz", and if your
rig displays the frequency of the suppressed carrier, you need to
set the rig to:
a) 5332
b)5330.5
c)5333.5
d)5334

And:

When you're transmitting on a 60m ham allocation freq with a dipole
antenna fed by a length of coax with loss of 3dB, the rig's power
should not exceed:

a)50W
b)100W
c)70W
d)30W

1177. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 05:34:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC86CDA.8CE9DCE6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

>

I just realized that a beam for 5Mhz would be absurd......

Too big!

:-)

1178. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 06:05:38 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <ba9s7i$5e3$0@208.206.142.106>
Source record: 67226
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> >
> > All our rigs read nominal carrier frequency. Any textbook will tell you
> > that SSB frequency is normally reckoned as the nominal carrier frequency.
> > 'Assigned frequency' is a miltary term, as per the primary users.
>
> Looks like new VEC questions for the general and extra pools will be
> like:
>
> On the 60m amateur allocation of "5332 KHz", and if your
> rig displays the frequency of the suppressed carrier, you need to
> set the rig to:
> a) 5332
> b)5330.5
> c)5333.5
> d)5334
>
> And:
>
> When you're transmitting on a 60m ham allocation freq with a dipole
> antenna fed by a length of coax with loss of 3dB, the rig's power
> should not exceed:
>
> a)50W
> b)100W
> c)70W
> d)30W

I don't like to throw cold water on the party, but I don't see much benefit in

the new 60 meter allocation beyond having a few channels available for emergency use - and after all, that was *the* justification for asking for the assignment in the first place. Looks like we got the bare minimum we asked for. I hope time will see a serious improvement in the dimensions of the allocation, but one is left wondering about the short term....

There are plenty of potential problems with with "channelization" on HF ham bands, especially where frequency tolerance and specific maximum voice bandwidths are mandated. A great many older ham rigs, including PLL and other frequency synthesized units, have drifted far enough to very likely be out of tolerance For that matter, many fresh from the factory have in the past been

poorly adjusted. I know, no tolerance has yet been published, but it's certain that if discrete frequency channels are specified, a tolerance will also be. In a frequency band that is never a problem, one station or group of stations merely "zero beats" or tunes in the net control or other station, and everyone is talking on the same frequency-whatever each individual transmitter frequency readout shows. With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance with the rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if correct?
Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods available to most hams, is that going to be good enough? And what if it "seems to be off"? Will most hams be able to adjust it accurately? Or even determine if it needs adjusting? Send it to the factory for their opinion? What?

And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal filter might be? Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at the max? Really sure, now? It's well known that crystals almost always drift a bit with aging.
A typical filter contains several crystals. How do you know where yours cuts off? Can you check it to be sure?

For that matter, channelization on ham radio is a new precedent, as far as I know. Yes, "channels" have long been used on VHF, but they have always been within authorized bands, and violating a frequency tolerance was never an issue. At HF it's a new concept entirely, within ham radio. I can forsee a lot of outgoing mail from OO's and probably FCC also.

So..... I think I'll just hide and watch to see what happens. If I need to get on 60 meters for an emergency, I'll do so. Otherwise, I'm gonna sit it out until the situation stabilizes a bit - and the situation would seem to call for a bit of stabilization, fer sure. I think I'll spend some time just watching the show.

Dick

1179. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 12:48:53 UTC
From: Big Al <BigAl@grupposietemet.net>
Message-ID: <baajrhffn0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67229
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:ba8bcq$vbg$0@208.206.142.106...
>
>
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
> > news:ba6ue1$ran$0@208.207.71.149:
> >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > >
> > >> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >>
> > >> > This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
> > >> >
> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> >
> > >> > The granting of just five spot frequencies--5332, 5348, 5368, 5373,
> > >> > and 5405 kHz--at 60m
> > >>
> > >> So when do we get to use them? Now?
> > >>
> > >> To get our USB signal centered we'd need to dial
> > >> our rigs to 5330.6, 5346.6, 5366.6, 5371.6, and 5403.6 KHz That's
> > >> (freq) -(2.8/2).
> > >
> > > Huh? Since when do you "center" a SSB signal? When you dial up 5332
> > > and transmit a 2.8 khz-wide USB signal, it's proper for it to be 2.8
khz
> > > wide
> > > *above* 5332. If it conforms to the proper signal bandwidth, that's
> > > proper. The operating frequency is still 5332 khz.
> > >
> > > Dick
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to
be
> > on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.
>
```

> Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
> assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.
> So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.
> It's stupid.
> Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of ignorance on FCC's
> part.
>

"Technical Staff at FCC" is a standing joke on the professional
side of the industry. FCC has not had anything resembling a
"technical" staff for years. Bureaucratic bumbling and incompetence
more accurately describe today's FCC staff.

al

1180. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 12:51:00 UTC
From: Big Al <BigAl@grupposietemet.net>
Message-ID: <baajvffvh0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67230
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf3yaac.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 18 May 2003 16:12:10 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
> >assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.
>
> Wrong. The FCC Rules (Sect. 2.1 - based on the International
> Radio Regulations) define the "assigned frequency" as the
> center of the occupied bandwidth, not the suppressed carrier.
> If your rig reads the suppressed carrier frequency, -you- have
> the make the mental adjustment to keep the center of the
> occupied bandwidth where the FCC tells you to.
>
> >So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.
>
> The frequency you "use" is whatever your rig reads to put the
> center of the occupied bandwidth where the FCC tells you to.
>
> > It's stupid.
>
> Not at all. It's the convention followed by the commercial
> services all over the world. It's your rig that may be lying
> to you.
>
> > Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of ignorance on
FCC's
> >part.
>
> Look for scads of hams to fall to that little quirk of
> ignorance on THEIR part.
>
> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>
Do you EVER grow tired of being a FCC apologist?

al

1181. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 12:51:16 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93805A13A87BAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 67231
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:3EC86CDA.8CE9DCE6@ix.netcom.com:

>>
>
> I just realized that a beam for 5Mhz would be absurd......
>
> Too big!
>
>:-)
>
>
>
>
>

Oh, I don't know, there are mini-beams for 7 MHz, and there is a firm in Scotland (Antron, or something like that? - there are two firms with similar names) that make a 1/3 size beam for 40, as opposed to the Cushcraft, which is 2/3 size. I'm sure they could make a 60m version. Or maybe you could build a Maltese quad for 60? On first blush, some might be put off by 1/3 size giving you negative gain, but don't forget it would have a F/B ratio greater than 0 dB, and a somewhat lower radiation angle than a dipole as well, plus it would be in the clear (trees are very lossy), so I think in practice it wouldn't look that way. Not worth putting up a mini-beam for 5 chanels, though.

1182. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 12:52:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305190452.2293ec1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67232
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3EC86CDA.8CE9DCE6@ix.netcom.com>...
> >
>
> I just realized that a beam for 5Mhz would be absurd......
>
> Too big!

Nah. Piece of cake even for 80/75M.

http://force12inc.com/sigma280info-001.htm

>
> :-)

:-> :-> :->

w3rv

1183. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 12:54:36 UTC
From: Big Al <BigAl@grupposietemet.net>
Message-ID: <baak67$gr7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67233
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf3yqkd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 18 May 2003 21:36:36 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
> >This is another perfect example of why certain things should be left to
the
> >technical staff and out of the hands of politicians.
>
> I do believe that this was handled by the technical staff in
> the International Bureau (the bureau that is the liaison with
> NTIA) as well as by Bill Cross (who is an active ham) in the
> Wireless Telecomm Bureau (the bureau that handles rulemaking in
> the Amateur Radio Service).
>

Yes, Cross is regarded as quite a "ham" in industry
professional circles.

> The politicians in the FCC are too busy conglomerating
> broadcast ownership, fostering wireline competition, auctioning
> off gobs of spectrum to "wireless" carriers, and figuring how fast
> they can put the internet on power line carriers to deal with any
> Amateur Radio rulemaking.
>

Yup, you got that one half correct. Today's FCC is populated
with politicians, but they have only one main mission, and that is
job protection, at all costs. Anything else is unimportant, unless
it affects job protection.

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

1184. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 12:57:02 UTC
From: Big Al <BigAl@grupposietemet.net>
Message-ID: <baakaohcl0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67234
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf3xrrb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 18 May 2003 03:57:26 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> >Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to be
> >on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.
>
> Depends on whether your rig reads "assigned frequency" which
> is the center of the occupied bandwidth or the frequency of the
> suppressed carrier which (theoretically) is the lower edge of
> the occupied bandwidth.
>
> --

You may as well be speaking a foreign tongue to today's no code
culture appliance operator.

> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

1185. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 13:44:06 UTC
From: Chuck / KE4ETH <chuck_hawks@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Rd7ya.108771$cg.20815@fe10.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 67238
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EC86CDA.8CE9DCE6@ix.netcom.com...
> >
>
> I just realized that a beam for 5Mhz would be absurd......
>
> Too big!
>
> :-)

Be easier to turn the Earth under it. <HI>

Chuck
KE4ETH

1186. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 15:21:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <baasoe$56d$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67237
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EC82C1F.62331C1F@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > The FCC has granted operation on USB (2K8J3E emission) only, with a
> > maximum effective radiated power limit of 50 W relative to a 0 dB
> > gain antenna--a half-wave dipole.
>
> Sounds like most of our transceivers, coupled with somewhat lossy
> coax and antennas cut for 40 and 80, should comply with this
> power level restriction.
>
> What about beams? Can I concentrate my effective radiated
> power in one direction, or do the rules consider that to be
> exceeding the max effective radiated power in that direction?
> Like looking like 500W in that direction and 1 watt in all other
> directions? As if I took the 50W that was spread all over
> all directions and concentrated it in a narrow beam direction.
> Or maybe I can only use a QRP rig with that beam?

468/5.1 = 91 foot elements....big beam eh? How many elements?

Dan/W4NTI

1187. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 16:17:10 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC90386.761D08E6@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67235

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> .. and I don't think anyone can call me overweight! ..
>
> So, Vipul, if Amateur Radio leads to obesity, what happened?

George Burns claimed that he'd lived 100 years by smoking cigars, drinking whiskey and enjoying a young woman at least once every day. Some wag replied: my grandfather did all that and only live to 70. Well, replied Burns, it would have worked had he kept doing it another 30 years.

Same goes for ham radio and obesity .... keep doing it and see.

73, K3DWW

1188. Re: Expanded 8-Band CB Channel Chart 10 metres

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 16:29:54 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EC90682.6797DEC@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67236

kuzen001@duke.edu wrote:
>
> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote:
> > This came up in a college LE course I took a few years ago. The prof
> > disliked manditory sentancing because it forced release of more
> > dangerous criminals and had many ancidotal examples. I do not have my
>
> MandAtory. SentEncing. AnECdotal.

Sorry. I have too little respect for the person I was replying to, who
was trying to elicit an OT argument about drugs, to bother running the
spell checker. Thank you for correcting these mistakes. .... (c:

1189. Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 19:06:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu>
Source record: 67239

I had a blast at Dayton, and thought I'd share some thoughts on it.

I showed up Friday morning, and after registering, hit the flea market. I was surprised at how big it was. Friday morning was also quite busy outside. I think most people saw the weekend forecast and decided that Friday was the day.

I was looking for a linear amp, and found quite a few for sale. Lots of Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker, but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.

I didn't want to lug that thing around, so I went out to the bus. What this leads up to is "Take the bus!" I am amazed at how much better the bus is compared to the parking lot at Hara's. Just a couple hundred foot walk to the bus, then a couple more hundred to my van, and a lot of steps saved. And 2 dollars versus 8 dollars a day leaves me with money to spend on better things than parking. Also the parking lot was a muddy mess due to all the rain. So Then I hop back on the bus to go back up to Hara's.

Saturday was wet. Since it was forecast to rain, I planned on Saturday as an inside day. I got lots of goodies from the commercial vendors then. The rain slacked off, and I went back outside to try a deal on a KW tuner I was eyeing to go along with the new amp. Guy wouldn't budge on the price, so he got to keep it.

Sunday was just a hang-out day, and to see if any flea market bargains cropped up.

Now for the thoughts on the trip. I find it amusing that some hams here and elsewhere gripe about the obese, bizarre, and smelly hams that some obsess over. There were a few there to be sure. But not all that many. So in fairness to the gripers, I saw:

The dude with the miniature tower and three element beam on a hard hat.

The "Jungle Jim" guy who was wearing a pith helmet, a flowery shirt that looked more like it was designed for his wife, and didn't change nor shower all weekend.

A few amazingly obese guys.

A few amazingly old guys.

BUT! They were very much the exception. As my first Dayton Hamvention, I was keeping an eye out for the attendees, and found that in addition

to these characters I pointed out, that there were:

Quite a few young hams in attendance. Many brought their young lady friends.

Female hams. The percentage was about what I expected. Not high, but still there. This has been my experience in most technical fields, which seem to have trouble attracting women. But the ones who were there were happy enough to be there.

Normal looking hams with their normal looking families.

There were a fair amount of attractive ladies there. Not only the ladies in the booths, but also walking about in the crowd.

African American Hams. I didn't keep a count, but there ware a significant number.

All in all, I'd say that it looked like a normal cross-section of people.

The guys with the weird hats were no different than the people who go to football games and wear cheese wedge hats, or paint their chests in team colors. In fact they are less goofy IMO.

And I don't favor picking on the obese.

Soooo, the only person I took real exception was the smelly guy. Everyone can take a shower once in a while.

Final score: Regular people I saw: 10's of thousands

People who really need to clean up their act: 1

Personally, I think that when people gripe and complain about the obese, smelly, old, nerdy, weird, all male, all white, antisocial hams, they are saying a lot more about themselves than they say about those they denigrate.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1190. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 19:18:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC92E1A.7050607@psu.edu>
Source record: 67240

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>
>>Oh, I get it now! Those electrons don't weigh very much. Electronics
>>is the secret to weight control!
>
>
> Proper behavior and meditation leads to weight loss is some diets.

> Focus on contesting and random contacts, antenna setups require less physical
> activity. The idle activity that follows, making random contacts, takes little
> activity.

1. Why would a person ONLY do that? Are you making a strawman? A
hypothetical Ham who doesn't do anything else but contest? then
mysteriously disappears and does nothing else until the next contest?

When I'm not contesting I'm usually getting plenty of physical activity.

2. I lose weight over field day. The calories used setting up,
operating all night, and then tearing down and storing all the field day
equipment use up huge numbers of calories. I'm more beat after field day
than I am in a three hockey game week.

> Furthermore, these activities lead to "celebrating" afterwards with food.
> Often, the food is not healthy.

Yeah, I think its the rf exposure that makes the brain crave bad food.

> Many Hams that attend Hamfest are very overweight. I have not seen this in
> other types of events I have been to.

Not from what I've seen. How many hamfests have you been to?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1191. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 19:23:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC92F4F.50803@psu.edu>
Source record: 67242
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

white mouse wrote:
> Watching the live webcam feed from the
> Dayton Hamvention right now at:
>
> http://tmedlin.com/hamvention.html
>
> Looks like it's raining at a pretty good clip
> and I can see what looks like 2 or 3 buyers
> at the most walking the flea market asile in
> the live photo snapped just a minute ago.
>
> Is this photographic confirmation that the
> Dayton Hamvention, and hamfests in general
> also, are going the way of the dinosaur?

Nope. It means that less people are going to walk around in a cold rain.

> Has e-Bay killed hamfests?

I doubt it. There is probably some effect though. But just wait. I suspect that as internet fraud suffers a crackdown, this all may change. At some point, Ebay will probably share some culpability in what happens there. And auction fraud is the number one internet complaint to the FTC.

> I recall Dayton as being so packed in past years
> you felt like you were at the Indy-500. Now it looks
> like our local junk weekend flea market pulls
> more attendees. How sad. Time to stick a fork in it?

You base your conclusion on insufficient evidence. A webcam in the rain is not much of an indicator.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1192. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 19:25:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EC92F94.1080106@psu.edu>
Source record: 67241

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Did anyone attend the unofficial forum on
>>Freebanding in 21st Century?
>
>
> Yea i was there, it was allright.

Didn't see you there Bruce. I was looking for the cbplusser hat or t-shirt.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1193. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 21:07:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC94794.CE952486@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

>
>
> There are plenty of potential problems with with "channelization" on HF ham
> bands, especially where frequency tolerance and specific maximum voice
> bandwidths are mandated.

> With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance with the
> rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if correct?
> Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods available to
> most hams, is that going to be good enough?

Zero beating against WWV should be more than good enough. Use
the 5MHz WWV station, and if you find that your rig is off a bit, just
note the error, and "mis-tune" yourself by the same error to null it
out when operating these new allocations. This if your rig's manual
doesn't describe how to adjust the rig to fix the error. Page 24 of
my TS440SAT's manual tells how.

> And what if it "seems to be off"?
> Will most hams be able to adjust it accurately? Or even determine if it needs
> adjusting? Send it to the factory for their opinion? What?
>
> And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal filter might be?
> Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at the max? Really sure, now? It's
> well known that crystals almost always drift a bit with aging.

Not so far as to be a problem here.

>
> A typical filter contains several crystals. How do you know where yours cuts
> off? Can you check it to be sure?

We could check it on another band, and have someone several miles away
(with the attenuator switched in on his receiver) check above and below
the "channel" you're on. Most all rigs use an intermediate frequency for
the SSB modulator and heterodyne that to the frequency you want to transmit
on. So using another band to check it works fine for this.

Besides, crystals are pretty reliable. How often do you find bad SSB
other than those someone deliberately messed with on the air?
And those are likely due to misadjusted linears.

The rigs the other users of 5Mhz use are likely to be quite similar to
modern ham rigs except for how the user selects the channel. And that

is just a microprocessor fetching a number from memory and loading the PLLs with it. My TS440SAT can be placed into such a mode with the "VFO/M" front panel key. So the big knob selects channels instead of incrementing or decrementing the frequency. It's all firmware differences here, the rest of the rig can be otherwise identical. The point here is that a modern ham rig should perform just as well as the rigs used by the other services around 5MHz.

1194. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 22:08:29 UTC
From: "Ron \"Stompin\" James" <stomp@kenisbestersyo.org>
Message-ID: <babkl1$6ur$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67244

Which Dayton hamfest did you attend? Because you did
not attend the same one I did!

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu...
> I had a blast at Dayton, and thought I'd share some thoughts on it.
>
> I showed up Friday morning, and after registering, hit the flea market.
> I was surprised at how big it was. Friday morning was also quite busy
> outside. I think most people saw the weekend forecast and decided that
> Friday was the day.
>

Flea market was bad news and much smaller than previous
years. Prices were outrageous for the same junk idiots haul
from fest to fest.

> I was looking for a linear amp, and found quite a few for sale. Lots of
> Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found
> a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the
> face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker,
> but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.

There were many amps, but they were all for CB. Very few
ham amps, and as expected, the sellers had wild ideas of what
they were worth.

>
> I didn't want to lug that thing around, so I went out to the bus. What
> this leads up to is "Take the bus!" I am amazed at how much better the
> bus is compared to the parking lot at Hara's. Just a couple hundred foot
> walk to the bus, then a couple more hundred to my van, and a lot of
> steps saved. And 2 dollars versus 8 dollars a day leaves me with money
> to spend on better things than parking. Also the parking lot was a muddy
> mess due to all the rain. So Then I hop back on the bus to go back up to
> Hara's.

If you want to be in the boondocks, the bus is fine, I guess.

>
> Saturday was wet. Since it was forecast to rain, I planned on Saturday
> as an inside day. I got lots of goodies from the commercial vendors
> then. The rain slacked off, and I went back outside to try a deal on a
> KW tuner I was eyeing to go along with the new amp. Guy wouldn't budge
> on the price, so he got to keep it.
>

Yeah, that's right, nobody would budge on prices on anything.
Goodies from vendors? You call all those slick color flyers
goodies?

> Sunday was just a hang-out day, and to see if any flea market bargains
> cropped up.

Same as day before, same junk, same high prices. Same obese
slobs wanting outrageous prices for same junk they haul around all
year to hamfests.

>
>
> Now for the thoughts on the trip. I find it amusing that some hams here
> and elsewhere gripe about the obese, bizarre, and smelly hams that some
> obsess over. There were a few there to be sure. But not all that many.
> So in fairness to the gripers, I saw:

Every other ham was obese and stunk!

>
> The dude with the miniature tower and three element beam on a hard hat.
>
> The "Jungle Jim" guy who was wearing a pith helmet, a flowery shirt
> that looked more like it was designed for his wife, and didn't change
> nor shower all weekend.
>
> A few amazingly obese guys.

A few!!??? You better get your eyes checked!

>
> A few amazingly old guys.

A few!!??? It looked like several nursing homes sent all their
residents to the hamfest!

>
>
> BUT! They were very much the exception. As my first Dayton Hamvention,
> I was keeping an eye out for the attendees, and found that in addition
> to these characters I pointed out, that there were:
>
> Quite a few young hams in attendance. Many brought their young lady
> friends.

I saw no license Fwankie of BARF, and he never has a girl with
him. That was it for young people. Lady friends??? What do
you consider a lady?

>
> Female hams. The percentage was about what I expected. Not high, but
> still there. This has been my experience in most technical fields, which
> seem to have trouble attracting women. But the ones who were there were
> happy enough to be there.

The same three or four ugly oinkers you see at every hamfest.

>
> Normal looking hams with their normal looking families.

You have a strange idea as to what "normal" is!
Families? Saw a few guys dragging their filthy little screaming
kids around. That was it. Probably because their old lady
had to work that weekend.

>
> There were a fair amount of attractive ladies there. Not only the
> ladies in the booths, but also walking about in the crowd.

Attractive!!!!????? Whew!!! You DO need to get your
eyes examined, pronto!

>
>
> African American Hams. I didn't keep a count, but there ware a
> significant number.

Idiot! The few blacks you saw were employees on the custodial
staff! I didn't see a single black ham. Dayton is a white thang,
doncha know?

>
> All in all, I'd say that it looked like a normal cross-section of people.

Like I said, get to an eye doctor ASAP!

>
> The guys with the weird hats were no different than the people who go
> to football games and wear cheese wedge hats, or paint their chests in
> team colors. In fact they are less goofy IMO.
>

Except the hams dress like that every day, whereas the sports fans
only do it at games.

> And I don't favor picking on the obese.

Are you a liberal?

>
> Soooo, the only person I took real exception was the smelly guy.
> Everyone can take a shower once in a while.

There you go! You got one right! Except there were many
smelly guys, hundreds!

>
>
> Final score: Regular people I saw: 10's of thousands

What do you consider "regular." I know I'm repeating but
get for that eye exam soon!

>
>
> People who really need to clean up their act: 1

Who are you referring to?

>
> Personally, I think that when people gripe and complain about the
> obese, smelly, old, nerdy, weird, all male, all white, antisocial hams,
> they are saying a lot more about themselves than they say about those
> they denigrate.

No, what they are doing is sharing a lesson learned the hard way.
Don't waste your money on Dayton, unless you are a psychology
student doing a class project or better yet you get paid to be there.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

1195. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 22:14:08 UTC
From: "Ron \"Stompin\" James" <stomp@kenisbestersyo.org>
Message-ID: <babkvi$7l0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67245
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Ron "Stompin" James" <stomp@kenisbestersyo.org> wrote in message
news:babkl1$6ur$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu...
> > I had a blast at Dayton, and thought I'd share some thoughts on it.
> >
> > I showed up Friday morning, and after registering, hit the flea market.
> > I was surprised at how big it was. Friday morning was also quite busy
> > outside. I think most people saw the weekend forecast and decided that
> > Friday was the day.
> >
>
> Flea market was bad news and much smaller than previous
> years. Prices were outrageous for the same junk idiots haul
> from fest to fest.
>
> > I was looking for a linear amp, and found quite a few for sale. Lots of
> > Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found
> > a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the
> > face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker,
> > but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.
>
> There were many amps, but they were all for CB. Very few
> ham amps, and as expected, the sellers had wild ideas of what
> they were worth.
>
>
> >
> > I didn't want to lug that thing around, so I went out to the bus. What
> > this leads up to is "Take the bus!" I am amazed at how much better the
> > bus is compared to the parking lot at Hara's. Just a couple hundred foot
> > walk to the bus, then a couple more hundred to my van, and a lot of
> > steps saved. And 2 dollars versus 8 dollars a day leaves me with money
> > to spend on better things than parking. Also the parking lot was a muddy
> > mess due to all the rain. So Then I hop back on the bus to go back up to
> > Hara's.
>
> If you want to be in the boondocks, the bus is fine, I guess.
>
> >
> > Saturday was wet. Since it was forecast to rain, I planned on Saturday
> > as an inside day. I got lots of goodies from the commercial vendors

> > then. The rain slacked off, and I went back outside to try a deal on a
> > KW tuner I was eyeing to go along with the new amp. Guy wouldn't budge
> > on the price, so he got to keep it.
> >
>
> Yeah, that's right, nobody would budge on prices on anything.
> Goodies from vendors? You call all those slick color flyers
> goodies?
>
>
> > Sunday was just a hang-out day, and to see if any flea market bargains
> > cropped up.
>
> Same as day before, same junk, same high prices. Same obese
> slobs wanting outrageous prices for same junk they haul around all
> year to hamfests.
>
> >
> >
> > Now for the thoughts on the trip. I find it amusing that some hams here
> > and elsewhere gripe about the obese, bizarre, and smelly hams that some
> > obsess over. There were a few there to be sure. But not all that many.
> > So in fairness to the gripers, I saw:
>
> Every other ham was obese and stunk!
>
> >
> > The dude with the miniature tower and three element beam on a hard hat.
> >
> > The "Jungle Jim" guy who was wearing a pith helmet, a flowery shirt
> > that looked more like it was designed for his wife, and didn't change
> > nor shower all weekend.
> >
> > A few amazingly obese guys.
>
> A few!!??? You better get your eyes checked!
>
> >
> > A few amazingly old guys.
>
> A few!!??? It looked like several nursing homes sent all their
> residents to the hamfest!
>
>
> >
> >
> > BUT! They were very much the exception. As my first Dayton Hamvention,
> > I was keeping an eye out for the attendees, and found that in addition
> > to these characters I pointed out, that there were:
> >

> > Quite a few young hams in attendance. Many brought their young lady
> > friends.
>
> I saw no license Fwankie of BARF, and he never has a girl with
> him. That was it for young people. Lady friends??? What do
> you consider a lady?
>
>
> >
> > Female hams. The percentage was about what I expected. Not high, but
> > still there. This has been my experience in most technical fields, which

> > seem to have trouble attracting women. But the ones who were there were
> > happy enough to be there.
>
> The same three or four ugly oinkers you see at every hamfest.
>
>
> >
> > Normal looking hams with their normal looking families.
>
> You have a strange idea as to what "normal" is!
> Families? Saw a few guys dragging their filthy little screaming
> kids around. That was it. Probably because their old lady
> had to work that weekend.
>
>
> >
> > There were a fair amount of attractive ladies there. Not only the
> > ladies in the booths, but also walking about in the crowd.
>
> Attractive!!!!????? Whew!!! You DO need to get your
> eyes examined, pronto!
>
>
> >
> >
> > African American Hams. I didn't keep a count, but there ware a
> > significant number.
>
> Idiot! The few blacks you saw were employees on the custodial
> staff! I didn't see a single black ham. Dayton is a white thang,
> doncha know?
>
>
> >
> > All in all, I'd say that it looked like a normal cross-section of
people.
>
>

> Like I said, get to an eye doctor ASAP!
>
> >
> > The guys with the weird hats were no different than the people who go
> > to football games and wear cheese wedge hats, or paint their chests in
> > team colors. In fact they are less goofy IMO.
> >
>
> Except the hams dress like that every day, whereas the sports fans
> only do it at games.
>
>
> > And I don't favor picking on the obese.
>
> Are you a liberal?
>
> >
> > Soooo, the only person I took real exception was the smelly guy.
> > Everyone can take a shower once in a while.
>
>
> There you go! You got one right! Except there were many
> smelly guys, hundreds!
>
>
> >
> >
> > Final score: Regular people I saw: 10's of thousands
>
> What do you consider "regular." I know I'm repeating but
> get for that eye exam soon!
>
> >
> >
> > People who really need to clean up their act: 1
>
> Who are you referring to?
>
> >
> > Personally, I think that when people gripe and complain about the
> > obese, smelly, old, nerdy, weird, all male, all white, antisocial hams,
> > they are saying a lot more about themselves than they say about those
> > they denigrate.
>
> No, what they are doing is sharing a lesson learned the hard way.
> Don't waste your money on Dayton, unless you are a psychology
> student doing a class project or better yet you get paid to be there.
>
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -

> >
>
>

Ron

1196. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 23:15:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf56pcf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67246
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
>
> Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
>
> A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.

Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
you were in that category, Dick.

One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
the rule tells you to be.

The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
channel.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1197. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 23:15:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf58v7h.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 19 May 2003 08:51:00 -0400, Big Al wrote:

> Do you EVER grow tired of being a FCC apologist?

APOLOGIST? HA!!

Mister Anonymous Big Al, I'm one of the loudest critics of the FCC..... read some of the diatribes that I post from time to time. The one that you replied to in another posting was a very mild gentlemanly expression of my views. Is the agency screwed up? You bet your bottom. We can thank Charlie Ferris and his successors for that. Is it what we have to work with unless we get it changed somehow? Ditto. What I won't buy into is anonymous widespread generalities with no basis in specifics or fact.

I earn my snack money keeping current on the Rules and the case law (amateur radio is a small sliver of what I handle) and advising clients what the FCC Rules require and how to get where they want to go without violating them. That's something that I'm good at and enjoy both personally and professionally.

It's a lot easier and cheaper for the client to do it that way than to have to mount a defense in administrative litigation and hearings.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1198. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 23:15:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf56g7e.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 19 May 2003 04:09:58 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>>>Except that they have given us 5332 kHz USB +/-1.4 kHz, so you need to
>>>be on 5330.5 kHz. If you were on 5332 you'd be out of band.
>>
>> Depends on whether your rig reads "assigned frequency" which
>> is the center of the occupied bandwidth or the frequency of the
>> suppressed carrier which (theoretically) is the lower edge of
>> the occupied bandwidth.
>>
>All our rigs read nominal carrier frequency. Any textbook will tell you
>that SSB frequency is normally reckoned as the nominal carrier frequency.
>'Assigned frequency' is a miltary term, as per the primary users.

I'm sorry that your rig does not have a panel or automatic
switch to change the displayed readout frequency from "suppressed
carrier" to "center of occupied bandwidth" if you can't make
the computation in your head.

Get a copy of Part 2 of the FCC Rules and READ the definition
of "assigned frequency" in Section 2.1 of the Rules. This
applies to the Amateur Radio Service as well as other FCC Radio
Services. This is the standard method of specifying discrete
channels for regulatory purposes.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1199. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 23:15:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf58lag.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67247
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 19 May 2003 06:05:38 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> There are plenty of potential problems with with
"channelization" on HF ham bands, especially where frequency
tolerance and specific maximum voice bandwidths are mandated.

Other than in the Amateur Radio Service, HF comms have been
channelized for decades. Remember that we are secondary in
the 60-m allocation. so we get to play by the "house rules"
in that regard.

>A great many older ham rigs, including PLL and other frequency
>synthesized units, have drifted far enough to very likely be out
>of tolerance For that matter, many fresh from the factory have
>in the past been poorly adjusted. I know, no tolerance has yet
>been published, but it's certain that if discrete frequency
>channels are specified, a tolerance will also be.

Are we being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 1990s'
technological standards now?

> In a frequency band that is never a problem, one station or
>group of stations merely "zero beats" or tunes in the net control
>or other station, and everyone is talking on the same
>frequency-whatever each individual transmitter frequency readout
>shows. With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance
>with the rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if
>correct?

Interpretation of Sections 97.101(a) and 97.103(a) of the Rules
puts the burden on the station operator and licensee to ensure
that their operation complies with FCC Rules.

Look at it this way - the FCC gave us five "mini-bands" to
operate in.

>Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods
>available to most hams, is that going to be good enough? And what
>if it "seems to be off"? Will most hams be able to adjust it
>accurately? Or even determine if it needs adjusting? Send it to
>the factory for their opinion? What?

Is the sound that I hear that of kicking or screaming?

> And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal
>filter might be? Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at

>the max? Really sure, now? It's well known that crystals almost
>always drift a bit with aging. A typical filter contains several
>crystals. How do you know where yours cuts off? Can you check it
>to be sure?

Hint -- the simple way is to either unsuppress the carrier
or inject a single tone of known frequency. Measure the output
(single rf frequency) of the rig (into a dummy load, of course).

This will tell you what "dial offset" to use. Simple, eh what?

If you can't rely on "reading the dial", get a good frequency
counter. Even a "cheapie" 0.1 ppm counter will get you within
5 Hz at 5 MHz.

> For that matter, channelization on ham radio is a new
>precedent, as far as I know. Yes, "channels" have long been used
>on VHF, but they have always been within authorized bands, and
>violating a frequency tolerance was never an issue. At HF it's a
>new concept entirely, within ham radio. I can forsee a lot of
>outgoing mail from OO's and probably FCC also.

Kicking or screaming ?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1200. ARNewsline 1344 - May 16 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 23:33:00 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519193300.28592.00000390@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67250

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1344 – May 16, 2003

The following is a closed circuit advisory. Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1344 will follow.

Ladies and gentlemen, Amateur Radio Newsline's support fund administrator, Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

I want to begin by saying thank-you to all of those who have contributed so far to keeping these Amateur Radio Newsline reports coming your way. As I said a few weeks ago, to continue bringing you the news and to continue to honor the accomplishments of youthful radio amateurs with the Young Ham of the Year Award, we have to raise about $1000 a month. I am happy to tell you that thanks to your generosity, we are now about 20% of the way to that goal. That's the good news. The bad is that we still have 80% of the way to go and the bills keep coming in.

I know that I have said this before but I have to again. The bottom line is that you, and only you keep all of this going. Its your tax deductible contributions that pay the cost of producing and distributing Amateur Radio Newsline bulletins. Its your generosity that makes possible the honor bestowed on a young ham operator every August.

Without any doubt, you are the most important part of the Amateur Radio Newsline family because it is you who tell us through your contributions that you want us to continue. And for that we are eternally grateful.

Remember, Amateur Radio Newsline is a federal 501 c 3, not for profit corporation, and, as I said earlier, your contributions are tax deductible. Our address is the Amateur Radio Newsline Support Fund, Post Office Box 660937, Arcadia California, 91066.

Thank you for taking the time to listen. Newscast number 1344 follows immediately.

--

Thank you Andy. Now, Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1344 with a release date of Thursday, May 15th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. The tornadoes of May continue as ham radio lends a hand and the doors open at Hamvention 2003. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1344 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE TORNADOES OF MAY CONTINUE

According to statics, May 4th through the 10th, 2003 was the most active week of tornadoes on record. This, as scores of twisters ripped across the nation's midsection, reducing hundreds of homes and businesses to splinters. We have more on the storms and the part ham radio played in the aftermath in this report.

--

It was a busy week for ARES and RACES volunteers across the nations mid-section. Nearly 300 tornadoes have been reported since the beginning of May. That’s nearly 100 more than the most recent comparable outbreak in 1999. And so far, May 4th to the 10th has been the most volatile time of all.

Tornadoes have been everywhere from Oklahoma and Kansas to the West and to Alabama and Tennessee here on the south. And ham radio operators have been on the job as severe weather spotters looking for approaching storms. They have also been part of the clean-up effort after they have hit.

Among the groups using ham radio is the Salvation Army. Its website says that nine emergency disaster vehicles were set up in Kansas and Western Missouri following twisters that hit there. Its communications arm -- the Salvation Army Team Emergency Radio Network was dispatched to each location to assist using Amateur Radio channels.

One twister that struck the Oklahoma City area late Friday the 9th approached the metropolitan area from the southwest, then skipped through the city. This storm snapped utility poles, flipped a light airplane parked at a local airport and ripped apart an elementary school. It also knocked out a lot of telephone communications bringing out emergency trained ham radio operators to fill in.

Not long after this tornado hit, the Federal Communications Commission declared a general communications emergency for the Oklahoma area. United States Amateurs were told that they could not use 3 point 900 MHz, plus or minus 3 kHz, unless they were handling emergency traffic. The FCC said the declaration was in support of ham radio communications by the Salvation Army's tornado relief efforts. The ban was in force for about 24 hours, terminating at 22:30 on Saturday May 10th.

And on Saturday, May 10th, the weather service posted more tornado warnings for parts of Indiana, Missouri and Illinois. And the Storm Prediction Center said severe thunderstorms were likely from eastern Oklahoma to western Ohio. In northeastern Kentucky, at least 17 people were treated at hospitals and more than two dozen homes were damaged Saturday night after a tornado hit in Lewis and Mason counties near Maysville. This put already weary ham radio communicators back on alert once again. Adding to the misery, torrential downpours flooded streets and fields in Indiana put hams there on call as well.

But it was not over yet. Storms with wind speeds of up to 150 mph hit parts of Central Kentucky early Sunday the 11th. Homes were damaged in Hardin, Hart and Mercer counties. Retired ARRL President George Wilson, W4OYI, who lives in

Owensboro Kentucky says that there were two siren alerts indicating severe weather was on its way. He says that local hams involved in storm spotting duties geared up under the leadership of Emergency Coordinator Jake Jennings, KG4EMO. Thankfully, no twisters actually hit but one was spotted around midnight causing one of the alarms.

Severe weather alert systems and ham radio operators involved in ARES and RACES may be in for quite a work out in the days to come. This is because meteoreologists say that the 2003 tornado season is really just beginning.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, in New Orleans.

--

President Bush has cleared the way for federal aid by issuing a disaster declaration for ravaged areas of Tennessee, Kansas, and Missouri Oklahoma. The tornadoes combined with straight-line wind, lightning and floods to caused 44 deaths from Kansas to Georgia. (ARNewsline™)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: HAMVENTION WANTS TO STAY AT HARA!

The 2003 Dayton Hamvention is on and the big news is that it wants to stay where it is. Amateur Radio Newsline’s producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has that story:

--

The Hamvention wants to stay at the Hara Arena. So says the Dayton Daily News which reports that Hamvention organizers are in negotiations for a two-year contract to comtinue using the Trotwood Ohio facility. My colleague Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, has that part of the story:

--

The Dayton Daily News article Bill refereed to quotes Hamvention production manager Garry Matthews, KB8GOL. He says that organizers are pleased with Hara Arena and want to keep the show in the area. Also, that no other local venue can comfortably hold Hamvention at its current size. This says Matthews, makes a move unlikely.

A story in the May 2nd ARRL Letter said exhibitors would prefer the show to be held in Columbus if Hara wasn't available. Indianapolis and Cincinnati were also listed as possible sites.

When asked by the Dayton Daily News, Matthews said that the article doesn't mean Hamvention organizers are looking for another site. But says KB8GOL, organizers do have contingency plans that would move the convention elsewhere if Hara couldn't host it.

Will Hamvention 2004 be at the HARA Arena? We should know more by Sunday the 18th when Hamvention 2003 comes to an end.

I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ. Bill.

--

Thanks Henry.

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: SOCIAL HOUR WILL HONOR AWARD WINNERS

Now turning to the social side of Hamvention 2003 -- and after all -- the Hamvention is a major social event -- there is some very good news. Seemingly taking a cue from the highly successful ham radio cocktail hour at the National Association of Broadcasters convention, the Hamvention will host a similar gathering this year. As Hamvention General Chairman Pat Neff, N8IGS, told RAIN's Hap Holly, KC9RP, this gathering is to honor the Hamventions award winners:

--

Neff: "Theres going to a an award winners reception at HARA on Saturday. Its going to start at I believe 6' o'clock and it will be within two of the largest forum rooms that will be converted. But its only going to have a capacity of about 450 people."

--

In addition to drinks and horderves what else can those buying tickets to this gathering expect?

--

The award winners will be giving acceptance speaches there and, like I say, its going to be an informal to-do that will allow the average attendee to be able to possibly get to talk with the award winners as well.

--

Neff says that the decision to hold the reception at the Hara Arena came as the result of feedback from past Hamvention attendees. Many said it was hard to spend the day at the show and then travel across town for a banquet. With the banquet now history and an informal reception at the Hara taking its place, those wanting to attend need only buy a ticket and hang around. We will.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

Amateur Radio Newsline has a team of reporters in Dayton and will provide full covering of Hamvention 2003. (ARNewsline™)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Hamvention repeater, W8BI, serving Dayton Ohio.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: BIG HAPPENINGS IN DX

Still with Hamvention news, this years D-X forum should be one of the better ones in recent histoey. So says moderator Jay Slough, K4ZLE, who adds that the scheduled speakers are a really impressive line up. For instasnce, Daily D-X Editor Bernie McClenny, W3UR, will be talking on the recent AH3D operation. And Al Hernandez, K3VN on hand with the ZL7C story. The ARRL's Wayne Mills, N7NG with a DXCC update, and if thats not enough, Tedd Mirgliotta, KB8NW, will be on hand to present the Northern Ohio DX Association Award for the 2002 DXpedition of the Year. It looks like there will be something for everyone at Hamvention 2003. (OPDX)

**

RADIO LAW: HR-1478 GETS SUPPORT FROM CQ MAGAZINE

CQ Magazine has joined the ARRL in asking hams to support House Bill HR-1478. This is the measure re-introduced by New York Congressman Steve Israel to expand the limited protections of "PRB-1" to homeowners' associations and restrictive covenants.

According to the ARRL, the 2002 version of the bill died without action. The new bill initially had 13 co-sponsors from both parties including the only two known hams in Congress. They are identified as Representative Greg Walden, WB7OCE, of Oregon and Representative Mike Ross, WD5DVR, of Arkansas.

The ARRL and CQ are both now encouraging amateurs to contact their representatives in Congress to request that they support and even co-sponsor the bill. (CQ)

**

ENFORCEMENT: PIRATE BROADCASTER SENTENCED TO JAIL

A Florida pirate broadcaster will spend the next nine months in a federal prison. This is the sentence handed down by United States Magistrate David A. Baker against Rayon Sherwin "Junior" Payne.

Payne's conviction is the result of an investigation that began in February of 1999. About that time the Commission's Tampa Office began receiving complaints from residents and broadcasters in Orlando of interference to the reception of licensed broadcast stations. The investigation lead them to Payne's unlicensed station after which he was charged with multiple counts of operating an unlicensed FM radio facility.

Payne pleaded guilty to two of the counts before Magistrate Baker who also sentenced him to one year supervised release in addition to the jail time. Once he is released Payne must perform 50 hours of community service and must not violate any Federal, State or Local laws of the Communications Act of 1934.

The FCC announced the sentence on Monday May 12th. The case was prosecuted by the United States Attorney's Office for the Middle District of Florida.

(FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: AN EXPENSIVE LESSON FOR MICHIGAN HAM

The FCC has told a ham to pay a $12,000 fine for willful and repeated interference, broadcasting of music and failing to identify with his call sign. Being ordered to pay is Scott E. Kamm, N0UGN, currently of Souix City Iowa but who had his statiion licensed to the town of Waterbury Nebraska when he was first cited.

As previously reported, last December the FCC T-hunted down a strong signal on the input to a local repeater to Kamm's Waterbury Nebraska residence. Agents then performed a station inspection where they found a two meter transciever set to the repeaters frequecy pair. But Kamm denied any knowledge of the jamming, telling the inspectors that he never transmitted on the system and that the radio gear was used for monitoring purposes only.

But the FCC refused to buy Kamm's story. On January 24th of this year the regulatory agency issued Kamm a Notice of Aparenlt Liability in the amount of $12,000. Kamm never responded to it. And so a few days ago on May 7th the FCC affirmed its earlier order and gave Kamm 30 days tio pay up. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: $2400 FINE FOR UNREGISTERED TOWER

The FCC has also issued a $2400 a monetary forfeiture to Morris Communications, Inc. of Greenville, South Carolina for failing to register an antenna structure. The FCC calls this one a willful violation of Section 17.4(a) of the Commission's Rules.

On July 8, 2002, the Atlanta Office issued Morris a $3,000 forfeiture notice for failing to register its antenna structure in willful violation. In its response, Morris admits that its tower was not registered, but argued that the forfeiture should be rescinded because it did not "willfully" violate the rules.

Morris claims that it made two good faith attempts to register the structure in 1999, but the Commission first rejected its application on erroneous grounds and later returned it without explanation.

But says the FCC, the Rules provides that, effective July 1, 1996, the owner of any proposed or existing antenna structure that requires notification to the Federal Aviation Administration must register the structure with the Commission. Abother section of the Rules provides that the owner of an antenna structure that had been assigned painting or lighting requirements prior to July 1, 1996 must have registered the structure prior to July 1, 1998.

Morris admits that its Adrian tower was not registered at the time of the inspection on May 7, 2002. Accordingly, the FCC says that that Morris violated the Rules and has ordered it to pay the fine. The entire fionding is on-line at: http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-03-1366A1.doc (FCC)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC RESOLVES COMMERCIAL BROADCAST SPECTRUM ISSUE

The FCC has released new procedures to allocate and license the commercial F-M broadcast band. This, where conflicting commercial and noncommercial uses are proposed. Since most new F-M and T-V channels can be used for commercial purposes and would be affected by non-commercial proposals, the CGC Communicator says that this decision may have widespread implications. (CGC)

**

RADIO RULES: FAA TO SEND CLEARANCE DATA TO FCC ELECTRONICALLY

According to a Primedia trade publication, the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Aviation Administration have announced that tower and antenna airspace clearance data from the FAA will now be transferred electronically to the FCC. This will enable the Commission to process antenna structure registration applications faster and more accurately, and will save staff time at both ends. The electronic transfer of data is also expected to reduce the time it takes to get this information into the FCC's database from one to two weeks to only one day. More information is opn the web at http://beradio.com/ar/radio_currents_24/index.htm#tower1 (CGC)

**

HAM RADIO PUBLICITY: NPR FEATURES “HELLO WORLD - A LIFE IN HAM RADIO”

Tom Walsh, K1TW, reports over the Internet that National Public Radio featured ham radio in a recent Talk of the Nation segment. Walsh says that the final 15 minutes of the two hour program on April 30th was devoted to the new book "Hello World - A life in Ham Radio” and even featured callers including someone who is a QSL manager.

Tom says that you can still hear the program. Just taker your web browser to the National Public Radio archives and bring up the April 30 version of Talk of the Nation. Go to the second hour, find the last 15 minutes, turn your speakers up and enjoy. The URL is www.npr.org/programs/totn/index.html>http://www.npr.org/programs/totn/index.html (K1TW, K1KI, others)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: W9GIG TO DEPART THE IRA

ARRL Central Division Director Dick Isely, W9GIG, says that he will not stand for re-election to an official position within the Illinois Repeater Association. Isley has been a guising force within the repeater council for years.

It was Isley’s guidence that helped to create the National Frequency Coordinators Committee several years ago. He has also served with ther Illinois Repeater Associuation for many years and has become a main stay in the repeater coordination community.

According to his departure announcement, the decision to stand-down has nothing directly to do with his position within the ARRL but he says that does want to put more of his time toward League matters. Isley says that he has thoroughly enjoyed working for the Illinois Repeater Association but feels that it is time that new people step up to leadership positions. He also wished the group continued success in its work of providing efficient and fair Amateur Radio repeater frequency coordination to the hams of Illinois. (Via E-Mail)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE IRAQ WAR: WHO IS ACCEPTING WHAT POST-CONFLICT OPERATIONS

With the war in Iraq now just about over, both CQ and the ARRL are accepting certain operations from that nation for their DX award programs. But there are some differences. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has that part of the story:

--
PKG HERE
--

Most observers believe that the situation regarding ham radio in Iraq is very fluid and criteria for operations will change. (ARRL, CQ, others)

**

INTERNATIONAL - AUSTRALIA: NEW 23 CM BEACON

VK4RTL experimental 23 centimeter beacon on air neat Townsville Australia. It weent on the air on 21st April on 1296.444 MHz at Mount Stuart for a trial run. Q-News reports that this mighty little beacon puts out a massive 2.5watts and can be heard on most modern tri-band handhelds around Townsville and Thuringowa. Reception and range reports go to vk4wit@wia.org.au (Q-News)

**

INTERNATIONAL - CANADA: CANADIAN SPECIAL PREFIXES.

Industry Canada has authorized the use of "Special Event Prefixes" between May 24th and July 27th to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the National Library of Canada. The special prefixes are C-K for all V-E's, C-J for all V-A's, C-Y for all V-Oh's and C-Z for all V-Y's. The special prefixes will therefore be available for use in the upcoming C-Q W-P-X C-W Contest on May 24 and 25th.

**

INTERNATIONAL - ITALY: WOULD YOU LIKE TO FLY IN MY BALLOON

Remember the 1970's song Up-up and Away by the 5th Dimension? Well a ham radio group in Italy has come up with a 21st century Amateur Radio version of just such an event.

The Milan Chapter of the Italian Amateur Radio Society says that its planning a manned Amateur Radio Balloning Experiment to take to the sky on Saturday, May 17th from Mantova Airport. Operating on 144.330 Mhz upper sideband, the in-flight operation is slated to begin between 08:00 to 09:00 U-T-C and last between 1 and 3 hours. A-P-R-S will be used to track the balloon during the time its aloft.

More information on the flight is the groups wesite. That information appears on the groups website at www.arimi.it/rubriche/arbe.html (IT2SAI)

**

ON THE AIR: GRID CIRCLEING ROVERS WANTED

N9REP says over the VHF Reflector that the K9RN VHF Contest Group is now accepting applications for captive rovers during the June VHF/UHF contest. Wendell says that the terrain in and around grid square EN52 is very rugged and harsh and that the first requirement for rovers is a vehicle capable of handling any on-or-off road QSO task, particularly regarding grid circling.

Any team wishing to be a captive rover must supply their own approved vehicle. A list of vehicle manufacturers that appear to meet all of the demanding Rover specifications is at www.maximog.com (VHF Relector)

**

DX

In DX, word that the make-up of the CY9 DXpedition team is now complete and the operation will take place from July 24th to August 2nd. The team members are N0RN, N5VL, W0IZ, KO4RR, K5AAH, K5AB and VE7SV. They will be taking with them a Battle Creek Special and will operate on the low bands during all openings. Callsign will be given either at the beginning of the operation or shortly before. QSL via N5VL. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: ITS T-HUNT TIME

And finally this wee, do you like hidden transmitter hunting? If you do then this one is for you. Here's Joe Moell, K0OV, has the latest information on the World Amateur Radio Direction Finding Championship games that are coming up.

--

Who are the best transmitter hunters in the country? That's what we'll find out when the Third USA ARDF Championships get under way near Cincinnati, Ohio on July 30. The sponsors, OH-KY-IN ARC and the Cincinnati Orienteering Club, promise two challenging radio-orienteering courses. One will be on two meters,

and the other on 80 meters. This is a test of individuals, and it's all on foot. You'll have five transmitters to find each day, negotiating your way through the forest with your map, compass and direction-finding gear. If you can walk or jog a 10 km racecourse, you have the stamina to complete an ARDF event. If you're a senior citizen, don't worry about being trounced by teenagers, because there are a total of nine age categories, five for men and boys, four for women and girls.

This year, the USA Championships are an international event, combined with the International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) Region 2 ARDF Championships. If past events are any indication, there will be plenty of international experts in the sport on hand, so you'll have a chance to learn foxtailing tips and techniques from the very best. Positions on ARDF Team USA to next year's World Championships in the Czech Republic are open, so perhaps you can earn a spot for yourself. We're looking for good candidates in all age/gender categories, so encourage your kids and grandkids to give it a try.

For the most intense experience, stay in the dorms at Miami University of Ohio, in close contact with the other competitors. But space is limited, so now is the time to make plans. You can stay elsewhere nearby if you like. In either case, time is getting short, so get registered at the Championships Web site: www.ardfusa.com That's ardfusa.com

For lots more on foxhunting, including equipment ideas and techniques, go to www.homingin.com. Read about past USA Championships and get a link to this year's. That's one word "homingin" --- homingin.com.

From southern California, where there's some kind of transmitter hunt almost every weekend, this is Joe Moell, Kay-zero-Oscar-Victor, for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Don’t worry if you missed those websites Joe mentioned. You will find them I the print edition of this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report. (K0OV, ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2003 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year closes May 30th. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and a fill-in-the-blank electronic application are at our new special website at www.yhoty.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the Editors Desk, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP, saying 73 and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline is copyright 2003 and all rights are reserved.

1201. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 23:37:45 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3EC96AC8.7040009@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 67351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Did the responders on this thread read the FCC Report and Order that is
linked from the ARRL page. It says quite clearly that the listed
frequencies are the center yet people are still arguing which frequency
is meant.
It is unusual relative to usual ham practice since all rigs I have ever
used read the suppressed carrier frequency - not the center frequency.
But so what? How hard is it to set your rig to -1.4KHz of the listed
channels. Maybe this will help some people learn that setting your VFO
to say 14.349.5 still puts your signal out of the band.
73
John

Phil Kane wrote:
> On Sun, 18 May 2003 21:36:36 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
>
>>This is another perfect example of why certain things should be left to the
>>technical staff and out of the hands of politicians.
>
>
> I do believe that this was handled by the technical staff in
> the International Bureau (the bureau that is the liaison with
> NTIA) as well as by Bill Cross (who is an active ham) in the
> Wireless Telecomm Bureau (the bureau that handles rulemaking in
> the Amateur Radio Service).
>
> The politicians in the FCC are too busy conglomerating
> broadcast ownership, fostering wireline competition, auctioning
> off gobs of spectrum to "wireless" carriers, and figuring how fast
> they can put the internet on power line carriers to deal with any
> Amateur Radio rulemaking.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

1202. Re: Dayton a washout on the Live WebCam ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-19 23:55:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519195526.27394.00000388@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67352

>Didn't see you there Bruce. I was looking for the cbplusser hat or t-shirt.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Well only took 40 of them, and they sold out the 1st hour, even had to sell the one I had on. They were a BIG HIT. Had a bunch of guys who gave me there E-Mail Adresses, so I could let them know when I had more.

1203. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 00:06:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EC97174.5A55095F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67353
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

>
> Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
> assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.
> So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.
>

Look again. The FCC usually just says "operate between 14.150 MHz
and 14.350 MHz with voice modes. It's up to us to pick out any frequency
to use to have all our sidebands inside that range. Which means don't
park your rig on 14.349 MHz and expect to keep all your USB sidebands
in band. It's just ham tradition to specify the frequency of our suppressed
carriers instead of the center of our USB signals.

After all, every ham eligible for the new freqs had to pass a code test.
And we all know that proves that we all are smart enough to handle this....

Just imagine, a band without a code allocation!

1204. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 00:24:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519202409.14837.00000077@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67355

In article <Rd7ya.108771$cg.20815@fe10.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Chuck / KE4ETH" <chuck_hawks@hotmail.com> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3EC86CDA.8CE9DCE6@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>>
>> I just realized that a beam for 5Mhz would be absurd......
>>
>> Too big!
>>
>> :-)
>
>Be easier to turn the Earth under it. <HI>
>
Not really all that big if someone is serious about it...

More than 30 years ago, K3JH (SK) had a custom-made 100+ foot tubular rotating mast.

On said mast he had long monoband Yagis for 6, 10, 15, 20 and 40 meters. All fullsized. The 40 meter one was 3 elements, and the other bands had more elements. I understand that most if not all of the Yagis were custom made, too.

Last but certainly not least, he had a full size 2 element 80 meter diamond quad. Top of the diamond hung from one of the big Yagis, the middle was supported by what looked like a 2 element Yagi but was actually mostly fiberglass, and the bottom was kept in line by a boom in the appropriate place. Yes, it all worked, and 'JH had a big signal.

All that and more on a ~1 acre suburban lot on Bryn Mawr, PA. All gone now. I saw it myself, though, many times, and I know the hams who built it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1205. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 00:24:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519202410.14837.00000078@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67354

In article <3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Lots of
>Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found
>a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the
>face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker,
>but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.

Mike,

You do know what those things sold for new, I hope. Also how old they are....

Still a good solid amp. Worse comes to worse, you can tear it apart, clean up the pieces, replace anything that's out of spec and rebuild it according to the manual.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1206. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 01:05:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EC97F5B.3010700@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67356

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Lots of
>>Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found
>>a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the
>>face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker,
>>but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.
>
>
> Mike,
>
> You do know what those things sold for new, I hope. Also how old they are....

Yes, they were very inexpensive in their time. I got the thing for very
little money.

> Still a good solid amp. Worse comes to worse, you can tear it apart, clean up
> the pieces, replace anything that's out of spec and rebuild it according to the
> manual.

This one has pretty new tubes, has been re-capped, and I have to check
to see what other mods might have been made.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1207. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 01:46:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305191746.38f8de37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67357

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030517231435.23307.00000070@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <3EC0F3F0.1080603@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> I hope nobody starts some kind of inane "awards program" for PSK-31
> and the other digital modes!

RTTY contests have been around since the '50s. There are already PSK
runbles. The coming of some kind or kinds of digital DXCC is only a
matter of time. It's the nature of us beasts. Some of us beasts.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv
Mixed DXCC ~300
Phone DXCC
5BDXCC
DUF
WAZ
. . . ad nauseam . .

1208. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 01:57:49 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <xYfya.190822$pa5.187097@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 67358

>
> So, do you guys have any reply to the _argument_, or are you just
> going to split hairs over definitions?
> You can call the requirement any skill level you like, I don't
care.
> Here, maybe you can wrap your brains around this:
>
> "Requiring somebody to acquire incredibly low, rudimentary, most
basic,
> the least possible, familiarity and ability to manipulate a Kleinschmidt
> teletype makes absolutely the same amount of sense as requiring them to
> acquire incredibly low, rudimentary, most basic, the least possible,
> familiarity and ability to copy CW."
>

Hello again Robert .... well I for one am not going to get involved in this "proficiency" discussion. I have stayed away from it over the years as it really is a dead end issue. It is that way because like Hennie Youngman says ..."How's the wife ...compared to what .." Some one who is at the 25 WPM level "may" look upon the 10 WPM as less proficient ..... my CW falls apart like a cheap sweater at 40 WPM or there about. I do hear guys that are 50 WPM and above ...I catch a word here and there but on the whole ..it just goes by. Do I routinely QSO with 40 plus WPM ops... yep but only if they bounce around 35 WPM . Do I QSO with 5 WPM op ??? again yes but at 5 WPM which I consider to be very "proficient" for a 5 WPM op. No hair splitting here just enjoyment of the mode.

BTW Robert I see no positives in bashing any class op ...we are here to learn and hopefully along the way have some fun and fellowship.

Take care and God Bless ....
Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh

1209. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 02:26:38 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <yngya.943899$S_4.960548@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 67359

> >
> > Here we go again with the old stick shift analogy ..... I am officially
> > adding this to the "CW always gets through" crap bucket. I can't beat
the
> > feel of taking my Miata around a curve with a nice shift and letting the
> > backside just come through .... I'd be laying in ditch if I tried that
> with
> > my Sante Fe.
>
> *shrug* it was offered by a pro-coder, actually. It's valid enough
> reasoning, though. When conditions are bad, good operators _can_ get
through
> with CW. You get a good feeling driving your Miata. My reply to either
point
> is a loud, obnoxious "So what?"

Oh come on Bob ... no need to get obnoxious about really anything on this newsgripes ..... you don't even have to get loud ....I'm listening and reading your points and am probably in more agreement than you may realize.

"Packet Radio may very well enhance the
> survivability of digital communications and the internet in the event of
> catastrophe." Hurray, and "So what?" Should everybody be required to be
able
> to set up a node? Hardly, no more than they should be required to fiddle
> about with CW.

Bob I cringe at the prospects of this happening on a national level ..... either we will shine as Americans and people in general or degenerate into what is happening in other parts of the world ....I wish I knew the answer.

You can require CW until the end of time, but if nobody's
> interested,

Glittering generality ..... nobody I guess all the thousands of stations I have worked over the years were either my imagination or non interested ops. I had a chat with a fellow on 2 meters one day on this same point. He repeatedly told me nobody operates CW with all the modern modes out there. I had asked if he had tuned about for several nights with good propagation on his HF rx in the CW bands. No reply ... I suggested that he try and see for himself. Granted I feel that there are not the number of staions out there that used to be on in general but you really can't tell that on a contest weekend. BTW which I avoid.

it's irrelevant how grand it is, or how reliable it is, or
> anything else. Heck, you'd probably get more licensees working this

question
> backwards. Let 'em get on HF and maybe _that'll_ give 'em the CW bug.
>

With what Bob ?? ... SSB ...digital ...etc with out even the least bit of
......gee I hate this word ....profeciency with CW.

Take care Robert ..God Bless

Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh

1210. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 02:53:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bac5b9$971$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 67360
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
> > >
> > > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
> > >
> > > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
>
> Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
> finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
> you were in that category, Dick.
>
> One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
> the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
> the rule tells you to be.
>
> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
> channel.

And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're discussing.
Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of technical convention. SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and has been that way ever since. It's the intelligent way to describe it. There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other modes. The reason as I just described is obvious. In fact, it is technically incorrect to do so. 5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be that way, in the face of technical accuracy.

In the absense of a *very* good reason to change that attribute, it can only be regarded as a dumb rule that will cause lots of confusion and more importantly cause many, many radio frequency readouts to read incorrectly - that is, assuming their operators have been apprised of the ridiculous rule.

If that's intelligent I sure don't see it.

Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its

face.

1211. Re: Dayton 03 trip report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 02:55:30 UTC
From: Dave Allan <Denny@kenallasaws.com>
Message-ID: <bac5f8$9fe$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67361
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I agree, Dayton is a total waste of time and money, but it
was entertaining watching all the obese fruit cakes trying to
get bargain basement prices for quality equipment. I notice
the body odor was very high this year, maybe high humidity,
plus we alrady know most of the fruits go two weeks without
a shower before attending Dayton.

Dave

"Mike" <mpautodets300@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ec90135@snipnews.snip.net...
> Well, I made the long trek to Dayton from
> Delaware after missing Dayton 99/01/02
> due to business. Somewhat easier this year
> travel wise as I flew in via my partner's
> Beech and all that was necessary was to
> get a rental car once we landed at the airport.
>
> I sorta wish that I'd stayed home. We got there
> late Friday afternoon, got our room (reserved)
> in Dayton and decided to go out and have
> dinner, then hit the Hara early Sat morning.
> Met many hams at our dinner and got to talking.
> More so with my friend Carl (who is not licensed)
> but told them many of his aero-stories and yearly
> trek to Oshkosh. (Oshkosh is to general aviation what
> Dayton is to Ham Radio and Mecca is to Islam)
> I WILL make a trip to Oshkosh later this
> Year FOR SURE!!
>
> We get to the flea market bright and early...and it begins
> to rain. A cold damp flea-market killing rain. This while
> we were waiting in queue to get in also. I do not know
> why but can someone please tell me why the dumbest
> and dimmest-lightbulbs-in-the-drawer always seem to
> get gate duty at hamfests?
>
> We get inside and we are greeted by dozens of tables
> on saw horses covered in blue plastic. Some had the sense
> to bring poles and set up a makeshift tent/cover.
> Just about everything that was available for sale on the
> outside flea market (that was not water-soaked and thus
> rendered as "damaged goods") was obscenly overpriced.
> On guy had a TS-520S that still had pizza-sauce stains on the

> main tuning dial. He wanted $400 for it. (Good luck pal, hope
> there are lotsa suckers in attendance) We decided to go
> inside. I felt like a sardene in the can. I got to see Icom's
> new IC-8500 or whatever. The MSRP is $5000 for it.
> I do not know about you but ANYONE who would pay
> 5K for a ham radio NEEDS to have their head examined.
>
> Yaesu had a nice display, but then again I feel Yaesu are
> the best engineered and designed radios going so I am a
> bit partial. If you open up the covers of a Yaesu and and
> Icom and a Kenwood and lay em side-by-side the difference
> ir readily apparent. Yaesu looks like someone put some
> thought and CAD into their designs. Everything fits into
> place like the inside engine compartment of a Honda Civic!
> Icoms and Kenwoods look like the inside of the $65 Korean
> made VCR you just bought at Circuit City. Thruhole components
> and wires all bent over, SMT components placed hap-hazardly
> and the cheapest sheet-steel chassis used. Yeah...I'm REALLY
> going to pay $5000 for an Icom that has a laptop LCD screen on
> the front and inside looks like a rat's next of circuits with no
> way for heat buildup to get out. (Attn all suckers! Blue Light Special
> at the Icom Table!)
>
> We left after just 3-4 hours, got some Pizza and beer, walked
> around the airpark shop looking at all the new aero toys (my
> friend was drooling at some kind of a NAV aid in a glass case
> at the store like I would at a new Yaesu HF) and we took off
> at around 5:00
>
> Sorry Dayton, but I will not be back. Not because the Wx
> crapped-out Dayton 2003, but because it makes no sense
> to goto a convention, be wet and crowded in and uncomfortable
> just to look at grossly overpriced radios. Better to purchase
> online or go up to HRO's store in Newark Delaware which
> is just 1/2 hour north of me.
>
> See you Boys in Oshkosh!!!
>
> This Year's dates are July 29 to Aug 04, 2003
>
> The Oshkosh Info site is at: http://www.airventure.org/
>
> How to Drive there: http://www.airventure.org/2003/about/driving_maps.html
>
> How to Fly In: http://www.airventure.org/2003/flying/index.html
>
> Oshkosh "101": http://www.airventure.org/2003/about/index.html
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>

1212. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 02:57:29 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519225729.14557.00000262@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67362

From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

>Dave never claimed that it helped build ALL the skills you need. It does
>build some of the skills.

You should re read his post. He claimed contesting is skill building for
emergency comm.

On several occasions, he implied contesting is equivalent to emergency
communications.

He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
emergency communications.

1213. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:02:20 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519230220.14557.00000263@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67363

From K4CAP (formerly K4YZ):

>So, Vipul, if Amateur Radio leads to obesity, what happened?

I never said ALL Hams are fat. Just that a greater percentage than the general population. Some people can eat more and not gain weight.

If you are in a hobby that tends to use less exercise, people eat more, and engage in anti-social behaviour, a greater percentage of these people will be fat.

>Steve, K4CAP

Congratulations on your new call sign.

1214. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:07:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519230736.14557.00000265@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67364

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>1. Why would a person ONLY do that? Are you making a strawman? A
>hypothetical Ham who doesn't do anything else but contest?

No, just noticing what most Hams like to do.

>2. I lose weight over field day. The calories used setting up,
>operating all night, and then tearing down and storing all the field day
>equipment use up huge numbers of calories.

Thats one day.

>> Furthermore, these activities lead to "celebrating" afterwards with food.
>> Often, the food is not healthy.
>
> Yeah, I think its the rf exposure that makes the brain crave bad food.

Every antenna setup from my local club I've joined, they usually eat heavily
afterwards.

>Not from what I've seen. How many hamfests have you been to?

Quite a few. All demographics seem the same each one.

1215. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:10:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <M0hya.3549$sh5.2537666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67365

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030519225729.14557.00000262@mb-m03.aol.com...
> From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> >Dave never claimed that it helped build ALL the skills you need. It does
> >build some of the skills.
>
> You should re read his post. He claimed contesting is skill building for
> emergency comm.

I read his posts very carefully. My statement still stands. He never
claimed that it builds all the skills one needs.

>
> On several occasions, he implied contesting is equivalent to emergency
> communications.

Nope, he never said that either. He just said it is valuable in building
skills.

>
> He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
> emergency communications.

You will need to provide a direct quote from his postings to substantiate
that. There was no such statement in any of his postings that I saw.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1216. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:10:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <N0hya.3550$sh5.2537440@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67366

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030519230220.14557.00000263@mb-m03.aol.com...
> From K4CAP (formerly K4YZ):
>
> >So, Vipul, if Amateur Radio leads to obesity, what happened?
>
> I never said ALL Hams are fat. Just that a greater percentage than the
general
> population. Some people can eat more and not gain weight.
>
> If you are in a hobby that tends to use less exercise, people eat more,
and
> engage in anti-social behaviour, a greater percentage of these people will
be
> fat.
>
> >Steve, K4CAP
>
> Congratulations on your new call sign.

Just got back from Dayton. Vshah, you'll be glad to know that roughly half the hams I saw were skinny. I saw hams of all ages, sizes, sexes, races and countries.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1217. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:14:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519231459.24111.00000554@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67367

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/19/2003 9:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030519225729.14557.00000262@mb-m03.aol.com>

>From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>>Dave never claimed that it helped build ALL the skills you need. It does
>>build some of the skills.
>
>You should re read his post. He claimed contesting is skill building for
>emergency comm.

YOU should read it, Vippy.

NO WHERE does it say ANYTHING like "this is the end all and be all" of
emergency communications training.

>On several occasions, he implied contesting is equivalent to emergency
>communications.

In some cases it is. If YOU had ever done any amount of either you'd KNOW
this to be true.

However you HAVEN'T so you just blow smoke in here. Yuor lack of
experience is GLARING.

>He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
>emergency communications.

And that statement would make you a liar, Vipul.

Lennie, welcome him to your club.

Steve, K4CAP

1218. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:19:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519231912.24111.00000555@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67368

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/19/2003 10:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030519230220.14557.00000263@mb-m03.aol.com>

>From K4CAP (formerly K4YZ):
>
>>So, Vipul, if Amateur Radio leads to obesity, what happened?
>
>I never said ALL Hams are fat. Just that a greater percentage than the
>general
>population. Some people can eat more and not gain weight.

And YOU have yet to provide us the reference to the study that even
remotely proves this.

>If you are in a hobby that tends to use less exercise, people eat more, and
>engage in anti-social behaviour, a greater percentage of these people will be
>fat.

Amateur Radio is ANYTHING but "anti-social".

>Congratulations on your new call sign.

Thanks. When are you gonna apply for KV1PUL..??? Or KV1PPY...?!?! Both
are good CW calls.

Steve, K4CAP

1219. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:24:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030519232438.24111.00000556@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67369

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/19/2003 10:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030519230736.14557.00000265@mb-m03.aol.com>

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>>1. Why would a person ONLY do that? Are you making a strawman? A
>>hypothetical Ham who doesn't do anything else but contest?
>
>No, just noticing what most Hams like to do.

"Most Hams"...?!?!

I don't keep exact tabs on all the contests or contest results, but I do notice that the results posts in QST and "CQ" Magazines hardly reflects anything even remotely like "most" Hams.

>>2. I lose weight over field day. The calories used setting up,
>>operating all night, and then tearing down and storing all the field day
>>equipment use up huge numbers of calories.
>
>Thats one day.

But that's one day more than you have, Vipul.

>>> Furthermore, these activities lead to "celebrating" afterwards with food.
>>> Often, the food is not healthy.
>>
>> Yeah, I think its the rf exposure that makes the brain crave bad food.
>
>Every antenna setup from my local club I've joined, they usually eat heavily
>afterwards.

I'd sure like to join that club! We just sweated a lot and had Cokes.

>>Not from what I've seen. How many hamfests have you been to?
>
>Quite a few. All demographics seem the same each one.

WHOA! Vippy, just a week or so ago you were at less than 10 or 12. Do you categorize that as "quite a few"?

Steve, K4CAP

1220. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:28:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bac7cg$e13$0@208.207.71.161>
Source record: 67370
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 19 May 2003 06:05:38 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > There are plenty of potential problems with with
> "channelization" on HF ham bands, especially where frequency
> tolerance and specific maximum voice bandwidths are mandated.
>
> Other than in the Amateur Radio Service, HF comms have been
> channelized for decades. Remember that we are secondary in
> the 60-m allocation. so we get to play by the "house rules"
> in that regard.
>

Again - what we got here was no more than the minimum necessary to
conduct emergency communications at 60 meters. No more.

>
> >A great many older ham rigs, including PLL and other frequency
> >synthesized units, have drifted far enough to very likely be out
> >of tolerance For that matter, many fresh from the factory have
> >in the past been poorly adjusted. I know, no tolerance has yet
> >been published, but it's certain that if discrete frequency
> >channels are specified, a tolerance will also be.
>
> Are we being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 1990s'
> technological standards now?
>

Been there for awhile, haven't we? I worked there for a full commercial
career. But that certainly doesn't make it a good thing for ham radio.
Ham gear has never been subject to strict tolerances as has commercial
and othre non-ham gear. So now we get to play by commercial tolerance
rules, eh? That's a good thing for ham radio? Not in my book.

> > In a frequency band that is never a problem, one station or
> >group of stations merely "zero beats" or tunes in the net control
> >or other station, and everyone is talking on the same
> >frequency-whatever each individual transmitter frequency readout
> >shows. With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance
> >with the rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if
> >correct?
>
> Interpretation of Sections 97.101(a) and 97.103(a) of the Rules
> puts the burden on the station operator and licensee to ensure

> that their operation complies with FCC Rules.

General blanket coverage for all services at all times. But the
difference is that hams have alway had BANDS, and never discrete
frequency channels with strict tolerances. I'm not real anxious to see
that change. It introduces a non-relaxed element to ham radio that tends
to change the nature of it.
But it would give me a use for my 100watt Motorola Micom crystal
controlled HF transciever! Maybe I'll crystal it up for 60 meters!
But when I order crystals, it'll have to be for frequencies 1.4 kc below
the authorized frequency. Only a Federal bureaucracy could screw things
up that badly, sorry!

>
>
> Look at it this way - the FCC gave us five "mini-bands" to
> operate in.

No way that properly describes the case. "Bands" convey frequency
flexibility and that's absent.

>
>
> >Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods
> >available to most hams, is that going to be good enough? And what
> >if it "seems to be off"? Will most hams be able to adjust it
> >accurately? Or even determine if it needs adjusting? Send it to
> >the factory for their opinion? What?
>
> Is the sound that I hear that of kicking or screaming?

Not from me. I have all the equipment I need to stay in shape to handle
it and the knowledge to use it. Most hams have neither.

>
>
> > And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal
> >filter might be? Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at
> >the max? Really sure, now? It's well known that crystals almost
> >always drift a bit with aging. A typical filter contains several
> >crystals. How do you know where yours cuts off? Can you check it
> >to be sure?
>
> Hint -- the simple way is to either unsuppress the carrier
> or inject a single tone of known frequency. Measure the output
> (single rf frequency) of the rig (into a dummy load, of course).
>
> This will tell you what "dial offset" to use. Simple, eh what?
>
> If you can't rely on "reading the dial", get a good frequency
> counter. Even a "cheapie" 0.1 ppm counter will get you within
> 5 Hz at 5 MHz.

But it tells nothing about how wide your signal is. Do you feel you can trust the filters in ham gear as you would in commercial units? I don't. They deliberately were not built with the same care and to the same standards since the same rigorous tolerances were never demanded of them.

And again, you're an engineer and you and I know how to do all this. How many new Generals do you think picked up all this information enroute through the Question Pools?

>
>
> > For that matter, channelization on ham radio is a new
> >precedent, as far as I know. Yes, "channels" have long been used
> >on VHF, but they have always been within authorized bands, and
> >violating a frequency tolerance was never an issue. At HF it's a
> >new concept entirely, within ham radio. I can forsee a lot of
> >outgoing mail from OO's and probably FCC also.
>
> Kicking or screaming ?

Hey Phil- it ain't ME that I'm concerned about, rather all those legions of the unlearned out there in ham radio land who haven't even a clue what we're talking about. I spent a couple years with Uncle Sam, running around Europe calibrating electronic gizmos and picked up a pretty good feel for tolerances and how to calculate them. I also ran a VE team for eight years, while you sat in the SF director's office, remember? I *know* what we're dealing with here. Most of them don't. You can bet the farm there'll be a bunch of hams sitting on the posted frequency, not down 1.4khz.

And once more, for effect-- just because the rest of the world of radio has long used channels certainly doesn't mean it's a good thing for ham radio. I give you reference to the 40 channels below ten meters as evidence.
It's gonna be hard to move a couple kc's up the band to avoid all that QRM, isn't it?

If that's what ham radio is coming to then it's a good way to get us to lose interest, and one more method of spectrum swiping.

1221. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:40:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bac82r$f3i$0@208.207.71.161>
Source record: 67371
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> >
> > Looks like the "technical staff" at FCC have gone braindead, again. They
> > assign a frequency which puts you out of band when you dial it up. Right.
> > So now the frequency assigned is not the frequency you use.
> >
>
> Look again. The FCC usually just says "operate between 14.150 MHz
> and 14.350 MHz with voice modes. It's up to us to pick out any frequency
> to use to have all our sidebands inside that range. Which means don't
> park your rig on 14.349 MHz and expect to keep all your USB sidebands
> in band. It's just ham tradition to specify the frequency of our suppressed
> carriers instead of the center of our USB signals.
>
> After all, every ham eligible for the new freqs had to pass a code test.
> And we all know that proves that we all are smart enough to handle this....
>
> Just imagine, a band without a code allocation!

Yoiu don't do all that well as a smartass, Bob.

1222. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:50:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030519235058.17796.00000139@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67372

In article <20030518142454.24390.00000101@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>>I enjoy *occasional*
>>competitive operation. However, I'm not interested in a steady diet of it.
>
>Try 7035 kHz
>
>>Unfortunately, organizations like 10-10 and FISTS are shoving this
>particular
>>"diet" down my throat.
>
>As I said before, I dunno about this 10-10 stuff, but I've never felt any
>pressure from FISTS folks
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>FISTS #4360

Jim:

Perhaps I've been a bit overzealous in my inclusion of FISTS in this particular thread, but my personal take on FISTS is that they appear to be more interested in paper-chasing than in seeking the goal which their organization espouses -- the "Preservation of Morse Code." Nancy Kott, WZ8C, the North American Secretary of the FISTS CW Club, made an impressive showing at the ARRL "Town Hall" forum at the 1997 Dayton Hamvention. She essentially demolished Fred Maia, W5YI, in open debate on the issue of code testing. She gained a great deal of momentum that day, but once she got the train rolling, she immediately seemed to jump off. There was nothing said thereafter from a standpoint of mobilizing "political" action on the part of the FISTS membership to attempt to counter the trend toward the reduction and eventual elimination of code testing requirements. I guess I felt more than a little bit let down by that. Since then, FISTS has become little more than a CW Awards Program. I guess I fail to see how that helps the FISTS "cause" of "preserving" the Morse Code, since they didn't see their way clear to making a concerted effort to support the continuance of code testing requirements.

Once all the present FISTS members have worked each other enough times to earn their Diamond, Platinum, Zinc, Magnesium, and other elemental awards, I wonder what they'll do once they run out of new CW users to work on-the-air? With the reduction and soon to be total

elimination of code testing, that day will surely come.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1223. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:52:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bac8pbgpj0@208.207.71.161>
Source record: 67373
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > There are plenty of potential problems with with "channelization" on HF ham
> > bands, especially where frequency tolerance and specific maximum voice
> > bandwidths are mandated.
>
> > With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance with the
> > rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if correct?
> > Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods available to
> > most hams, is that going to be good enough?
>
> Zero beating against WWV should be more than good enough. Use
> the 5MHz WWV station, and if you find that your rig is off a bit, just
> note the error, and "mis-tune" yourself by the same error to null it
> out when operating these new allocations. This if your rig's manual
> doesn't describe how to adjust the rig to fix the error. Page 24 of
> my TS440SAT's manual tells how.

If that's how you calculate a frequency tolerance you're in as deep as the newbies
will be.

>
>
> > And what if it "seems to be off"?
> > Will most hams be able to adjust it accurately? Or even determine if it needs
> > adjusting? Send it to the factory for their opinion? What?
> >
> > And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal filter might be?
> > Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at the max? Really sure, now? It's
> > well known that crystals almost always drift a bit with aging.
>
> Not so far as to be a problem here.

So when you dial up 5331.6 how much within tolerance is your TS440?

>
>
> >
> > A typical filter contains several crystals. How do you know where yours cuts
> > off? Can you check it to be sure?
>

> We could check it on another band, and have someone several miles away
> (with the attenuator switched in on his receiver) check above and below
> the "channel" you're on. Most all rigs use an intermediate frequency for
> the SSB modulator and heterodyne that to the frequency you want to transmit
> on. So using another band to check it works fine for this.

And you still don' know the exact bandpass of your crystal filter. I doubt the FCC
will bother us on this issue, but you know how it is. Rulz is rulz.

>
>
> Besides, crystals are pretty reliable. How often do you find bad SSB
> other than those someone deliberately messed with on the air?
> And those are likely due to misadjusted linears.

Not the point. In this instance we hams are being held to commercial tolerance
standards when our gear was not designed nor built for it.

>
>
> The rigs the other users of 5Mhz use are likely to be quite similar to
> modern ham rigs except for how the user selects the channel. And that
> is just a microprocessor fetching a number from memory and loading the
> PLLs with it. My TS440SAT can be placed into such a mode with
> the "VFO/M" front panel key. So the big knob selects channels instead
> of incrementing or decrementing the frequency. It's all firmware
> differences here, the rest of the rig can be otherwise identical. The
> point here is that a modern ham rig should perform just as well as
> the rigs used by the other services around 5MHz.

And you *know* that all this means your TS440 meets the necessary tolerances, right?

1224. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 03:58:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EC9A7F8.2020806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67374

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 5/19/2003 10:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030519230736.14557.00000265@mb-m03.aol.com>
>
>
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>>
>>
>>>1. Why would a person ONLY do that? Are you making a strawman? A
>>>hypothetical Ham who doesn't do anything else but contest?
>>
>>No, just noticing what most Hams like to do.
>
>
> "Most Hams"...?!?!
>
> I don't keep exact tabs on all the contests or contest results, but I do
> notice that the results posts in QST and "CQ" Magazines hardly reflects
> anything even remotely like "most" Hams.

Good point Steve! I like to contest. Jim and Larry like CW. And Vipul
likes to whine........ ARS has something for everyone.

Maybe he'd be happier if QST had an award for that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

>
>>>2. I lose weight over field day. The calories used setting up,
>>>operating all night, and then tearing down and storing all the field day
>>>equipment use up huge numbers of calories.
>>
>>Thats one day.
>
>
> But that's one day more than you have, Vipul.
>
>
>>>>Furthermore, these activities lead to "celebrating" afterwards with food.
>>>>Often, the food is not healthy.
>>>
>>> Yeah, I think its the rf exposure that makes the brain crave bad food.
>>

>>Every antenna setup from my local club I've joined, they usually eat heavily
>>afterwards.
>
>
> I'd sure like to join that club! We just sweated a lot and had Cokes.
>
>
>>>Not from what I've seen. How many hamfests have you been to?
>>
>>Quite a few. All demographics seem the same each one.
>
>
> WHOA! Vippy, just a week or so ago you were at less than 10 or 12. Do you
> categorize that as "quite a few"?

Arguing wit dis one is like herdin' cats.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

1225. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 04:02:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520000253.14557.00000266@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67375

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> NO WHERE does it say ANYTHING like "this is the end all and be all" of
>emergency communications training.

He claimed it was skill building for emergency comm skills. I claimed it is
only incidental to emergency comm.

The goals are different. One gains emergency comm skills if one practices that.
That is not what contests give points for.

>>He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
>>emergency communications.
>
> And that statement would make you a liar, Vipul.

No, I claimed he understood the truth, but he was trying to mislead.

He made several posts insisting that contesting was skill building for
emergency comm. I point this out several times and he insists on it.

Any skill is chance correlation. No <responsible> person would say they are
useful for emergency comm. Picking out signals in a controlled situation is not
as useful for an emergency situation. Where is his demographics to determine
the INTENTIONS of contesters?

1226. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 04:08:50 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520000850.14557.00000268@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67376

From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net

> If the
>majority of hamming is paper chasing, contesting, awards, etc., then sobeit.

Yes, this is what most Hams like to do.

1227. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 04:22:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520002242.15462.00000131@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67378

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hf58lag.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 19 May 2003 06:05:38 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>> There are plenty of potential problems with with
>"channelization" on HF ham bands, especially where frequency
>tolerance and specific maximum voice bandwidths are mandated.
>
> Other than in the Amateur Radio Service, HF comms have been
> channelized for decades. Remember that we are secondary in
> the 60-m allocation. so we get to play by the "house rules"
> in that regard.

:-) It's a smaller "house" out in the suburbs where some of
the gods of radio dwell...

>>A great many older ham rigs, including PLL and other frequency
>>synthesized units, have drifted far enough to very likely be out
>>of tolerance For that matter, many fresh from the factory have
>>in the past been poorly adjusted. I know, no tolerance has yet
>>been published, but it's certain that if discrete frequency
>>channels are specified, a tolerance will also be.
>
> Are we being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 1990s'
> technological standards now?

More like 1970s' standards, perhaps earlier... :-)

>> In a frequency band that is never a problem, one station or
>>group of stations merely "zero beats" or tunes in the net control
>>or other station, and everyone is talking on the same
>>frequency-whatever each individual transmitter frequency readout
>>shows. With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance
>>with the rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if
>>correct?
>
> Interpretation of Sections 97.101(a) and 97.103(a) of the Rules
> puts the burden on the station operator and licensee to ensure
> that their operation complies with FCC Rules.
>
> Look at it this way - the FCC gave us five "mini-bands" to
> operate in.

Not enough for some... :-)

>>Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods
>>available to most hams, is that going to be good enough? And what
>>if it "seems to be off"? Will most hams be able to adjust it
>>accurately? Or even determine if it needs adjusting? Send it to
>>the factory for their opinion? What?
>
> Is the sound that I hear that of kicking or screaming?

He might have run out of boxes and packing material?

>> And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal
>>filter might be? Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at
>>the max? Really sure, now? It's well known that crystals almost
>>always drift a bit with aging. A typical filter contains several
>>crystals. How do you know where yours cuts off? Can you check it
>>to be sure?
>
> Hint -- the simple way is to either unsuppress the carrier
> or inject a single tone of known frequency. Measure the output
> (single rf frequency) of the rig (into a dummy load, of course).
>
> This will tell you what "dial offset" to use. Simple, eh what?
>
> If you can't rely on "reading the dial", get a good frequency
> counter. Even a "cheapie" 0.1 ppm counter will get you within
> 5 Hz at 5 MHz.

Yes. 0.1 PPM (or more properly 100 PPB) accuracy is equal
to 0.5 Hz at 5 MHz. The counter would be showing a correct
count to plus-minus the least significant digit.

Most "cheapie" frequency counters would have 1 to 5 PPM
accuracy leaving the factory. That's an error of only 5 to 25
Hz at 5 MHz. Most PLL or DDS-controlled transceivers
fine-tune in 10 Hz steps. 10 Hz is 2 PPM at 5 MHz.

The new 97.303 (s) rather clearly states "Amateur operators
shall ensure that their transmission occupies only the 2.8 KHz
centered around each of these frequencies." No need to go to
Part 2 for any reference although that should be useful (all
Parts are available free for download from the USGPO website
or via a link on the FCC website.

It should be a "no-brainer" to zero-beat a 5 or 10 MHz internal
TCXO or a transceiver againts a good WWV signal and trim
the crystal to within a 5 to 0.5 Hz beat. Problem is, too many
plug-and-play appliance operators never got farther in than the
front and rear panels and such a suggestion may be too
technical for those wizards of the airways. They just plugged
the box into the wall and played...no brains about the box's guts.

>> For that matter, channelization on ham radio is a new
>>precedent, as far as I know. Yes, "channels" have long been used

>>on VHF, but they have always been within authorized bands, and
>>violating a frequency tolerance was never an issue. At HF it's a
>>new concept entirely, within ham radio. I can forsee a lot of
>>outgoing mail from OO's and probably FCC also.
>
> Kicking or screaming ?

"Hams have always done it that way..." or something similar. :-)

1228. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 04:22:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520002246.15462.00000132@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67377

In article <bac5b9$971$0@208.207.71.175>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
>> >
>> > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
>> >
>> > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
>>
>> Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
>> finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
>> you were in that category, Dick.
>>
>> One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
>> the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
>> the rule tells you to be.
>>
>> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
>> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
>> channel.
>
> And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're
>discussing.

The emission type specified in the new 97.303 is "2K8J3E."
Not "FM." :-)

> Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do
>something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of
>technical convention.

Nope. Commercial "sideband" began in the 1930s. Amateur
"sideband" didn't start on its most-used mode ride until the late
1950s. By then the commercial and military "sideband" users
were well entrenched in their technical use and descriptions.

>SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and
>has been that way ever since.

Ahem...the dial indicator on most SSB-capable transceivers
using PLL or DDS frequency control is offset to the center of
the filter passband. Those will shift depending on upper or

lower sideband selected.

>It's the intelligent way to describe it.

No, it's just a convention. Legally it will be more proper to
specify band limits without regard to band width...and the rules
state to operate within those band limits.

>There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
>modes. The reason as I just described is obvious.

Amateur SSB is third on the long list of "sideband" users and
amateurs were among the last to adopt SSB wholeheartedly.
[small boat users may have been the last...] Amateurs were
never ever the first to use SSB.

>In fact, it is technically incorrect to do so.

Make up your mind. ?

>5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
>ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a
>fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be
>that way, in the face of technical accuracy.

Did you read R&O 03-105 and the new 97.303 content? Do so.
It is at the bottom of page 25 of the R&O released May 14, 2003.

Rather clear and explicit description of the five "mini-bands,"
allocated emission type and "transmission occupies only the
2.8 KHz centered around each of these frequencies."

> In the absense of a *very* good reason to change that attribute, it can
>only be regarded as a dumb rule that will cause lots of confusion and
>more importantly cause many, many radio frequency readouts to read
>incorrectly - that is, assuming their operators have been apprised of
>the ridiculous rule.

US civil radio regulations aren't driven by the conventions of
frequency displays on ready-built equipment in regards to
transmission of RF energy. The shift of frequency DISPLAY
is a user convenience convention...what concerns every other
user of the EM spectrum is the precise frequency of ANY
RF source.

> If that's intelligent I sure don't see it.

Pages 18 and 19 of R&O 03-105 list all the Commenters on
the NPRMs preceding the R&O. "Richard Carroll" was not on
that list.

> Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described
>as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
>face.

Nooooo. It's just against the way YOU want it to be.

You are thinking ONLY of single-channel SSB users and how a few manufacturers designed the ready-built transceivers YOU and thousands of others use (including the HF SSB transceivers now in use by small-boat owners). Try thinking of describing a commercial SSB spectral occupancy made up of four 3 KHz chunks, each one having modulation data that starts and ends in a 100 to 2800 KHz spectral distribution...the four taking up about 12 KHz of RF bandspace. :-) Those were there before amateurs were using "sideband" in large numbers.

You now HAVE five little mini-bands in a frequency area not available to amateurs before (at least since the end of WW2). Why are you bitching so mightily?

1229. Re: Dayton 03 trip report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 04:50:03 UTC
From: Bob <baseballwedge@mchsi.comNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <cqcjcvk4v846l2gf2e87n8j545acu94h7b@4ax.com>
Source record: 67379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 19 May 2003 22:55:30 -0400, "Dave Allan"
<Denny@kenallasaws.com> wrote:

> I agree, Dayton is a total waste of time and money, but it
>was entertaining watching all the obese fruit cakes trying to
>get bargain basement prices for quality equipment. I notice
>the body odor was very high this year, maybe high humidity,
>plus we alrady know most of the fruits go two weeks without
>a shower before attending Dayton.
>
>Dave

I'd like to see things from your point of view but I can't seem to get
my head that far up my ass.

1230. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 06:20:01 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <badfot$rmgv0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67396

How the hell does one learn CW??

Ryan KC8PMX

> > Consider this analogy: Should everyone who wants a driver's license be
> required
> > to learn how to drive stick-shift?
>
> But we'd still require people to learn CW, even if they have no
> intention of driving a stick...err, operating CW.
> I guess I should be thoroughly cowed by that logic, but it somehow
> fails to impress me.
>
>
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003
>
>

1231. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 07:48:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAEF5609.1B07B%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 67380

"No CW Test" wrote:
>
> How can this be?
>
> If true, it means that Len is WRONG!

Well, it means he was mistaken. It happens to all of us.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1232. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 07:51:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAEF56B7.1B07D%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 67381

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Must be the "New Beaurocracy" then. MY DD-214
> only says it is for separation from active duty.
> MY Honorable Discharge didn't arrive as a "DD-214"
> but as another certificate and then four years
> later by mail in 1960.

Yep, she got the wall certificate also - in a real cheap green padded vinyl display folder. It says "Honorable Discharge."

On the DD-214 (Nov 88 printing), where is says "Character of Service" towards the bottom of the page, it says "Honorable." Just below that, it says "Separation Code," with "JFL" typed into that block. Finally, just below that, it says "Narrative Reason for Separation" with "Disability, Severance Pay" typed in.

My DD-214 (Nov 72 printing) says nothing about "Narrative Reason for Separation." Towards the top, it just says type of separation and character of service.

> Keep up the good work on that SSB VHF transceiver
> design...

Actually, a friend gave me an older transceiver that doesn't work and I'm trying to restore that at this point. Since it looks like I'll have to replace a good amount of the guts, I should learn a lot just from this. I wish I could get a schematic, but it doesn't have a name or model number on it. I have no idea who made it. Perhaps I should post a picture of it on the internet to see if anyone recognizes it. But, before I can do that, I have to get that darn camera working again. One of these days, I suppose.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1233. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 07:58:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305192358.62a016a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67382
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Chuck / KE4ETH" <chuck_hawks@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<Rd7ya.108771$cg.20815@fe10.atl2.webusenet.com>...
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3EC86CDA.8CE9DCE6@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > I just realized that a beam for 5Mhz would be absurd......
> > >
> > > Too big!
> > >
> > > :-)
> >
> > Be easier to turn the Earth under it. <HI>

Be careful here, hams have done some monstrous beams and still do 'em.
Right here in this neighborhood k3jh/n3ea (SK) had a fullsize
two-element 3.5 Mhz quad up even back in the '60s. That's a quad with
540+ feet of rotatable wires. And he spun it with an old WW2
prop-pitch motor. Without having to turn the earth at all.

>
> Chuck
> KE4ETH

w3rv

1234. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 11:21:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520072146.18833.00000002@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67383

>Subject: Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/19/2003 11:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520000850.14557.00000268@mb-m03.aol.com>
>
>From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
>> If the
>>majority of hamming is paper chasing, contesting, awards, etc., then sobeit.
>
>Yes, this is what most Hams like to do.

Another idiotic statement.

If that's what "most Hams" like to do, then why aren't award numbers in the HUNDREDS of thousands, rather than a few dozens? There's over 600,000 Amateurs in the United States alone, several million worldwide.

DXCC has been around since about 1936. Yet my DXCC award, earned in 2000, is only about 37000.

Do you enjoy making yourself look so silly in public, Vipul? If so, why not get a bit more instant gratification and just sit on a public bus with a dunce cap on and your finger up your nose?

Steve, K4CAP

1235. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 11:31:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520073115.18833.00000003@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67384

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/19/2003 11:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520000253.14557.00000266@mb-m03.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>> NO WHERE does it say ANYTHING like "this is the end all and be all" of
>>emergency communications training.
>
>He claimed it was skill building for emergency comm skills. I claimed it is
>only incidental to emergency comm.

That's because you do not know any better nor have any experience to draw
an informed opinion from.

>The goals are different. One gains emergency comm skills if one practices
>that.
>That is not what contests give points for.

The goals may be different, but it's the same objective...The rapid,
accurate exchange of precisely accurate information. The "contest" nature adds
the stress factor that one is under in "an emergency".

>>>He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
>>>emergency communications.
>>
>> And that statement would make you a liar, Vipul.
>
>No, I claimed he understood the truth, but he was trying to mislead.

He's not misleading anything. His statements were clear and concise. It
appears YOU are the only one having a problem. This is no doubt due to your
handicapp of English not being your antive language.

>He made several posts insisting that contesting was skill building for
>emergency comm. I point this out several times and he insists on it.

BECAUSE HE'S RIGHT, VIPUL!

>Any skill is chance correlation.

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! !
! ! ! !

No <responsible> person would say they are
>useful for emergency comm.

Again, this is becasue you don't know any better. You have NO experience base from which to draw on.

>Picking out signals in a controlled situation is not
>as useful for an emergency situation.

What "controlled situation"...?!?! Again, you prove your ignorance of both contesting and truely emergent situations.

>Where is his demographics to determine
>the INTENTIONS of contesters?

BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

It's not about what contesters "intentions" are, Vippy.

Assinine....Absolutely assinine...

Steve, K4CAP

1236. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 11:33:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520073314.18833.00000004@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67385

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>Date: 5/20/2003 2:48 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BAEF5609.1B07B%stewart@say.net>

>"No CW Test" wrote:
>>
>> How can this be?
>>
>> If true, it means that Len is WRONG!
>
>
> Well, it means he was mistaken. It happens to all of us

However some people take personal pride in trying to foist errors upon
others as "factual". Such is the realm of Lennie.

Steve, K4CAP

1237. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 11:56:53 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bad52b$ek4$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67570

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote

> Hello again Robert .... well I for one am not going to get involved in
this
> "proficiency" discussion.

Hehehe...actually, this _isn't_ a proficiency discussion, although
it's been neatly diverted in that direction.

>BTW Robert I see no positives in bashing any class op

Just to be clear, I'm not bashing CW, and I've seen very little of
that (until somebody gets their back to the wall on the real issue). It's
the _requirement_ that's at issue, as far as I'm concerned.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1238. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 12:01:54 UTC
From: Mark Mansfield <mmansfield@serepcoordsinc.org>
Message-ID: <bad5fpgjh0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67387
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message:

> > There are plenty of potential problems with with
> "channelization" on HF ham bands, especially where frequency
> tolerance and specific maximum voice bandwidths are mandated.
>
> Other than in the Amateur Radio Service, HF comms have been
> channelized for decades. Remember that we are secondary in
> the 60-m allocation. so we get to play by the "house rules"
> in that regard.

Not true! Broad & Sweeping generalizations like this are
generally always wrong. The U.S. military does not follow
any broad & sweeping channel plan.

>
> >A great many older ham rigs, including PLL and other frequency
> >synthesized units, have drifted far enough to very likely be out
> >of tolerance For that matter, many fresh from the factory have
> >in the past been poorly adjusted. I know, no tolerance has yet
> >been published, but it's certain that if discrete frequency
> >channels are specified, a tolerance will also be.
>
> Are we being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 1990s'
> technological standards now?

You need to get up to speed. You are living in a 1960s
time warp in the 21st century.

>
> > In a frequency band that is never a problem, one station or
> >group of stations merely "zero beats" or tunes in the net control
> >or other station, and everyone is talking on the same
> >frequency-whatever each individual transmitter frequency readout
> >shows. With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance
> >with the rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if
> >correct?
>
> Interpretation of Sections 97.101(a) and 97.103(a) of the Rules
> puts the burden on the station operator and licensee to ensure
> that their operation complies with FCC Rules.

Today's incoming no code tech has a reading comprehension
down near the 3rd grad level. But enough to memorize the
answers in the Radio Shack License Guide. Good Luck!

>
> Look at it this way - the FCC gave us five "mini-bands" to
> operate in.

Duuuhhh, mini-band?

>
> >Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods
> >available to most hams, is that going to be good enough? And what
> >if it "seems to be off"? Will most hams be able to adjust it
> >accurately? Or even determine if it needs adjusting? Send it to
> >the factory for their opinion? What?
>
> Is the sound that I hear that of kicking or screaming?

Do you operate on 14313?

>
> > And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal
> >filter might be? Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at
> >the max? Really sure, now? It's well known that crystals almost
> >always drift a bit with aging. A typical filter contains several
> >crystals. How do you know where yours cuts off? Can you check it
> >to be sure?
>
> Hint -- the simple way is to either unsuppress the carrier
> or inject a single tone of known frequency. Measure the output
> (single rf frequency) of the rig (into a dummy load, of course).

Hint -- No code techs. are unaware of any frequencies beyond
CB and two meters.

>
> This will tell you what "dial offset" to use. Simple, eh what?

Is that Freeband?

>
> If you can't rely on "reading the dial", get a good frequency
> counter. Even a "cheapie" 0.1 ppm counter will get you within
> 5 Hz at 5 MHz.

Tell me more...

>
> > For that matter, channelization on ham radio is a new
> >precedent, as far as I know. Yes, "channels" have long been used
> >on VHF, but they have always been within authorized bands, and
> >violating a frequency tolerance was never an issue. At HF it's a
> >new concept entirely, within ham radio. I can forsee a lot of
> >outgoing mail from OO's and probably FCC also.
>
> Kicking or screaming ?

Standard English?

>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>

Good DX,

Mark Mansfield, (G-821A)
Tech Rep. Spec. Ops, Army 52 area
Frequency Coordinator, SW Operating Zone

1239. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 12:02:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECA1662.92FB79F0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67386

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> >Dave never claimed that it helped build ALL the skills you need. It does
> >build some of the skills.
>
> You should re read his post. He claimed contesting is skill building for
> emergency comm.

He did not claim or imply that contesting is only skill building for
emergency communications.

> On several occasions, he implied contesting is equivalent to emergency
> communications.

No, he did not.

> He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
> emergency communications.

No, he did not.

Perhaps, Vipul, you need to do the re-reading.

Dave K8MN

1240. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 12:03:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECA1746.9E2E846A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67388

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4CAP (formerly K4YZ):
>
> >So, Vipul, if Amateur Radio leads to obesity, what happened?
>
> I never said ALL Hams are fat. Just that a greater percentage than the general
> population.

Yes, you have written that several times. You aren't a guy to let facts
stand in the way of a good troll.

> Some people can eat more and not gain weight.

Thank you, Doctor Shah.

> If you are in a hobby that tends to use less exercise, people eat more, and
> engage in anti-social behaviour, a greater percentage of these people will be
> fat.

Just for grins, please demonstrate how communicating with others can be
considered anti-social. While you'e at it, why not give a stab at
enlightening us on the relationship between anti-social behavior and
weight.

Dave K8MN

1241. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 12:14:42 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bad63l$f33$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67569

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote

[I wrote: >>]

> "Packet Radio may very well enhance the
> > survivability of digital communications and the internet in the event of
> > catastrophe." Hurray, and "So what?" Should everybody be required to be
> able
> > to set up a node? Hardly, no more than they should be required to fiddle
> > about with CW.
>
> Bob I cringe at the prospects of this happening on a national level
.....
> either we will shine as Americans and people in general or degenerate
into
> what is happening in other parts of the world ....I wish I knew the
answer.

Not sure which you're talking about - dropping CW?

>
>
>
> You can require CW until the end of time, but if nobody's
> > interested,
>
> Glittering generality ..... nobody I guess all the thousands of stations I
> have worked over the years were either my imagination or non interested
ops.

You miss the point - what's happening _now_? How many people are
upgrading their licenses? How many people are _learning_ CW?

> I had a chat with a fellow on 2 meters one day on this same point. He
> repeatedly told me nobody operates CW with all the modern modes out there.
> I had asked if he had tuned about for several nights with good propagation
> on his HF rx in the CW bands. No reply ... I suggested that he try and
see
> for himself. Granted I feel that there are not the number of staions out
> there that used to be on in general but you really can't tell that on a
> contest weekend. BTW which I avoid.

Which indicates that the ARS is, (excepting the Technician class) at
best, stagnant, if not actually declining.

>
> it's irrelevant how grand it is, or how reliable it is, or

> > anything else. Heck, you'd probably get more licensees working this
> question
> > backwards. Let 'em get on HF and maybe _that'll_ give 'em the CW bug.
> >
>
> With what Bob ?? ... SSB ...digital ...etc with out even the least bit
of
> ......gee I hate this word ....profeciency with CW.

Why not? Without the least bit of knowledge of CW, I've operated HF teletype over 1KW, encrypted; cut tapes, caught the sked, did all the things necessary as supervisor of radio room, including working other modes over the whole spectrum - VLF to UHF on the boat and VHF to SHF on shore duty, AM and FM phone, FSK, PSK, encrypted voice and teletype, you name it. Whenever I went to learn anything about radio systems (operating anywhere in the spectrum) nobody ever asked me if I knew CW, or implied that knowing it was somehow beneficial to my ability to operate the equipment or run the shack, nor is it (or was) a prerequisite for any of the tech schools I went to.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

1242. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 12:25:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECA1BD1.FEAB1E8F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67389

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> DXCC has been around since about 1936. Yet my DXCC award, earned in 2000,
> is only about 37000.

Mine, from the mid-1970's is in the 17,000 range. Don't forget that
DXCC was started over again after WWII.

Dave K8MN

1243. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 12:26:46 UTC
From: Mark Mansfield <mmansfield@serepcoordsinc.org>
Message-ID: <bad6ueitv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67390
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bac7cg$e13$0@208.207.71.161...
>
>>
>
> Been there for awhile, haven't we? I worked there for a full commercial
> career. But that certainly doesn't make it a good thing for ham radio.
> Ham gear has never been subject to strict tolerances as has commercial
> and othre non-ham gear. So now we get to play by commercial tolerance
> rules, eh? That's a good thing for ham radio? Not in my book.

Not in my book either!

>
>
>
> But it would give me a use for my 100watt Motorola Micom crystal
> controlled HF transciever! Maybe I'll crystal it up for 60 meters!
> But when I order crystals, it'll have to be for frequencies 1.4 kc below
> the authorized frequency. Only a Federal bureaucracy could screw things
> up that badly, sorry!
>
>
But not just any bureaucracy. The gross mismanagement and
incompetence spewing out of the FCC in the last few years
shows an agency in disarray, out of control and out of touch with
reality. Managers are paranoid about job protection and totally
absorbed in watching their back, while they delegate high management
level tasks out to very junior inexperienced people who cannot
figure out what a Hertz is, let alone a frequency allocation! What
we are seeing is an agency imploding into itself. Embroiled in
internal bickering and politics. I look for the agency to be sliced
and diced in the near future. Already there are rumblings of this
at very high levels.

73,

Mark Mansfield, P.E.

1244. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 12:39:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA21E9.6070301@psu.edu>
Source record: 67391

Ron \"Stompin\" James wrote:
> Which Dayton hamfest did you attend? Because you did
> not attend the same one I did!
>
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu...
>
>>I had a blast at Dayton, and thought I'd share some thoughts on it.
>>
>>I showed up Friday morning, and after registering, hit the flea market.
>>I was surprised at how big it was. Friday morning was also quite busy
>>outside. I think most people saw the weekend forecast and decided that
>>Friday was the day.
>>
>
>
> Flea market was bad news and much smaller than previous
> years. Prices were outrageous for the same junk idiots haul
> from fest to fest.

This is America man. No price controls. The seller can ask what they
want, and if you don't like it, keep on walkin'.

>
>>I was looking for a linear amp, and found quite a few for sale. Lots of
>>Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found
>>a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the
>>face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker,
>>but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.
>
>
> There were many amps, but they were all for CB. Very few
> ham amps, and as expected, the sellers had wild ideas of what
> they were worth.

This statement makes me wonder if you were there. I had my choice of
maybe 20 amplifiers, several SB200's to choose from. I only saw one amp
that was of the CB variety.

>>I didn't want to lug that thing around, so I went out to the bus. What
>>this leads up to is "Take the bus!" I am amazed at how much better the
>>bus is compared to the parking lot at Hara's. Just a couple hundred foot
>>walk to the bus, then a couple more hundred to my van, and a lot of
>>steps saved. And 2 dollars versus 8 dollars a day leaves me with money
>>to spend on better things than parking. Also the parking lot was a muddy

>>mess due to all the rain. So Then I hop back on the bus to go back up to
>>Hara's.
>
>
> If you want to be in the boondocks, the bus is fine, I guess.

Also mskes me wonder if you were there. The bus trip was less than 5
minutes wach way.

>>Saturday was wet. Since it was forecast to rain, I planned on Saturday
>>as an inside day. I got lots of goodies from the commercial vendors
>>then. The rain slacked off, and I went back outside to try a deal on a
>>KW tuner I was eyeing to go along with the new amp. Guy wouldn't budge
>>on the price, so he got to keep it.
>>
>
>
> Yeah, that's right, nobody would budge on prices on anything.
> Goodies from vendors? You call all those slick color flyers
> goodies?

No, I call a new Heil headset/mic goodies and new batteries and a
charger for my H-T, and other things like that goodies.

>>Sunday was just a hang-out day, and to see if any flea market bargains
>>cropped up.
>
>
> Same as day before, same junk, same high prices. Same obese
> slobs wanting outrageous prices for same junk they haul around all
> year to hamfests.

This is still America, last time I checked.

>>Now for the thoughts on the trip. I find it amusing that some hams here
>>and elsewhere gripe about the obese, bizarre, and smelly hams that some
>>obsess over. There were a few there to be sure. But not all that many.
>>So in fairness to the gripers, I saw:
>
>
> Every other ham was obese and stunk!

You really weren't there, were ya?

<snippage>

>>The guys with the weird hats were no different than the people who go
>>to football games and wear cheese wedge hats, or paint their chests in
>>team colors. In fact they are less goofy IMO.
>>
>
>
> Except the hams dress like that every day, whereas the sports fans

> only do it at games.

right.

>
>
>>And I don't favor picking on the obese.
>
>
> Are you a liberal?

Not even close. Are you French?

<snippage>

- Mike -

1245. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 13:01:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA2726.1080702@psu.edu>
Source record: 67393

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>
>>1. Why would a person ONLY do that? Are you making a strawman? A
>>hypothetical Ham who doesn't do anything else but contest?
>
>
> No, just noticing what most Hams like to do.

Whether or not you know it, you just answered my question.

>>2. I lose weight over field day. The calories used setting up,
>>operating all night, and then tearing down and storing all the field day
>>equipment use up huge numbers of calories.
>
>
> Thats one day.

Nothing stops my being active after that either.

By the way, it isn't one day. We set up Friday night. We come back
Saturday and operate from the start of the contest through Sunday to the
end of the contest. I would hav thought that someone who knows enough
about Hams to be so judgemental would have already known that.

>
>>>Furthermore, these activities lead to "celebrating" afterwards with food.
>>>Often, the food is not healthy.
>>
>> Yeah, I think its the rf exposure that makes the brain crave bad food.
>
>
> Every antenna setup from my local club I've joined, they usually eat heavily
> afterwards.

We have a picnic during Saturday evening. The people who have done
setup do indeed eat well. But if you spend the day pounding stakes,
putting up tents and radios, and all the other stuff involved in a
high-key field day, you can get away with eating a lot.

>>Not from what I've seen. How many hamfests have you been to?
>
>
> Quite a few. All demographics seem the same each one.

Well, so have I. I think our opposite reactions say more about us than it does about the hamfest attendees. If you want to be so negative, then it's your right.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1246. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 13:03:27 UTC
From: Shephed <roll1up@smkey.com>
Message-ID: <zIpya.57792$VP.15208894@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 67392

Great post Mike,
My deal of the day on Friday was a very clean Icom IC-551, $165.00.

All in all, this year was fun and I can't wait until next year.

73
Dan, N8IE

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu...
> I had a blast at Dayton, and thought I'd share some thoughts on it.
>
> I showed up Friday morning, and after registering, hit the flea market.
> I was surprised at how big it was. Friday morning was also quite busy
> outside. I think most people saw the weekend forecast and decided that
> Friday was the day.
>
> I was looking for a linear amp, and found quite a few for sale. Lots of
> Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found
> a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the
> face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker,
> but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.
>
> I didn't want to lug that thing around, so I went out to the bus. What
> this leads up to is "Take the bus!" I am amazed at how much better the
> bus is compared to the parking lot at Hara's. Just a couple hundred foot
> walk to the bus, then a couple more hundred to my van, and a lot of
> steps saved. And 2 dollars versus 8 dollars a day leaves me with money
> to spend on better things than parking. Also the parking lot was a muddy
> mess due to all the rain. So Then I hop back on the bus to go back up to
> Hara's.
>
> Saturday was wet. Since it was forecast to rain, I planned on Saturday
> as an inside day. I got lots of goodies from the commercial vendors
> then. The rain slacked off, and I went back outside to try a deal on a
> KW tuner I was eyeing to go along with the new amp. Guy wouldn't budge
> on the price, so he got to keep it.
>
> Sunday was just a hang-out day, and to see if any flea market bargains
> cropped up.
>
>
> Now for the thoughts on the trip. I find it amusing that some hams here
> and elsewhere gripe about the obese, bizarre, and smelly hams that some
> obsess over. There were a few there to be sure. But not all that many.
> So in fairness to the gripers, I saw:

>
> The dude with the miniature tower and three element beam on a hard hat.
>
> The "Jungle Jim" guy who was wearing a pith helmet, a flowery shirt
> that looked more like it was designed for his wife, and didn't change
> nor shower all weekend.
>
> A few amazingly obese guys.
>
> A few amazingly old guys.
>
>
> BUT! They were very much the exception. As my first Dayton Hamvention,
> I was keeping an eye out for the attendees, and found that in addition
> to these characters I pointed out, that there were:
>
> Quite a few young hams in attendance. Many brought their young lady
> friends.
>
> Female hams. The percentage was about what I expected. Not high, but
> still there. This has been my experience in most technical fields, which
> seem to have trouble attracting women. But the ones who were there were
> happy enough to be there.
>
> Normal looking hams with their normal looking families.
>
> There were a fair amount of attractive ladies there. Not only the
> ladies in the booths, but also walking about in the crowd.
>
>
> African American Hams. I didn't keep a count, but there ware a
> significant number.
>
> All in all, I'd say that it looked like a normal cross-section of people.
>
> The guys with the weird hats were no different than the people who go
> to football games and wear cheese wedge hats, or paint their chests in
> team colors. In fact they are less goofy IMO.
>
> And I don't favor picking on the obese.
>
> Soooo, the only person I took real exception was the smelly guy.
> Everyone can take a shower once in a while.
>
>
> Final score: Regular people I saw: 10's of thousands
>
>
> People who really need to clean up their act: 1
>

>
> Personally, I think that when people gripe and complain about the
> obese, smelly, old, nerdy, weird, all male, all white, antisocial hams,
> they are saying a lot more about themselves than they say about those
> they denigrate.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

1247. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 13:08:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA28D0.8060802@psu.edu>
Source record: 67395

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030519225729.14557.00000262@mb-m03.aol.com...
>
>>From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>>>Dave never claimed that it helped build ALL the skills you need. It does
>>>build some of the skills.
>>
>>You should re read his post. He claimed contesting is skill building for
>>emergency comm.
>
>
> I read his posts very carefully. My statement still stands. He never
> claimed that it builds all the skills one needs.
>
>
>>On several occasions, he implied contesting is equivalent to emergency
>>communications.
>
>
> Nope, he never said that either. He just said it is valuable in building
> skills.
>
>
>>He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
>>emergency communications.
>
>
> You will need to provide a direct quote from his postings to substantiate
> that. There was no such statement in any of his postings that I saw.

Can't be done, because Dave didn't say that. He did say, and I agree, that contesting enhances your ability to make an accurate QSO, taking and giving information. I think he may have noted that there is an endurance characteristic that is applied also. If not, I'm saying it now.

What contesting doesn't do is train someone to keep their wits about them in stressful situations. That is something that is hard to train for. Some aspects can be trained by repetitive and rote activities, but that only goes so far. If novel situations come up, and they do, then a person who can think clearly under stress is needed. And I don't know if that can be trained.

Now watch Vipul answer this with a one line - "no it doesn't".

- Mike KB3EIA -

1248. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 13:15:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA2A63.8080202@psu.edu>
Source record: 67394

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>>NO WHERE does it say ANYTHING like "this is the end all and be all" of
>>emergency communications training.
>
>
> He claimed it was skill building for emergency comm skills. I claimed it is
> only incidental to emergency comm.
>
> The goals are different. One gains emergency comm skills if one practices that.
> That is not what contests give points for.

Hey Vipul. I asked you to come up with another method of training for
emergency communications. Haven't heard back yet.

We've gone over with you exactly *why* it does train you for emerency
ops, so I'm not going to reiterate.

So tell us what does.....

>
>>>He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
>>>emergency communications.
>>
>> And that statement would make you a liar, Vipul.
>
>
> No, I claimed he understood the truth, but he was trying to mislead.
>
> He made several posts insisting that contesting was skill building for
> emergency comm. I point this out several times and he insists on it.
>
> Any skill is chance correlation. No <responsible> person would say they are
> useful for emergency comm. Picking out signals in a controlled situation is not
> as useful for an emergency situation. Where is his demographics to determine
> the INTENTIONS of contesters?

Controlled situation? You find contesting a controlled situation? What
contests have you operated in?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1249. Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 15:01:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA4360.4040708@psu.edu>
Source record: 67397

Hey Jim,

Am I right that you have an Elecraft K2? I saw one and spoke with the rep about it at Dayton, and was very impressed with it.

I was just wondering what you though of the thing. It seems like an exceptional value.

- mike KB3EIA -

1250. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 15:13:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA461F.2040003@psu.edu>
Source record: 67398

garigue wrote:
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message

<some snippage>

>> And most of those keys are a far cry from Mr. Morse's original, as
>>is the modern equipment used in digital modes.
>
>
>
> Huh ???? make and break was make and break at the big bang just as it will
> be when we collapse back to that grain sized mass ....

I'de like to see someone send Morse with a knife switch........

<more snippage>

> Is ham radio CW ???? ....dare I say that ham radio is electronics ????? I
> think that this is where we as a group generally fall into the trap of turf
> be it CW or Phone or digital or contests or DX or building or QRP or
> antennas or public service etc ....It is none of these things exclusively
> but the sum total. Should we hit the "unwashed" newcomer with a technical
> test that will challange a 1st year EE student. Yes why not ...give it to
> em ... make him worthy to put his rig on the air and kill ham radio as sure
> as increasing the CW test to 35 WPM. There is a real sense of elitism that
> I see from some hams regarding the next fellows "electronic savy". I look
> at the service and ticket as an entry to learn and grow.

There you have it. The qualifying tests are a beginning, not an end. We should all keep on learning, but the best way to learn is to Get on the air.

I wonder how many hams like the idea of having to know more than THEY already do in order to get a ticket.

Good post Tom.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1251. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 15:15:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA46A2.9030804@psu.edu>
Source record: 67399

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>In article <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
>>>manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense as
>>>requiring them to show proficiency at CW.
>>>
>>
>>There's no way the current 5 wpm code test can be reasonably called a
>>demonstration of "proficiency". Basic skills, yes, but not proficiency.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> More accurately, VERY basic skills.

Sure enough, Dick. After getting the basics, they should be able to get
on th eair, and increas their skills as needed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1252. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 16:10:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305200810.db9a995@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67400

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3EC97F5B.3010700@adelphia.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Yes, they were very inexpensive in their time.

In 2003 dollars, anyway. Back when they were new, it was a different story.

> I got the thing for very little money.

And they say there's no bargains at Dayton?
>
> > Still a good solid amp. Worse comes to worse, you can tear it apart, clean
> > up the pieces, replace anything that's out of spec and rebuild it according
> > to the manual.
>
> This one has pretty new tubes, has been re-capped, and I have to check
> to see what other mods might have been made.

Always a good idea. Might want to re-diode it, too. Cheap insurance.

Is it an SB-200 or SB-201?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1253. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 16:12:01 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <badk4h$a4o$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 67401

Mike Coslo wrote:

> The qualifying tests are a beginning, not an end.

Well that is where the outlook has changed rather drastically in the past decade or so. Prior to that shift in attitude, evidently designed to be all-inclusie ans to be sure that no potential ham, no matter how unlearned, ever feels "left out" because of his lack of knowledge. And for sure we don't want to scare anyone away by informing him that he will be required to actually study and show evidence of having done so.

Back in those golden times the entry level exams were indeed known as, well entry level. Beyond that one was expectred to show that he had indeed advanced.

Ham radio, we hardly knew ye.

1254. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 16:40:17 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <temkcvcj8pguq9u833t386kv6lstlsgm2s@4ax.com>
Source record: 67402
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I calculate a quarter-wave antenna for 5 millihertz to be roughly 9 million miles long.

What did I miss?

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1255. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 16:43:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305200843.4d4b1bc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67403

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030519235058.17796.00000139@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <20030518142454.24390.00000101@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> >>I enjoy *occasional*
> >>competitive operation. However, I'm not interested in a steady diet of it.
> >
> >Try 7035 kHz
> >
> >>Unfortunately, organizations like 10-10 and FISTS are shoving this
> particular
> >>"diet" down my throat.
> >
> >As I said before, I dunno about this 10-10 stuff, but I've never felt any
> >pressure from FISTS folks
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >FISTS #4360
>
> Jim:
>
> Perhaps I've been a bit overzealous in my inclusion of FISTS in this
> particular thread, but my personal take on FISTS is that they appear
> to be more interested in paper-chasing than in seeking the goal which
> their organization espouses -- the "Preservation of Morse Code."

Seems quite the opposite to me. The awards are just one facet of the
org. I don't have any of 'em, yet.

> Nancy Kott, WZ8C, the North American Secretary of the FISTS CW
> Club, made an impressive showing at the ARRL "Town Hall" forum at
> the 1997 Dayton Hamvention. She essentially demolished Fred Maia,
> W5YI, in open debate on the issue of code testing.

Six years ago. Does anybody have a transcript or a recording?

> She gained a
> great deal of momentum that day, but once she got the train rolling,
> she immediately seemed to jump off. There was nothing said thereafter
> from a standpoint of mobilizing "political" action on the part of the
> FISTS membership to attempt to counter the trend toward the
> reduction and eventual elimination of code testing requirements. I
> guess I felt more than a little bit let down by that.

As I understand it, the decision was made to focus on preserving the CODE, not the TEST. Several reasons:

- at least some FISTS members and prospective members support the code but oppose the test

- they would need to have an elected board and officers in order to represent the membership

- the basis and purpose of FISTS is, after all, to preserve the code itself, not any particular test or testing level. Political action to "save the test" could be seen as an admission that without the test, code use among hams will die out. Which simply gives anti-code and anti-test folks another argument.

The keys (pun intended) to preserving Morse Code are to use it, teach it, demonstrate it and most of all share the fun. That's what FISTS is all about.

Look at the other digital modes and their proponents. Did they need a test to get folks to use those modes?

> Since then, FISTS
> has become little more than a CW Awards Program.

Not from where I sit. Code Buddys, newsletters, and just general camaraderie are all parts of it. Exchanging FISTS numbers is just part of the game.

> I guess I fail to
> see how that helps the FISTS "cause" of "preserving" the Morse Code,
> since they didn't see their way clear to making a concerted effort to
> support the continuance of code testing requirements.

See above. Do you really think Morse will die out if the test goes away? I don't.
>
> Once all the present FISTS members have worked each other enough
> times to earn their Diamond, Platinum, Zinc, Magnesium, and other
> elemental awards, I wonder what they'll do once they run out of new
> CW users to work on-the-air?

I've been using Morse Code on the ham bands since 1967 and I haven't run out of new folks to work yet.

> With the reduction and soon to be total
> elimination of code testing, that day will surely come.

Maybe - or maybe not.

You should have been around back in the '60s and early '70s. Back then, most of the hams I knew in this area (southern EPA, SNJ, northeastern MD and DE) had two kinds of rigs: HF SSB transceivers and VHF AM rigs. Almost all of the HF SSB transceivers of that time did a really poor job on CW - no narrow filter, no RIT, AGC on all the time.

Some did not even include CW at all. The VHF rigs were even worse. It was as if the manufacturers were trying to kill off CW by not making decent rigs for the mode.

If a ham wanted a good CW rig, he/she had to either buy separates (Collins 75S/32S, Drake R4/T4, Heath SB-300/400, various older used rigs), do extensive mods, or build a rig. I did the latter. The only folks who had QSK were those who homebrewed or modified their rigs to have it. I did that too.

It wasn't till Ten Tec and Ikensu that transceivers capable of serious CW work began to show up on the market.

Yet through all that, CW use survived and grew. It will continue to do so if we promote it, support it and demonstrate it. Test or no test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1256. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 16:49:42 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3ECA5CA6.56B3B98D@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 67404
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mark Mansfield wrote:

> Today's incoming no code tech has a reading comprehension
> down near the 3rd grad level. But enough to memorize the
> answers in the Radio Shack License Guide. Good Luck!

You would make a good elder. NOT!

> Hint -- No code techs. are unaware of any frequencies beyond
> CB and two meters.

You have a very poor outlook of the very people now coming in to bolster
the ranks of the dying hams. I guess you think CW is the end all. If one
doesn't know code, they are stupid. Ham radio does not need you. Good-bye.

P.S. All the new techs over here know much more then that. They like
6 meters, too. The best of both worlds, HF & VHF in one band! IRLP
is fun for a day or so, then one wants real DX again...

1257. What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 16:53:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECA5D81.3080702@psu.edu>
Source record: 67405

What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into the service now?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1258. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 17:21:27 UTC
From: K3UD <K3UD@charter.net>
Message-ID: <20052003122127709O%K3UD@charter.net>
Source record: 67406

In article <c2356669.0305010808.42290432@posting.google.com>, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:

> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
> As of April 30, 2003:
>
> Novice - 34,679 (decrease of 14,650)
> Technician - 254,333 (increase of 48,939)
> Technician Plus - 69,433 (decrease of 59,458)
> General - 140,662 (increase of 28,173)
> Advanced - 83,690 (decrease of 16,092)
> Extra - 103,908 (increase of 25,158)
> Total - 686,862 (increase of 12,070)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Annualized growth rate: 0.6%.
Projected decade growth rate: 6%
At least there is still a positive growth rate.

73
George
K3UD

1259. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 19:52:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf70tsn.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 20 May 2003 02:53:29 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described
>as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
>face.

Have it YOUR way, HAVE it your way.... (music courtesy of
Burger King ads).

Go ahead, Dick, be contrary to the way that the rest of the
comunications regulatory profession does things.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1260. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 19:52:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf71i1p.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 20 May 2003 08:26:46 -0400, Mark Mansfield wrote:

>I look for the agency to be sliced and diced in the near future.
>Already there are rumblings of this at very high levels.

I've been advocating that almost from the time I started --
separate the technical and enforcement "spectrum cops" from the
politicians, license-granters, and deal-makers. The Congress
really wants to pull the strings on the latter and couldn't
care less about the former.

Canada did that a long time ago (CRTC / Industry Canada) and it
works very well.

Can't happen too soon. At least I know that I ran MY shop properly.

--
73 de Phil Kane P.E. - K2ASP

1261. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 19:52:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf713no.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 20 May 2003 03:28:16 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>And again, you're an engineer and you and I know how to do all this. How
>many new Generals do you think picked up all this information enroute
>through the Question Pools?

They're going to have to learn quickly, one way or the
other......just like we had to learn.

>You can bet the farm there'll be a bunch of hams sitting on the posted
>frequency, not down 1.4khz.

Ditto.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1262. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 21:52:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520175222.15079.00000042@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67410

From: K3UD K3UD@charter.net

>Annualized growth rate: 0.6%.
>Projected decade growth rate: 6%
>At least there is still a positive growth rate.
>

Not if you factor in Interest, Taxes, Depreciation, and Amortization.

You're better off with the bank.

1263. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 23:06:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520190623.15079.00000055@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67411

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is
>coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into
>the service now?

I assume you are not talking about military service.

Hams do not think everyone who comes into the ARS is an idiot. Hams often encourage thier children to become Hams and show them how to operate well. I must admit, some of them seem to know what they are doing. This is a result of interest and practice.

Idiots do not join the ARS. If they do not have the skills, they can practice them.

Some join to become utility Hams. Hams that just use amateur radio for utility communications. For example, to save money on phone bill or to only use APRS and do nothing else with it.

Others join to become appliance operators. This is a step above the utility Ham. It is basically the same thing, except these Hams use several modes for fun also.

Others do service activities/emergency communications.

Some write programs and build circuits.

There are also other uses.

Only if local clubs do not encourage participation, do people not become useful. Such as meetings to discuss what one did and not include others. Then, the ARS suffers.

1264. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 23:26:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECAB989.4FDD5748@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67412
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 20 May 2003 02:53:29 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described
> >as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
> >face.
>
> Have it YOUR way, HAVE it your way.... (music courtesy of
> Burger King ads).
>
> Go ahead, Dick, be contrary to the way that the rest of the
> comunications regulatory profession does things.
>

Does it really matter how the channel is specified? How many people know what the frequencies of broadcast TV channel 4 are? Or conversely, did you know that the FCC refers to channel number instead of carrier frequency when talking about the FM broadcast band?

Hams are like to just give each new "channel" a nickname like "305", "465", "665", "715" and "4305" So we can change channels quickly by dialing up either keypad entry or surf our memories on our rigs. And the names would relate to what we see on the frequency displays. As long as we get our signals in the proper place in the radio spectrum, it doesn't matter what we call it.

It's like on 2m when we say "the '79 machine" for the repeater on 146.79 freq you receive on and you transmit on 146.19 to get repeated.

1265. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 23:31:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECABACC.10886415@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67413
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > There are plenty of potential problems with with "channelization" on HF ham
> > > bands, especially where frequency tolerance and specific maximum voice
> > > bandwidths are mandated.
> >
> > > With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance with the
> > > rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if correct?
> > > Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods available to
> > > most hams, is that going to be good enough?
> >
> > Zero beating against WWV should be more than good enough. Use
> > the 5MHz WWV station, and if you find that your rig is off a bit, just
> > note the error, and "mis-tune" yourself by the same error to null it
> > out when operating these new allocations. This if your rig's manual
> > doesn't describe how to adjust the rig to fix the error. Page 24 of
> > my TS440SAT's manual tells how.
>
> If that's how you calculate a frequency tolerance you're in as deep as the newbies
> will be.
>

Okay, what did I miss? I better know before I get on that band.
So tell us how it's done.

1266. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-20 23:51:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECABFB5.4060708@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67414

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is
>>coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into
>>the service now?
>
>
> I assume you are not talking about military service.
>
> Hams do not think everyone who comes into the ARS is an idiot. Hams often
> encourage thier children to become Hams and show them how to operate well. I
> must admit, some of them seem to know what they are doing. This is a result of
> interest and practice.
>
> Idiots do not join the ARS. If they do not have the skills, they can practice
> them.
>
> Some join to become utility Hams. Hams that just use amateur radio for utility
> communications. For example, to save money on phone bill or to only use APRS
> and do nothing else with it.
>
> Others join to become appliance operators. This is a step above the utility
> Ham. It is basically the same thing, except these Hams use several modes for
> fun also.
>
> Others do service activities/emergency communications.
>
> Some write programs and build circuits.
>
> There are also other uses.
>
> Only if local clubs do not encourage participation, do people not become
> useful. Such as meetings to discuss what one did and not include others. Then,
> the ARS suffers.

Best post you have made yet Vipul.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1267. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 00:08:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECAC37D.F8989470@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67415
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> . Most of them don't.
> You can bet the farm there'll be a bunch of hams sitting on the posted
> frequency, not down 1.4khz.
>

It's 1.5Khz. Besides, more often than not, a newbie may hear other users and dial his rig down to get reasonable quality SSB reception and thus be nearly on the correct frequency. As there are guardbands between channels, being slightly off freq isn't very serious, only mildly serious. And that's because our SSB transmit filters have side skirts that are not "brick wall" from passband to stopband.

My rig's specs say "400Hz to 2600Hz" at 6dB down. Doesn't say what it's doing say at 10dB down, but it's likely not grossly wrong for the 5MHz band. also the frequency accuracy spec'd is ï¿½ 1 x 10^-5 of the carrier freq. That's 50Hz at 5MHz, which looks good enough. Say it drifted worse as the rig aged, it still won't be much worse.

The FCC full well knows that hams will use their existing modern rigs to get on 5 MHz, and if they though that we couldn't handle it, not let us have these allocations. Few hams have trouble being on freq for repeaters on the 2m band, and the percentage error you can have there is much less.

The biggest problem is likely to people dialing up the wrong freq on their rigs, but education is the answer there. Like QST telling us what numbers to set our rigs to to get our signals where they should be, when they publish the news about this allocation.

1268. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 00:30:36 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <MMzya.50929$rt6.18815@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 67416

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3ECA461F.2040003@psu.edu...
>
>
> garigue wrote:
> > "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
>
> <some snippage>
>
> >> And most of those keys are a far cry from Mr. Morse's original,
as
> >>is the modern equipment used in digital modes.
> >
> >
> >
> > Huh ???? make and break was make and break at the big bang just as it
will
> > be when we collapse back to that grain sized mass ....
>
>
> I'de like to see someone send Morse with a knife switch........

Mike ....I have to credit you with a new Q codex ....

QKS? sending with a knife switch & of course QKS? are you sending with a
knife switch?

I sometimes find myself in that catagory of QKS sending especially on a
Friday night after a few Iron City Beers!

73 Mike ..God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic nr Pittsburgh
>

1269. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:09:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520210959.01631.00000098@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67417

In article <3ECA5D81.3080702@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is
>coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into
>the service now?

Both!

And we've had both types since long before I became a ham 35 years ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1270. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520211001.01631.00000099@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67418

In article <3ECA4360.4040708@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Hey Jim,

yo
>
> Am I right that you have an Elecraft K2?

S/N 2084. Assembled two years ago (spring 2001). Added the antenna tuner and audio filter options. Used it QRP last two Field Days and November SS. Did not win the class but did better than I expected for the time spent and antennas used.

>I saw one and spoke with the
>rep about it at Dayton, and was very impressed with it.

The rx is fantastic. Not only very sensitive, but incredible dynamic range numbers, particularly at 5 kHz spacing. Very clean and 'transparent' audio. Incredible QSK. Variable bandwidth xtal lattice filter with four filter selections per mode. Also has: Split/RIT/XIT, ten memories, keyer with memory, defeatable AGC, selectable tuning rate, fully adjustable sidetone and BFO, lots of other features. Current demand on receive is very low for the performance obtained - typically about a quarter amp. Lacks passband tuning and general coverage rx.

The design puts basic radio performance before bells and whistles. For example, an ingenious PLL design gives very low phase noise from a simple circuit. The trade-off is that the indicated frequency may be off by as much as 100 Hz even if the reference oscillator is dead-on.

>I was just wondering what you though of the thing.

For decades I homebrewed my rigs from scratch because the price of a rig that had the features and performance I wanted was always well over $2000 (example: Ten Tec Omni 6). Plus I like having rigs I can work on without a lab full of speical tools and test equipment. The K2 comes very close to ideal for me. Only real problems are the size (it's almost too small) and the cost of getting the 100 watt amp and tuner options.

The contrast in size, weight and technology between the K2 and my homebrew Southgate Type 7 transceiver (latest in a long line of homebrew rigs) is surreal. Which simply adds to the fun. I use whichever rig strikes my fancy at the moment.

> It seems like an exceptional value.
>
All depends on what you want from a rig. A fully-loaded K2/100 (K2 with 100

watt amp, ATU, 160 meters/2nd rx antenna, noise blanker, and SSB will run you more than $1300 without power supply or microphone. And that's unbuilt. Compare that to what you'd pay for a new FT-897 or used Omni 6.

OTOH the basic K2 is $600, which sounds like a lot for a QRP rig but is actually very inexpensive for the rx and QSK performance. You don't have to spend money on options you don't want or need, and options can be added as funds become available. Options can also be removed if you don't want them any more.

See if you can find a local who has one. More than 3300 K2s out there now.

Building one requires a good temperature-controlled soldering station, (I use a milsurp Weller WCTPK - swords into plowshares and all that). good longnose and diagonal pliers, and a small screwdriver or two.

To get a feeling for what's inside, visit the website

http://www.elecraft.com

You can download the manuals, schematics and other info with no obligation.

Standard disclaimer: The only connection I have with Elecraft is as a satisfied customer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1271. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:21:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520212124.02076.00000130@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67420

In article <temkcvcj8pguq9u833t386kv6lstlsgm2s@4ax.com>, Jim Weir
<jim@rst-engr.com> writes:

>I calculate a quarter-wave antenna for 5 millihertz to be roughly 9 million
>miles long.
>
>What did I miss?

The "PRD" discussion on the 5 milliHertz antenna location... :-)

1272. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:21:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520212124.02076.00000131@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67421

In article <badfot$rmgv0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>How the hell does one learn CW??
>
>Ryan KC8PMX

With extreme patience, grasshpper... :-)

"That was Zen, this is Tao..." :-)

1273. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:21:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520212127.02076.00000132@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67419

In article <bac7cg$e13$0@208.207.71.161>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 19 May 2003 06:05:38 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> > There are plenty of potential problems with with
>> "channelization" on HF ham bands, especially where frequency
>> tolerance and specific maximum voice bandwidths are mandated.
>>
>> Other than in the Amateur Radio Service, HF comms have been
>> channelized for decades. Remember that we are secondary in
>> the 60-m allocation. so we get to play by the "house rules"
>> in that regard.
>
> Again - what we got here was no more than the minimum necessary to
>conduct emergency communications at 60 meters. No more.

Only emergency communications? With voice SSB?

How can that be? Isn't all the important "emergency" traffic
handled by OOK CW?

>> >A great many older ham rigs, including PLL and other frequency
>> >synthesized units, have drifted far enough to very likely be out
>> >of tolerance For that matter, many fresh from the factory have
>> >in the past been poorly adjusted. I know, no tolerance has yet
>> >been published, but it's certain that if discrete frequency
>> >channels are specified, a tolerance will also be.
>>
>> Are we being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 1990s'
>> technological standards now?
>
> Been there for awhile, haven't we? I worked there for a full commercial
>career. But that certainly doesn't make it a good thing for ham radio.
>Ham gear has never been subject to strict tolerances as has commercial
>and othre non-ham gear. So now we get to play by commercial tolerance
>rules, eh? That's a good thing for ham radio? Not in my book.

In the "book" known as Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations
(five volumes, softbound, from US GPO), US radio amateurs
had to stay WITHIN BAND LIMITS and still do. Go outside those
band limit frequencies and you are IN VIOLATION.

>> > In a frequency band that is never a problem, one station or
>> >group of stations merely "zero beats" or tunes in the net control
>> >or other station, and everyone is talking on the same
>> >frequency-whatever each individual transmitter frequency readout
>> >shows. With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance
>> >with the rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if
>> >correct?
>>
>> Interpretation of Sections 97.101(a) and 97.103(a) of the Rules
>> puts the burden on the station operator and licensee to ensure
>> that their operation complies with FCC Rules.
>
> General blanket coverage for all services at all times. But the
>difference is that hams have alway had BANDS, and never discrete
>frequency channels with strict tolerances.

What is the "tolerance" specified for the new 97.303 in FCC
03-150?

Did you see a "tolerance?" I didn't. Do you have a copy of 03-105?
I do.

>I'm not real anxious to see
>that change. It introduces a non-relaxed element to ham radio that tends
>to change the nature of it.

What "tends" are you talking about? The FCC has been quite
explicit on band edge frequencies since 1934.

>But it would give me a use for my 100watt Motorola Micom crystal
>controlled HF transciever! Maybe I'll crystal it up for 60 meters!
>But when I order crystals, it'll have to be for frequencies 1.4 kc below
>the authorized frequency.

Bully for you, old timer...but stay within the specified maximum
power limit or you will be IN VIOLATION!

"Transmissions shall not exceed an effective radiated power
(e.r.p.) of 50 W PEP."

>Only a Federal bureaucracy could screw things up that badly, sorry!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...a screamer and kicker doesn't like a new freebie?

:-)

> No way that properly describes the case. "Bands" convey frequency
>flexibility and that's absent.

Awww...no sub-bands available in 2.8 KHz bandwidth?

FCC 03-105 is fairly explicit on upper sideband SSB...ONLY.

>> >Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods
>> >available to most hams, is that going to be good enough? And what
>> >if it "seems to be off"? Will most hams be able to adjust it

>> >accurately? Or even determine if it needs adjusting? Send it to
>> >the factory for their opinion? What?
>>
>> Is the sound that I hear that of kicking or screaming?
>
>Not from me. I have all the equipment I need to stay in shape to handle
>it and the knowledge to use it. Most hams have neither.

Of course you do... :-)

>> > And who knows just how close the tolerance on his SSB crystal
>> >filter might be? Are you *sure* you will be only 2.8 khz wide at
>> >the max? Really sure, now? It's well known that crystals almost
>> >always drift a bit with aging. A typical filter contains several
>> >crystals. How do you know where yours cuts off? Can you check it
>> >to be sure?
>>
>> Hint -- the simple way is to either unsuppress the carrier
>> or inject a single tone of known frequency. Measure the output
>> (single rf frequency) of the rig (into a dummy load, of course).
>>
>> This will tell you what "dial offset" to use. Simple, eh what?
>>
>> If you can't rely on "reading the dial", get a good frequency
>> counter. Even a "cheapie" 0.1 ppm counter will get you within
>> 5 Hz at 5 MHz.
>
> But it tells nothing about how wide your signal is. Do you feel you can
>trust the filters in ham gear as you would in commercial units? I don't.
>They deliberately were not built with the same care and to the same
>standards since the same rigorous tolerances were never demanded of
>them.
>
>And again, you're an engineer and you and I know how to do all this.

Oh, my..."you know how to do this." And you avoided stating
anything on a setup to do so. :-)

All you need is a stable signal source of RF for a receiver or an
AF source for the transmitter audio, both of which are separately
measureable in frequency. Here are two ways of doing it:

For the receiver, set the RF source to a known in-band tunable
frequency, measure the source's frequency accurately. Tune
the receiver for a zero-beat on that carrier. The difference in
displayed receiver frequency with the measured source frequency
is your receiver's frequency tolerance. [you could do that alone
with a sample of the internal crystal frequency standard...this is
another way to do it] Retune the receiver until the indicated signal
level falls off so many S units. Take the difference between the
original zero-beat display and this display frequency...that is one
part of the internal receiver filter bandwidth. Retune again on the

other side of the zero-beat and note that difference. Add the two differences and you have the total receiver filter bandwidth.

For the transmitter spectral content in SSB, have a "closed" power output indication (your choice) with a dummy load and a sample of the RF output into the frequency counter. Apply the AF source to the transmitters' audio input at a constant level according to manufacturer's recommendation for nominal audio modulation level. Change the audio frequency over the entire tunable audio spectrum and note the RF power output level. If the RF power output level indication is reasonably accurate, you will wind up with the total transmitter modulation bandwidth, including both low and high-frequency audio roll-off points.

For a more accurate depiction of total transmitter bandwidth, including odd and sundry spurs and out-of-band delinquencies, an accurate spectrum analyzer is preferred. However, a wide-dynamic-range RF output power meter can show the total RF power output of a no-modulation-input condition...which could then be examined and compared with the out-of-band power levels allowed in Part 97.

>How
>many new Generals do you think picked up all this information enroute
>through the Question Pools?

Hmmm...guess I don't count being only a former E-5, not a General. :-)

> Hey Phil- it ain't ME that I'm concerned about, rather all those
>legions of the unlearned out there in ham radio land who haven't even a
>clue what we're talking about.

Gosh, old timer, you've not been to those other "legions" in radio land? Lots of Big legion halls not involved with amateurism... :-)

>I spent a couple years with Uncle Sam,
>running around Europe calibrating electronic gizmos and picked up a
>pretty good feel for tolerances and how to calculate them.

The US Army have an MOS for "calibrating gizmos?" I don't think so.

I did three years at the Standards Lab of Ramo-Wooldrige working directly in metrology of electronic test equipment as a civilian.

>I also ran a
>VE team for eight years, while you sat in the SF director's office,
>remember? I *know* what we're dealing with here.

Yes, you proctored tests using prepared test forms and prepared test answer sheets. BFD technical knowledge required. :-)

>Most of them don't.
>You can bet the farm there'll be a bunch of hams sitting on the posted
>frequency, not down 1.4khz.

Then that "bunch" will be IN VIOLATION.

Just think...you could sit and monitor those micro-bands and
log all the violators and have a big fun time being Raddio Kop!
:-)

Great opportunity to be an I Toldya So! :-)

> And once more, for effect-- just because the rest of the world of radio
>has long used channels certainly doesn't mean it's a good thing for ham
>radio. I give you reference to the 40 channels below ten meters as
>evidence.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...another "Evil CB" rant dribbling out, old timer?

>It's gonna be hard to move a couple kc's up the band to avoid all that
>QRM, isn't it?

>
> If that's what ham radio is coming to then it's a good way to get us to
>lose interest, and one more method of spectrum swiping.

1274. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:30:13 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305210125460.2451@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67422
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 19 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
> > >
> > > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
> > >
> > > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
> >
> > Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
> > finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
> > you were in that category, Dick.
> >
> > One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
> > the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
> > the rule tells you to be.
> >
> > The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
> > channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
> > channel.

The rule may be clear in that respect, but the problem is that there is much equipment that would still display the "center" frequency if the SSB transmission were AM (i.e. the carrier frequency is displayed) and they do NOT have a feature to display the center of the modulation sideband that is in use.

My HF rig, being a Kenwood TS-930, is like that.

The example of an FM signal above does not help since FM is like DSB or regular AM - a central carrier and modulation both above and below. SSB is "lopsided" in that respect.

1275. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:41:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305210139050.2451@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67423
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 20 May 2003, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> ...
> There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
> modes. The reason as I just described is obvious. In fact, it is
> technically incorrect to do so. 5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
> ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a
> fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be
> that way, in the face of technical accuracy.

Regardless of correctness, because of this mismatch between the ruling and custom, some are bound to "correct" it by tuning 1.4kHz down from the frequencies listed in the ruling while others will set their radios to display those exact frequencies listed (thus tuning by the suppressed carrier and being +1.4kHz above the rest). The bad designation, being in conflict with the common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem - and that will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.

1276. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 01:58:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305210149250.2451@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67424

On Tue, 20 May 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <bac5b9$971$0@208.207.71.175>, "Dick Carroll;" writes:
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
> >> >
> >> > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
> >> >
> >> > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
> >>
> >> Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
> >> finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
> >> you were in that category, Dick.
> >>
> >> One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
> >> the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
> >> the rule tells you to be.
> >>
> >> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
> >> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
> >> channel.
> >
> > And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're
> >discussing.
>
> The emission type specified in the new 97.303 is "2K8J3E."
> Not "FM." :-)

Actually, that's missing a digit. 2k80J3E would be "more" correct, but we
probably all knew what you meant anyway. :-)

> > Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do
> >something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of
> >technical convention.
>
> Nope. Commercial "sideband" began in the 1930s. Amateur
> "sideband" didn't start on its most-used mode ride until the late
> 1950s. By then the commercial and military "sideband" users
> were well entrenched in their technical use and descriptions.
>
> >SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and
> >has been that way ever since.
>
> Ahem...the dial indicator on most SSB-capable transceivers
> using PLL or DDS frequency control is offset to the center of

> the filter passband. Those will shift depending on upper or
> lower sideband selected.
>
> >It's the intelligent way to describe it.
>
> No, it's just a convention. Legally it will be more proper to
> specify band limits without regard to band width...and the rules
> state to operate within those band limits.
>
> >There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
> >modes. The reason as I just described is obvious.
>
> Amateur SSB is third on the long list of "sideband" users and
> amateurs were among the last to adopt SSB wholeheartedly.
> [small boat users may have been the last...] Amateurs were
> never ever the first to use SSB.
>
> >In fact, it is technically incorrect to do so.
>
> Make up your mind. ?
>
> >5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
> >ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a
> >fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be
> >that way, in the face of technical accuracy.
>
> Did you read R&O 03-105 and the new 97.303 content? Do so.
> It is at the bottom of page 25 of the R&O released May 14, 2003.
>
> Rather clear and explicit description of the five "mini-bands,"
> allocated emission type and "transmission occupies only the
> 2.8 KHz centered around each of these frequencies."

Which means that the "carrier" frequency, if it were AM and not SSB, would be
1.4kHz below, and that's what some radios need to be tuned to in order for the
SSB signal to be where it should.... SSB is not a "centered" emission in that
it isn't usually specified by the center of its signal but by where the
suppressed carrier would be. That's the problem.

> > In the absense of a *very* good reason to change that attribute, it can
> >only be regarded as a dumb rule that will cause lots of confusion and
> >more importantly cause many, many radio frequency readouts to read
> >incorrectly - that is, assuming their operators have been apprised of
> >the ridiculous rule.
>
> US civil radio regulations aren't driven by the conventions of
> frequency displays on ready-built equipment in regards to
> transmission of RF energy. The shift of frequency DISPLAY
> is a user convenience convention...what concerns every other
> user of the EM spectrum is the precise frequency of ANY
> RF source.

What frequency shift? For many radios, when they change modes, the displayed frequency does not change. For many out there, that means set the displayed frequency (and thus the location of the suppressed carrier) to the number given, and for SSB, that means that the signal will be from frequency X to X+2.8kHz.

> > If that's intelligent I sure don't see it.
>
> Pages 18 and 19 of R&O 03-105 list all the Commenters on
> the NPRMs preceding the R&O. "Richard Carroll" was not on
> that list.
>
> > Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described
> >as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
> >face.
>
> Nooooo. It's just against the way YOU want it to be.
>
> You are thinking ONLY of single-channel SSB users and how a
> few manufacturers designed the ready-built transceivers YOU
> and thousands of others use (including the HF SSB transceivers
> now in use by small-boat owners). Try thinking of describing a
> commercial SSB spectral occupancy made up of four 3 KHz
> chunks, each one having modulation data that starts and ends
> in a 100 to 2800 KHz spectral distribution...the four taking up
> about 12 KHz of RF bandspace. :-) Those were there before
> amateurs were using "sideband" in large numbers.
>
> You now HAVE five little mini-bands in a frequency area not
> available to amateurs before (at least since the end of WW2).
> Why are you bitching so mightily?

Probably because the order was written in such a way that there is confusion over where to tune the radio in order to produce the desired emission....

1277. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:16:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520221657.27532.00000052@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67425

>Subject: Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/20/2003 8:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520212124.02076.00000131@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>In article <badfot$rmgv0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
><kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
>>How the hell does one learn CW??
>>
>>Ryan KC8PMX
>
> With extreme patience, grasshpper...

No doubt with the same patience that one learns how to spell
"grasshopper".

And one does not "learn" CW...One learns Morse Code.

Lennie's screen name used to be "NoCWTest" until all the people he kept
antagonizing made a fool out of him (as if THAT were a challenge) over that
point.

It's funny to see somone getting thier digs back in with Lennie's
abandoned screen name.

Steve, K4CAP

1278. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:22:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520222207.27532.00000053@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67426

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/20/2003 8:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520211001.01631.00000099@mb-m28.aol.com>

>All depends on what you want from a rig. A fully-loaded K2/100 (K2 with 100
>watt amp, ATU, 160 meters/2nd rx antenna, noise blanker, and SSB will run you
>more than $1300 without power supply or microphone. And that's unbuilt.
>Compare
>that to what you'd pay for a new FT-897 or used Omni 6.

I also now see a line of transverters for 6, 2 and 1.25M. This thing just
keeps getting better and better!

Steve, K4CAP

1279. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:30:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520223032.27532.00000054@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67427

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/20/2003 6:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520190623.15079.00000055@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>>What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is
>>coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into
>>the service now?
>
>I assume you are not talking about military service.

Someone needs a spanking.

>Hams do not think everyone who comes into the ARS is an idiot. Hams often
>encourage thier children to become Hams and show them how to operate well. I
>must admit, some of them seem to know what they are doing. This is a result
>of
>interest and practice.

Something we can agree on.

>Idiots do not join the ARS.

Not ALL idiots do...But SOME do...

>If they do not have the skills, they can practice them.

Like I was saying...

>Some join to become utility Hams.

"Utility Hams"...???

>Hams that just use amateur radio for utility
>communications. For example, to save money on phone bill or to only use APRS
>and do nothing else with it.

I see...yeet another "vipinition".

>Others join to become appliance operators.

No one "joins" Amateur Radio to be an "applicance operator".

>This is a step above the utility
>Ham. It is basically the same thing, except these Hams use several modes for
>fun also.

Ahhhhh....I see...Vipul is developing a CASTE system! Considering his probably national origin, this is understandable.

>Others do service activities/emergency communications.

Glad you finally accept this.

>Some write programs and build circuits.

I wrote a program for a high school play once.

>There are also other uses.

Looking for "preety fems", no doubt.

>Only if local clubs do not encourage participation, do people not become
>useful.

Uh huh...riiiiiiiiight.

>Such as meetings to discuss what one did and not include others. Then,
>the ARS suffers.

I think you're right...Hard to tell...

Steve, K4CAP

1280. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:31:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECAE51E.4030104@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67428

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3ECA4360.4040708@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Hey Jim,
>
>
> yo
>
>> Am I right that you have an Elecraft K2?
>
>
> S/N 2084. Assembled two years ago (spring 2001). Added the antenna tuner and
> audio filter options. Used it QRP last two Field Days and November SS. Did not
> win the class but did better than I expected for the time spent and antennas
> used.
>
>
>>I saw one and spoke with the
>>rep about it at Dayton, and was very impressed with it.
>
>
> The rx is fantastic. Not only very sensitive, but incredible dynamic range
> numbers, particularly at 5 kHz spacing. Very clean and 'transparent' audio.
> Incredible QSK. Variable bandwidth xtal lattice filter with four filter
> selections per mode. Also has: Split/RIT/XIT, ten memories, keyer with memory,
> defeatable AGC, selectable tuning rate, fully adjustable sidetone and BFO, lots
> of other features. Current demand on receive is very low for the performance
> obtained - typically about a quarter amp. Lacks passband tuning and general
> coverage rx.
>
> The design puts basic radio performance before bells and whistles. For example,
> an ingenious PLL design gives very low phase noise from a simple circuit. The
> trade-off is that the indicated frequency may be off by as much as 100 Hz even
> if the reference oscillator is dead-on.

Thanks for the good and detailed review, Jim. I think I'm going to get
one. I'll probably take the stepped route to get everything.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1281. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:31:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520223139.27532.00000055@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67429

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/20/2003 6:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ECABFB5.4060708@adelphia.net>

>Best post you have made yet Vipul.

You can read Vipulese...?!?!

WOW ! ! !

=)

73 de K4CAP

1282. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:32:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520223258.27532.00000056@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67430

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/20/2003 4:52 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520175222.15079.00000042@mb-m12.aol.com>

>You're better off with the bank.

Oh...?!?!

They are hovering around 3%. That's better?

Steve, K4CAP

1283. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:35:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030520223539.15462.00000158@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67431

In article <3ECA5D81.3080702@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is
>coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into
>the service now?
>

Mike:

Well, no point in complaining about the idiots. After all, the alleged
"majority"
of hams wanted reduced/eliminated code testing requirements. Now we have
them -- and significantly reduced written tests as well. So now, any idiot can
become a ham!

Reminds me of a line from a Harry Chapin song: "...And she walked away
in silence; It's strange but you'd never know; We'd both gotten what we'd
asked for, Such a long, long time ago." Unfortunately, for us hams, as it was
for Harry and Sue, "getting what we'd asked for" didn't bring a happy ending.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1284. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:37:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECAE680.5070004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67432

garigue wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3ECA461F.2040003@psu.edu...
>
>>
>>garigue wrote:
>>
>>>"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
>>
>><some snippage>
>>
>>>> And most of those keys are a far cry from Mr. Morse's original,
>>>
> as
>
>>>>is the modern equipment used in digital modes.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Huh ???? make and break was make and break at the big bang just as it
>>
> will
>
>>>be when we collapse back to that grain sized mass ....
>>
>>
>>I'de like to see someone send Morse with a knife switch........
>
>
> Mike ....I have to credit you with a new Q codex ....
>
> QKS? sending with a knife switch & of course QKS? are you sending with a
> knife switch?

ROFL!! Good one, Tom!!

> I sometimes find myself in that catagory of QKS sending especially on a
> Friday night after a few Iron City Beers!

Reminds me of when I was trying to learn CW. Under the naive idea that
I might do a bit better if I was relaxed while learning Morse, I tried
drinking a beer. One stinkin' beer. I didn't retain one thing from that
night's session! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1285. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:40:18 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520224018.15079.00000070@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67433

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Do you enjoy making yourself look so silly in public, Vipul?

No, its not fun to look silly in public.

>If so, why
>not get a bit more instant gratification and just sit on a public bus with a
>dunce cap on and your finger up your nose?

I did worse than that when I sat on the bus on the way to that event where I joined a random group of Hams. Fate designed itself around me. Like that movie-final destination.

I don't know how I could have avoided it. Still, I blame myself. Of course, the fated occurence did not change things (the anti-social behaviour). It just pointed it out. Later that night, I joined a random group of Hams that were anti-social.

1286. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:46:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520224601.27532.00000057@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67434

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/20/2003 8:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520212127.02076.00000132@mb-m14.aol.com>

>Tsk, tsk, tsk...a screamer and kicker doesn't like a new freebie?

Part 15 and 95 are "freebies", Your Putziness. The five new "channels" on 60 meters require the satisfactory passing of the Amateur General Class examination.

You've not done that yet, ergo any conversation you engage in over how these assignments should be used is moot, and in any case NOT related to the Morse Code test issue yuo claim to be soley interested in.

>All you need is a stable signal source of RF for a receiver or an
> AF source for the transmitter audio, both of which are separately
> measureable in frequency. Here are two ways of doing it:

Another technical dissertation in a policy forum, Lennie? You ahve assured us you don't do that!

>The US Army have an MOS for "calibrating gizmos?" I don't think
> so.

Better think again. The USMC has MOS's for calibration specialists in several fields too.

(This get's easier and easier.....)

Steve, K4CAP

1287. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 02:56:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520225651.15079.00000073@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67435

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>I agree,
>that contesting enhances your ability to make an accurate QSO, taking
>and giving information.

No it doesn't.

Actually, it does, but once you get that contesting is not much use. There is a difference doing this on each mode. You look for different sounds in each mode.

Once you get that, the rest is just fun. If thats what you find fun. Seems more like work.

Contesting helps you know about antennas and propogation conditions.

>I think he may have noted that there is an
>endurance characteristic that is applied also. If not, I'm saying it now.

Yes, endurance is required. Tuning those knobs and keying CW for extended time periods requires that.

Thats why people consume chips before the event. Its carbo loading.

Even better is to do some jogging beforehand. An article in QST claims, one person increased his CW speed after jogging and because of it. Studies were claimed to have been done.

Also, the ability to stay awake. Caffene helps.

>What contesting doesn't do is train someone to keep their wits about
>them in stressful situations. That is something that is hard to train
>for.

Agree.

>Some aspects can be trained by repetitive and rote activities, but
>that only goes so far.

Contesting does not do that. If one plays tennis for fun every weekend, the person will get better. But, not as good if that person trained for it those weekends.

Also, contesting covers making those contacts. The other skills are not practiced because thats not what the points are for.

1288. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 03:10:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030520231015.15079.00000075@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67436

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>He claimed it was skill building for emergency comm skills. I claimed it is
>>only incidental to emergency comm.
>
> That's because you do not know any better nor have any experience to
>draw
>an informed opinion from.

One of my relatives worked as an EMT. This is experience to draw an informed opinion from. Perhaps, I should ask his opinion.

>The goals may be different, but it's the same objective...The rapid,
>accurate exchange of precisely accurate information.

I agree with this.

>The "contest" nature adds
>the stress factor that one is under in "an emergency".

I do not agree with that.

It really depends on the situation. At the last Ham gathering, things like the wind blowing were a factor. At the event, they positioned vehicles, tents, etc to handle this situation. Antennas were put in place.

I learned, they perfected setting up and taking down quickly, by making adaptors, labelling setups, covering connectors, etc.

This was sort of like an emergency, since if they did not handle the situation (the heavy wind) well, this would be disasterous.

Contests by themselves do not train for that. Its where you set up which adds to the experience, not just the contest itself.

Do the same contest in a non-windy location, and its not much of a challenge.

> It's not about what contesters "intentions" are, Vippy.

I would agree if contesting tests those situations. The purpose of a contest is to have fun, not to test those situations. If you want to prepare for emergency communications, you do drills - not do a contest (a game).

1289. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 03:23:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baereorua0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 67437

Dave Heil wrote:

> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > >Dave never claimed that it helped build ALL the skills you need. It does
> > >build some of the skills.
> >
> > You should re read his post. He claimed contesting is skill building for
> > emergency comm.
>
> He did not claim or imply that contesting is only skill building for
> emergency communications.
>
> > On several occasions, he implied contesting is equivalent to emergency
> > communications.
>
> No, he did not.
>
> > He surely did claim contesting helped build ALL the skills you need for
> > emergency communications.
>
> No, he did not.
>
> Perhaps, Vipul, you need to do the re-reading.

Vipul read it as he always reads things: He reads many things that were not written. What an imagination!

1290. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 03:27:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baerm4rua1@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 67438

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> >
> >>In article <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
> >>>manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense as
> >>>requiring them to show proficiency at CW.
> >>>
> >>
> >>There's no way the current 5 wpm code test can be reasonably called a
> >>demonstration of "proficiency". Basic skills, yes, but not proficiency.
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> > More accurately, VERY basic skills.
>
> Sure enough, Dick. After getting the basics, they should be able to get
> on th eair, and increas their skills as needed.

You bet. Just like the rest of us did.

1291. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 03:40:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baesevuci0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 67439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 20 May 2003 02:53:29 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > > Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described
> > >as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
> > >face.
> >
> > Have it YOUR way, HAVE it your way.... (music courtesy of
> > Burger King ads).
> >
> > Go ahead, Dick, be contrary to the way that the rest of the
> > comunications regulatory profession does things.
> >
>
> Does it really matter how the channel is specified?

Not to an appl;iance operator whose only interest is in dialing up a frequency and shooting the breeze. If you're interested in what you're actually doing and where you're doing it, it sure matters.

> As long as we get our signals in the proper
> place in the radio spectrum, it doesn't matter what we call it.

True. But if you don't know that FCC insists on you misdialing your frequency to be legal contrary to accurate technical convention as in this case, you can easily be in violation and have not violated anything but a silly, misleading rule. That may not matter to you but to me it sure does.

1292. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 03:53:08 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baet74vnm0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 67440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > There are plenty of potential problems with with "channelization" on HF ham
> > > > > bands, especially where frequency tolerance and specific maximum voice
> > > > > bandwidths are mandated.
> > > >
> > > > > With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance with the
> > > > > rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if correct?
> > > > > Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods available to
> > > > > most hams, is that going to be good enough?
> > > >
> > > > Zero beating against WWV should be more than good enough. Use
> > > > the 5MHz WWV station, and if you find that your rig is off a bit, just
> > > > note the error, and "mis-tune" yourself by the same error to null it
> > > > out when operating these new allocations. This if your rig's manual
> > > > doesn't describe how to adjust the rig to fix the error. Page 24 of
> > > > my TS440SAT's manual tells how.
> > >
> > > If that's how you calculate a frequency tolerance you're in as deep as the newbies
> > > will be.
> > >
> >
> > Okay, what did I miss? I better know before I get on that band.
> > So tell us how it's done.

As I see it, what you missed is the difference between a discrete frequency channel and the accompanying tolerance (which AFAIK hasn't yet been announced) and which your TS440 was NOT designed to meet, and commercial gear which was. If you can't put numbers on the situation you can't be certain you're within tolerance. I guess "close" is gonna be good enough, then.

And, you seem to be competent to take care of this problem. Most "ordinary" hams are not. The relaxed tests notwithstanding, looks like they better learn..

1293. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 04:01:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521000133.15079.00000078@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67441

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Does the term "antenna party" have any significance for you?

Yes, that's what they called those group antenna setups. I enjoyed those myself and learned a little.

>ust for grins, please demonstrate how communicating with others can be
>considered anti-social.

One example of anti-social behavior is going to a group function, and only speaking to your wife, not anyone at the party. Here, you are communicating with others (your wife). But, you are not communicating with others at the party.

In the contest, the communicating was done when others were socializing. At the remote location, they should have been on the beach, not at their radio.

I even saw this same thing occur in a video someone made about his DX trip where he setup to do contests. I saw this video at a Hamfest.

Seeing the other Ham on ATV, only shows that others are anti-social. Therefore, its a group supported anti-social activity.

I don't expect for you to understand it.

>While you'e at it, why not give a stab at
>enlightening us on the relationship between anti-social behavior and
>weight.

If one has too much stress and cannot sleep, one feels tired in the morning. Not enough sleep can hurt one's metabolism- no matter how much one exercises. This will lead to weight gain.
Here we have an emotional reaction (stress), leading to a physical reaction (tired, weight gain). Some stress may be caused by anti-social behavior.

One often overeats while watching TV or making random radio contacts. Excessive food consumption usually is anti-social behavior in itself and/or evidence of an anti-social person.

Others may lose weight because of anti-social nature. Weight loss for "no apparent reason" is often considered the result of anti-social behavior.

Sometimes food "substitutes" (or prevents) anti-social behavior.
Anti-social behavior often leads to food consumption.

1294. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 04:02:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baetp9$t1$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 67442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > . Most of them don't.
> > You can bet the farm there'll be a bunch of hams sitting on the posted
> > frequency, not down 1.4khz.
> >
>
> It's 1.5Khz.

??? I thought the word put out here was a 2.8khz bandwidth. If so, then 1.4 is half that, so one would dial that much lower in frequency.

> Besides, more often than not, a newbie may hear
> other users and dial his rig down to get reasonable quality SSB
> reception and thus be nearly on the correct frequency. As there
> are guardbands between channels, being slightly off freq isn't
> very serious, only mildly serious. And that's because our SSB
> transmit filters have side skirts that are not "brick wall" from
> passband to stopband.
>

But--- that isn't the situation, Robert. We didn't get a band of frequencies, just 5 discrete channels, with no authorization off of those discrete frequencies beyond the allowed tolerance, whatever that turns out to be. Surely they won't fail to announce one-will they? I've given up on expecting rational things from that quarter, though.

>
> My rig's specs say "400Hz to 2600Hz" at 6dB down. Doesn't
> say what it's doing say at 10dB down, but it's likely not grossly
> wrong for the 5MHz band.

There's a good chance that if you check it with good enough test gear it won't meet its announced specs. Ham gear never was manufactured to meet close specifications and I've seen some that was fairly far out of specs when new.

> also the frequency accuracy spec'd
> is ï¿½ 1 x 10^-5 of the carrier freq. That's 50Hz at 5MHz, which
> looks good enough. Say it drifted worse as the rig aged, it still
> won't be much worse.

But you're guessing, right? You don't KNOW.

>
>
> The FCC full well knows that hams will use their existing modern
> rigs to get on 5 MHz, and if they though that we couldn't handle
> it, not let us have these allocations. Few hams have trouble being
> on freq for repeaters on the 2m band, and the percentage error
> you can have there is much less.

If you assume that sort of benevolence from FCC you might get a rude surprise. If they announce commercial tolerances I wouldn't expect them to ignore violations.

>
>
> The biggest problem is likely to people dialing up the wrong
> freq on their rigs, but education is the answer there. Like QST
> telling us what numbers to set our rigs to to get our signals
> where they should be, when they publish the news about this
> allocation.

Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way every time.

1295. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 04:09:58 UTC
From: "W-157.203" <w157203@innovustenoinc.com>
Message-ID: <baeu6g$1jh$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

This entire 5 mHz allocation speaks so loud & clear as
to the idiocy of the FCC. One can only guess as to the
monumental incompetence found on the FCC employment
roster these days. This is truly an agency is diarray, more
like chaos.

R. Wrigenfield, Ph. D., P.E.
President & CEO
Renetictech Technology, LTD.

1296. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 05:00:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECB083F.A6BC11D8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67444

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >Does the term "antenna party" have any significance for you?
>
> Yes, that's what they called those group antenna setups. I enjoyed those myself
> and learned a little.

That's right, Vipul. You're making a little progress. Tuck this in the back of your brain for future reference. It is the custom for the fellow whose antennas are being erected to provide food and beverages for those who volunteer their time and effort in his behalf. It is a *social* thing.

> >ust for grins, please demonstrate how communicating with others can be
> >considered anti-social.
>
> One example of anti-social behavior is going to a group function, and only
> speaking to your wife, not anyone at the party.

Just who is it who does this?

> Here, you are communicating
> with others (your wife). But, you are not communicating with others at > the party.

No, I'm not doing either of those things and I don't know anyone who does so.

> In the contest, the communicating was done when others were socializing.

There is no obligation to socialize with a group when one's desire is to operate a contest. Operating in a contest is social activity with an entirely different group of people.

> At the
> remote location, they should have been on the beach, not at their > radio.

According to whom?

> I even saw this same thing occur in a video someone made about his DX trip
> where he setup to do contests. I saw this video at a Hamfest.

...and you didn't understand it. You came away with some peculiar concept which makes sense only to you.

> Seeing the other Ham on ATV, only shows that others are anti-social.
> Therefore, its a group supported anti-social activity.

How'd we get on ATV? Maybe you meant an All Terrain Vehicle. How does seeing someone demonstrate that other people are anti-social? How does any of this demonstrate the conclusion you've drawn in the last sentence above?

> I don't expect for you to understand it.

That's an understatement. I don't expect anyone to understand it.

> >While you'e at it, why not give a stab at
> >enlightening us on the relationship between anti-social behavior and
> >weight.
>
> If one has too much stress and cannot sleep, one feels tired in the morning.
> Not enough sleep can hurt one's metabolism- no matter how much one exercises.
> This will lead to weight gain.

Not necessarily.

> Here we have an emotional reaction (stress), leading to a physical reaction
> (tired, weight gain).

Not necessarily.

> Some stress may be caused by anti-social behavior.

Some stress may be caused by watching the evening news. Some stress may be caused by worrying about paying your bills. Some stress may be caused by social behavior. Some stress may be cause by not operating in a contest even though you'd like to because some Indian fellow in New England thinks that doing so is somehow anti-social.

> One often overeats while watching TV or making random radio contacts.

You're kidding. I never eat in the ham shack unless it is to grab a sandwich in the middle of a contest.

> Excessive food consumption usually is anti-social behavior in itself > and/or evidence of an anti-social person.

Really, Doctor Shah? I'm having trouble believing you.

> Others may lose weight because of anti-social nature. Weight loss for "no
> apparent reason" is often considered the result of anti-social behavior.

Really, Doctor Shah? A moment ago it was weight gain. You've been telling us all about fat, anti-social hams. Now you'd like us to worry about thin, anti-social hams (anti-social being defined by you as an individual not doing what you believe he should be doing with his time).

> Sometimes food "substitutes" (or prevents) anti-social behavior.

So now eating is a cure for anti-social behavior. I see.

> Anti-social behavior often leads to food consumption.

Hunger often leads to food consumption. Boredom can lead to food consumption. Now that I've read your latest attempt at rationalizing some of your ridiculous theories, I think I'll go have a bite to eat.

Dave K8MN

1297. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 05:06:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECB096A.E4723EBD@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > > . Most of them don't.
> > > You can bet the farm there'll be a bunch of hams sitting on the posted
> > > frequency, not down 1.4khz.
> > >
> >
> > It's 1.5Khz.
>
> ??? I thought the word put out here was a 2.8khz bandwidth. If so, then 1.4
> is half that, so one would dial that much lower in frequency.
>

That's what I first thought, but a proper USB signal has audio from
300 Hz to 2.7 kHz audio, so if you tune 1.5
kHz low your sig should extend -1.2 kHz/+1.2 kHz around the
frequency number specified by the FCC.

What's the channel spacing in this band anyway? I hear some
signals that sound like RTTY on 5344.5, 5338.5, 5411.5, and
voice at 5505.0 (aviation weather reports). These numbers are
what my rig reads out, i.e., the suppressed carrier freq.

1298. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 05:18:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521011839.17162.00000147@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 67447

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305210149250.2451@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Tue, 20 May 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <bac5b9$971$0@208.207.71.175>, "Dick Carroll;" writes:
>> >Phil Kane wrote:
>> >> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>> >> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
>> >> >
>> >> > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
>> >> >
>> >> > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
>> >>
>> >> Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
>> >> finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
>> >> you were in that category, Dick.
>> >>
>> >> One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
>> >> the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
>> >> the rule tells you to be.
>> >>
>> >> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
>> >> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
>> >> channel.
>> >
>> > And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're
>> >discussing.
>>
>> The emission type specified in the new 97.303 is "2K8J3E."
>> Not "FM." :-)
>
>Actually, that's missing a digit. 2k80J3E would be "more" correct, but we
>probably all knew what you meant anyway. :-)

Some of the keys on my computer keyboard must be sticky...from
the laughing at the technical competence of these olde-tymers of
many yarns in amateur radio. :-)

On page 25 of FCC 03-105, the first sentence of the paragraph at
the bottom of the page says, in parentheses:

"...(emission type 2K8J3E)..."

It does not say "2k80J3E." If you don't like the way the FCC said
anything in FCC 03-105, just write them, not me. I don't regulate
US civil radio and don't issue NPRMs or R&Os.

The NPRM 02-136 containing RM-10209 (the new 5 MHz band request) was issued May 15, 2002. FCC 03-105 was issued on May 14, 2003, just one day short of a full year. Everyone who cared to comment had almost a whole year to say what they wanted but only a few did. The Commenters are listed on pages 18, 19 of FCC 03-105. Their comments are in the public database at the FCC, accessible through the FCC ECFS.

Feel free to start some new Memorandum at the FCC requesting a clarity of thought phrased in ham-speak on stating anything technical. The procedures to do so are also public knowledge from the FCC.

>> > Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do
>> >something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of
>> >technical convention.
>>
>> Nope. Commercial "sideband" began in the 1930s. Amateur
>> "sideband" didn't start on its most-used mode ride until the late
>> 1950s. By then the commercial and military "sideband" users
>> were well entrenched in their technical use and descriptions.
>>
>> >SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and
>> >has been that way ever since.
>>
>> Ahem...the dial indicator on most SSB-capable transceivers
>> using PLL or DDS frequency control is offset to the center of
>> the filter passband. Those will shift depending on upper or
>> lower sideband selected.
>>
>> >It's the intelligent way to describe it.
>>
>> No, it's just a convention. Legally it will be more proper to
>> specify band limits without regard to band width...and the rules
>> state to operate within those band limits.
>>
>> >There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
>> >modes. The reason as I just described is obvious.
>>
>> Amateur SSB is third on the long list of "sideband" users and
>> amateurs were among the last to adopt SSB wholeheartedly.
>> [small boat users may have been the last...] Amateurs were
>> never ever the first to use SSB.
>>
>> >In fact, it is technically incorrect to do so.
>>
>> Make up your mind. ?
>>
>> >5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
>> >ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a
>> >fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be
>> >that way, in the face of technical accuracy.

>>
>> Did you read R&O 03-105 and the new 97.303 content? Do so.
>> It is at the bottom of page 25 of the R&O released May 14, 2003.
>>
>> Rather clear and explicit description of the five "mini-bands,"
>> allocated emission type and "transmission occupies only the
>> 2.8 KHz centered around each of these frequencies."
>
>Which means that the "carrier" frequency, if it were AM and not SSB, would be
>1.4kHz below, and that's what some radios need to be tuned to in order for the
>SSB signal to be where it should.... SSB is not a "centered" emission in that
>it isn't usually specified by the center of its signal but by where the
>suppressed carrier would be. That's the problem.

There's NO problem in the FCC 03-105 R&O.

There IS a problem in some amateurs' ability to read direct
explicit English.

FCC Rules aren't tailor-made to fit some current amateur radio
designs of ready-built equipment as to frequency display, shift
versus mode selection. FCC rules explicitly state a 2.8 KHz
bandwidth, the center frequency of each micro-band, and that it
is upper sideband.

Most of the brain-dead olde-tymers don't know squat about HOW
their ready-built, ready-designed rigs operate behind their front
panels. They don't bother to do a simple set-up to independently
measure their performance because they don't know how to do it.
Given an overt technical problem they would simply pack up their
radios to send back to the manufacturer (probably with an enclosed
angry note). That may be a new take on "advancing the state of the
radio art" in US amateur radio.

>> > In the absense of a *very* good reason to change that attribute, it can
>> >only be regarded as a dumb rule that will cause lots of confusion and
>> >more importantly cause many, many radio frequency readouts to read
>> >incorrectly - that is, assuming their operators have been apprised of
>> >the ridiculous rule.
>>
>> US civil radio regulations aren't driven by the conventions of
>> frequency displays on ready-built equipment in regards to
>> transmission of RF energy. The shift of frequency DISPLAY
>> is a user convenience convention...what concerns every other
>> user of the EM spectrum is the precise frequency of ANY
>> RF source.
>
>What frequency shift? For many radios, when they change modes, the displayed
>frequency does not change. For many out there, that means set the displayed
>frequency (and thus the location of the suppressed carrier) to the number
>given, and for SSB, that means that the signal will be from frequency X to
>X+2.8kHz.

The internal "shift" varies with manufacturers, but was done by some
of them to center the tuning in the different internal IF filters per a
selected mode.

FCC doesn't care HOW that is done. They just clearly specified 5
little "micro-bands" a bit differently than QST or CQ might say in
their publications. Olde-tymers seem to have difficulty of dealing
with the unexpected way it is said, but that is the olde-tymers'
problem, not the FCC. If the olde-tymers can't adjust, then they
will go the way of all dinosaurs of the past...

>> > If that's intelligent I sure don't see it.
>>
>> Pages 18 and 19 of R&O 03-105 list all the Commenters on
>> the NPRMs preceding the R&O. "Richard Carroll" was not on
>> that list.
>>
>> > Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described
>> >as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
>> >face.
>>
>> Nooooo. It's just against the way YOU want it to be.
>>
>> You are thinking ONLY of single-channel SSB users and how a
>> few manufacturers designed the ready-built transceivers YOU
>> and thousands of others use (including the HF SSB transceivers
>> now in use by small-boat owners). Try thinking of describing a
>> commercial SSB spectral occupancy made up of four 3 KHz
>> chunks, each one having modulation data that starts and ends
>> in a 100 to 2800 KHz spectral distribution...the four taking up
>> about 12 KHz of RF bandspace. :-) Those were there before
>> amateurs were using "sideband" in large numbers.
>>
>> You now HAVE five little mini-bands in a frequency area not
>> available to amateurs before (at least since the end of WW2).
>> Why are you bitching so mightily?
>
>Probably because the order was written in such a way that there is confusion
>over where to tune the radio in order to produce the desired emission....

No. As I said, it is evident that olde-tymers just cannot adjust to
clear, explicit English phrased differently than the "technical
knowledge" spoon-fed them through ARRL publications.

The bottom line must be that some olde-tymers are just plain
pished at not getting what they (rightfully) expected. BFD.

ARRL's legal firm failed to convince the FCC that this "60m" band
was justified. But, the FCC gave US amateurs five little "micro-
bands" in that "60m" region...better than nothing at all, I'd say.

Nobody is forcing any US amateur to use those micro-bands. US
amateurs didn't have any 60m frequencies before. FCC did NOT

take anything away from US amateurs in that 60m region. A few brain-dead unadjustable olde-tymers will bitch, moan, and whine anyway...

1299. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 05:18:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521011840.17162.00000148@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 67446

In article <3ECABACC.10886415@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
>> Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>> > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>> >
>> > > There are plenty of potential problems with with "channelization" on
HF ham
>> > > bands, especially where frequency tolerance and specific maximum voice
>> > > bandwidths are mandated.
>> >
>> > > With frequency readout accuracy critical to compliance with the
>> > > rules, a totally new situation arises. Whose rig if correct?
>> > > Yes, one can check it against WWV, but with measurement methods
available to
>> > > most hams, is that going to be good enough?
>> >
>> > Zero beating against WWV should be more than good enough. Use
>> > the 5MHz WWV station, and if you find that your rig is off a bit, just
>> > note the error, and "mis-tune" yourself by the same error to null it
>> > out when operating these new allocations. This if your rig's manual
>> > doesn't describe how to adjust the rig to fix the error. Page 24 of
>> > my TS440SAT's manual tells how.
>>
>> If that's how you calculate a frequency tolerance you're in as deep as the
newbies
>> will be.
>>
>
>Okay, what did I miss? I better know before I get on that band.
>So tell us how it's done.

Dickie is unable to tell anyone how it is done due to not knowing
how it is done. :-)

I described one way to do it accurately to a frequency counter's
accuracy...for both receiver and transmitter...any make or model.

1300. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 05:34:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baf35r$a7a$0@208.206.142.84>
Source record: 67448
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> > >
> > > > . Most of them don't.
> > > > You can bet the farm there'll be a bunch of hams sitting on the posted
> > > > frequency, not down 1.4khz.
> > > >
> > >
> > > It's 1.5Khz.
> >
> > ??? I thought the word put out here was a 2.8khz bandwidth. If so, then 1.4
> > is half that, so one would dial that much lower in frequency.
> >
>
> That's what I first thought, but a proper USB signal has audio from
> 300 Hz to 2.7 kHz audio, so if you tune 1.5
> kHz low your sig should extend -1.2 kHz/+1.2 kHz around the
> frequency number specified by the FCC.
>
> What's the channel spacing in this band anyway? I hear some
> signals that sound like RTTY on 5344.5, 5338.5, 5411.5, and
> voice at 5505.0 (aviation weather reports). These numbers are
> what my rig reads out, i.e., the suppressed carrier freq.

I see your point. Which makes the "off frequency" rule even that much more
ridiculous.
And then there's still the matter of just what your SSB filter actually
passes.......

1301. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 05:40:03 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baf3fj$a7a$1@208.206.142.84>
Source record: 67449

Robert wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:ba8airtbv0@208.206.142.106...
> >
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > In article <ba1cao$os6$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
> writes:
> > >
> > > >Requiring somebody to acquire skills like
> > > >manipulating a Kleinschmidt makes absolutely the same amount of sense
> as
> > > >requiring them to show proficiency at CW.
> > > >
> > > There's no way the current 5 wpm code test can be reasonably called a
> > > demonstration of "proficiency". Basic skills, yes, but not proficiency.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > More accurately, VERY basic skills.
>
> So, do you guys have any reply to the _argument_, or are you just
> going to split hairs over definitions?
> You can call the requirement any skill level you like, I don't care.
> Here, maybe you can wrap your brains around this:
>
> "Requiring somebody to acquire incredibly low, rudimentary, most basic,
> the least possible, familiarity and ability to manipulate a Kleinschmidt
> teletype makes absolutely the same amount of sense as requiring them to
> acquire incredibly low, rudimentary, most basic, the least possible,
> familiarity and ability to copy CW."
>
> Split away.

You have just demonstrated that you have absolutely no knowledge of the subject matter that you profess to know all about. In short, not a single clue.

1302. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 06:43:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521024341.09515.00000076@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67450

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 5/20/2003 9:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520223539.15462.00000158@mb-m06.aol.com>

>Now we have
>them -- and significantly reduced written tests as well. So now, any idiot
>can
>become a ham!

I don't think it's so much that the written tests are any easier in thier own right...It's just that we have mandated giving the answers away. THAT is the problem.

Steve, K4CAP

1303. Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 06:51:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521025141.09515.00000077@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67451

>Subject: Re: Inane Awards Programs (10-10, FISTS, etc.)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/20/2003 9:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520224018.15079.00000070@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>Do you enjoy making yourself look so silly in public, Vipul?
>
>No, its not fun to look silly in public.

Then why do you do it over and over again...?!?!?!

>I don't know how I could have avoided it. Still, I blame myself. Of course,
>the
>fated occurence did not change things (the anti-social behaviour). It just
>pointed it out. Later that night, I joined a random group of Hams that were
>anti-social.

I doubt that THEY were the ones being anti-social.

You have clearly identified who the "anti-social" person is in this forum, and that would be you. You create "definitions" for your own use, ignore the conventions of others, call people names and make assertions that are neither based upon fact nor informed opinion.

You "dismiss" the opinions of others who obviously DO have more knowledge and experience than you, and refer to Amateur Radio as a "cult". On top of that you are racist and bigoted and looking for "preety fems" in all the wrong places.

Yes, Vipul, someone in Amateur Radio >>IS<< "anti-social", and I dare say it IS you.

Think about it.

Steve, K4CAP

1304. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 07:00:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521030006.09515.00000078@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67452

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/20/2003 9:56 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520225651.15079.00000073@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>>I agree,
>>that contesting enhances your ability to make an accurate QSO, taking
>>and giving information.
>
>No it doesn't.

Yes, it does. with speed and accuarcy, which is what emergency
communications require.

>Actually, it does, but once you get that contesting is not much use. There is
>a
>difference doing this on each mode. You look for different sounds in each
>mode.

More assinine rantings, Vipul.

"Different sounds in each mode"..?!?!
BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

>Once you get that, the rest is just fun. If thats what you find fun. Seems
>more
>like work.

It's work when you don't know what you're doing.

YOU don't kow what you're doing.

>Contesting helps you know about antennas and propogation conditions.

What IS it with you and "antennas and propagation", Vipul? Are you THAT
stupid that you think those are the ONLY topics of technical conversation? If
you want to get one-tracked, go sit in a corner with Lennie the Loon and say
"SINCGARS" over and over to yourselves.

>>I think he may have noted that there is an
>>endurance characteristic that is applied also. If not, I'm saying it now.
>
>Yes, endurance is required. Tuning those knobs and keying CW for extended
>time
>periods requires that.

CW is NOT the only mode used in contesting, Vipul.

>Thats why people consume chips before the event. Its carbo loading.

More dieting tips from Dr. Shah.

>Even better is to do some jogging beforehand. An article in QST claims, one
>person increased his CW speed after jogging and because of it. Studies were
>claimed to have been done.

Lotsa "preety fems" on the jogging trail to keep the mind alert, no doubt.

>Also, the ability to stay awake. Caffene helps.

Caffiene is a bandaid, and a poor one at that.

Try again.

Steve, K4CAP

1305. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 07:15:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521031526.09515.00000080@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67453

>ubject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/20/2003 10:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030520231015.15079.00000075@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>>He claimed it was skill building for emergency comm skills. I claimed it is
>>>only incidental to emergency comm.
>>
>> That's because you do not know any better nor have any experience to
>>draw
>>an informed opinion from.
>
>One of my relatives worked as an EMT. This is experience to draw an informed
>opinion from. Perhaps, I should ask his opinion.

I have been an EMT. I am also a trauma nurse. An "informed opinion" is
created from personal experiences reinforced by documentary evidence.

Your "relatives" experiences may be interesting, even informative, but NOT
germane to "emergency communications" such as those conducted by Amateur Radio.

>>The goals may be different, but it's the same objective...The rapid,
>>accurate exchange of precisely accurate information.
>
>I agree with this.

As well you should. It's correct.

>>The "contest" nature adds
>>the stress factor that one is under in "an emergency".
>
>I do not agree with that.

Then you do not understand what's going on or being said to you.

>It really depends on the situation. At the last Ham gathering, things like
>the
>wind blowing were a factor. At the event, they positioned vehicles, tents,
>etc
>to handle this situation. Antennas were put in place.

Most "emergency communications" take place in the AFTERMATH of the
disaster. While weather certainly plays a major role in the events of the
moment, the actual passing of traffic and the ACCURACY of that act are the
important issues.

>I learned, they perfected setting up and taking down quickly, by making
>adaptors, labelling setups, covering connectors, etc.

Good for you. There's hope yet, but I am still hesitant to hold my
breath.

>This was sort of like an emergency, since if they did not handle the
>situation
>(the heavy wind) well, this would be disasterous.

True. But even MORE "disasterous" is not getting the right message to the
right person, accurately, timely and intact. Worse yet is having personnel or
materials sent to someplace they did not need to be.

>Contests by themselves do not train for that. Its where you set up which adds
>to the experience, not just the contest itself.

Do I need to tatoo this to your forehead, Vippy? NO ONE said contesting is
the end-all to emergency communications.

>Do the same contest in a non-windy location, and its not much of a challenge.

Lack of knowledge and experience glaring again, Vippy. If it were THAT
simple to do, either more people would be doing it, or NO ONE would be doing it
due to a lack of challenge.

>> It's not about what contesters "intentions" are, Vippy.
>
>I would agree if contesting tests those situations. The purpose of a contest
>is
>to have fun, not to test those situations. If you want to prepare for
>emergency
>communications, you do drills - not do a contest (a game).

Contesting IS a form of a drill, Vippy. Case in point...Do you know what
the "contest exchange" is for the ARRL Sweepstakes, and WHY it is what it is?

(1) It is the NTS standard message traffic preamble format.

(2) Using it as a "contest exchange" reinforces it's use as a traffic
handling aid for NTS and EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS.

In a contest, lack of speed and accuracy costs points.

In an emergency, lack of speed and accuracy may cost lives.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4CAP

1306. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 07:20:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521032002.09515.00000081@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67454

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/20/2003 11:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030521000133.15079.00000078@mb-m12.aol.com>

>One example of anti-social behavior is going to a group function, and only
>speaking to your wife, not anyone at the party. Here, you are communicating
>with others (your wife). But, you are not communicating with others at the
>party.

Perhaps if you tried English?

>In the contest, the communicating was done when others were socializing. At
>the
>remote location, they should have been on the beach, not at their radio.

The purpose of taking an Amateur Radio station to a DX location is to
activate that site. It's FUN to be on the top of the pile-up from time to
time.

>I even saw this same thing occur in a video someone made about his DX trip
>where he setup to do contests. I saw this video at a Hamfest.

No doubt you did.

>Seeing the other Ham on ATV, only shows that others are anti-social.

You ARE an idiot.

>Therefore, its a group supported anti-social activity.

Contradiction of terms.

>I don't expect for you to understand it.

There >>IS<< a lack of understanding here, Vippy, but unfortunately the
lack is yours.

>Anti-social behavior often leads to food consumption.

Then you should be one fat dude, Vippy. I mean greasy fat, too.

Steve, K4CAP

1307. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 07:30:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521033020.09515.00000082@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67455

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/21/2003 12:18 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030521011839.17162.00000147@mb-m16.aol.com>

>If the olde-tymers can't adjust, then they
> will go the way of all dinosaurs of the past...

Ranting and raving in USENET like you?

>No. As I said, it is evident that olde-tymers just cannot adjust to
> clear, explicit English phrased differently than the "technical
> knowledge" spoon-fed them through ARRL publications.

"You" have yet to prove there's a problem. One person asked a question
and you have branded ALL Amateur Radio as being maladjusted.

What an idiot.

>The bottom line must be that some olde-tymers are just plain
> pished at not getting what they (rightfully) expected. BFD.

Sounds like a certain ex-radio technician whining about not being
recognized for the genius he perceives himself and wondering why Radioland has
not accepted him for that.

>ARRL's legal firm failed to convince the FCC that this "60m" band
> was justified.

The ARRL "convince(ed)" them fine. The NTIA exerted more sway with it's
comments vis-a-vis other applications. They (NTIA) were, in the end, right.

>But, the FCC gave US amateurs five little "micro-
> bands" in that "60m" region...better than nothing at all, I'd say.

As a non-licensee and not being able to use ANY Amateur allocation, you
could say that about ANY slice of spectrum.

>A few
> brain-dead unadjustable olde-tymers will bitch, moan, and whine
> anyway...

Yes you will, won't you...?!?!

Steve, K4CAP

1308. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 12:28:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECB70D2.4090800@psu.edu>
Source record: 67456

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 5/20/2003 6:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3ECABFB5.4060708@adelphia.net>
>
>
>>Best post you have made yet Vipul.
>
>
> You can read Vipulese...?!?!
>
> WOW ! ! !

I just hate to think what it cost me!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1309. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 12:51:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECB7662.3000400@psu.edu>
Source record: 67457

Vshah101 wrote:

<A whole bunch of head-scratching stuff snipped>

then wrote:

> I don't expect for you to understand it.

Then you have succeeded admirably!

>
>>While you'e at it, why not give a stab at
>>enlightening us on the relationship between anti-social behavior and
>>weight.
>
>
> If one has too much stress and cannot sleep, one feels tired in the morning.
> Not enough sleep can hurt one's metabolism- no matter how much one exercises.
> This will lead to weight gain.
> Here we have an emotional reaction (stress), leading to a physical reaction
> (tired, weight gain). Some stress may be caused by anti-social behavior.
>
> One often overeats while watching TV or making random radio contacts.
> Excessive food consumption usually is anti-social behavior in itself and/or
> evidence of an anti-social person.

> Others may lose weight because of anti-social nature. Weight loss for "no
> apparent reason" is often considered the result of anti-social behavior.

Sometimes I chuckle. Sometimes I scratch my head. But I just don't
understand.

> Sometimes food "substitutes" (or prevents) anti-social behavior.
> Anti-social behavior often leads to food consumption.
>

Where do you get your science?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1310. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 16:36:22 UTC
From: Freddy the Freeloader <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <bbancvghnatit13oescbuj7b119pb8o5vv@4ax.com>
Source record: 67458

On 21 May 2003 02:35:39 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3ECA5D81.3080702@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is
>>coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into
>>the service now?
>>
>
>Mike:
>
>Well, no point in complaining about the idiots. After all, the alleged
>"majority"
>of hams wanted reduced/eliminated code testing requirements. Now we have
>them -- and significantly reduced written tests as well. So now, any idiot can
>become a ham!
>
>Reminds me of a line from a Harry Chapin song: "...And she walked away
>in silence; It's strange but you'd never know; We'd both gotten what we'd
>asked for, Such a long, long time ago." Unfortunately, for us hams, as it was
>for Harry and Sue, "getting what we'd asked for" didn't bring a happy ending.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Haven't looked at this group in some time. It's sad to see that the
king of idiots, Larry Roll, is still spouting his hate and derision
of anyone who doesn't want to pound two pieces of brass together to
make di-duh sounds. You're a Bad Ham, Roll. Everybody knows it. Go
soak your head.

1311. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 16:49:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECBAE02.E4585ACB@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67459
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> I'm sorry that your rig does not have a panel or automatic
> switch to change the displayed readout frequency from "suppressed
> carrier" to "center of occupied bandwidth" if you can't make
> the computation in your head.
>
> Get a copy of Part 2 of the FCC Rules and READ the definition
> of "assigned frequency" in Section 2.1 of the Rules. This
> applies to the Amateur Radio Service as well as other FCC Radio
> Services. This is the standard method of specifying discrete
> channels for regulatory purposes.
>

QST, when they publish the fact that we will be getting this
allocation, should mention how the FCC specifies the frequencies,
and point out that most ham rigs traditionally display the suppressed
carrier freq, and that we need to dial up the rig so the display
reads 1.5KHz lower than the FCC numbers. And, as there are only
5 freqs, just list the numbers translated into "ham" from "FCC/NATO".

1312. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 16:53:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305210853.426f5005@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67460

K3UD <K3UD@charter.net> wrote in message news:<20052003122127709O%K3UD@charter.net>...
> In article <c2356669.0305010808.42290432@posting.google.com>, N2EY
> <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >
> > As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> > Novice - 49,329
> > Tech - 205,394
> > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > General - 112,677
> > Advanced - 99,782
> > Extra - 78,750
> > Total - 674,792
> >
> > As of April 30, 2003:
> >
> > Novice - 34,679 (decrease of 14,650)
> > Technician - 254,333 (increase of 48,939)
> > Technician Plus - 69,433 (decrease of 59,458)
> > General - 140,662 (increase of 28,173)
> > Advanced - 83,690 (decrease of 16,092)
> > Extra - 103,908 (increase of 25,158)
> > Total - 686,862 (increase of 12,070)
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Annualized growth rate: 0.6%.
> Projected decade growth rate: 6%
> At least there is still a positive growth rate.

Agreed.

It will be interesting to compare the growth of the '80s, '90s and
'00s when all the data is in.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1313. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 17:24:01 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bagclm$na0$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67571

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> You have just demonstrated that you have absolutely no knowledge of the
>subject matter that you profess to know all about.

What have I claimed to "know all about"?

>In short, not a single clue.

Yeah, well, while you're splitting hairs this time over using the
term "CW" instead of "Morse", you _still_ haven't made the slightest
attempt to address the question. Should I just assume you don't have an
answer?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/2003

1314. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 18:00:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECBBEC7.4030801@psu.edu>
Source record: 67461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
>
>> I'm sorry that your rig does not have a panel or automatic
>> switch to change the displayed readout frequency from "suppressed
>> carrier" to "center of occupied bandwidth" if you can't make
>> the computation in your head.
>>
>> Get a copy of Part 2 of the FCC Rules and READ the definition
>> of "assigned frequency" in Section 2.1 of the Rules. This
>> applies to the Amateur Radio Service as well as other FCC Radio
>> Services. This is the standard method of specifying discrete
>> channels for regulatory purposes.
>>
>
>
> QST, when they publish the fact that we will be getting this
> allocation, should mention how the FCC specifies the frequencies,
> and point out that most ham rigs traditionally display the suppressed
> carrier freq, and that we need to dial up the rig so the display
> reads 1.5KHz lower than the FCC numbers. And, as there are only
> 5 freqs, just list the numbers translated into "ham" from "FCC/NATO".

Are you sure about that Robert? I hven't been around any rigs that
don't do that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1315. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 18:45:33 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <baghgd$1ajo$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 67463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
>> >
>> > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
>> >
>> > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
>>
[...]
>> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
>> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
>> channel.
>
> And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're
>discussing.

Here are the rules being talked about, from the definitions section
of Part 2. The (RR) means they were cribbed from the Radio Regulations:

Assigned Frequency. The centre of the frequency band assigned to a
station. (RR)
Assigned Frequency Band. The frequency band within which the
emission of a station is authorized; the width of the band equals the
necessary bandwidth plus twice the absolute value of the frequency
tolerance. Where space stations are concerned, the assigned frequency
band includes twice the maximum Doppler shift that may occur in relation
to any point of the Earth's surface. (RR)

Notice that they make no mention of any mode at all. That's because, in
general, an "assigned frequency band" is not necessarily associated with
any particular mode, it is just an assignment of a slice of spectrum, and
that spectrum doesn't move when the mode changes. The channel is hence
specified in a way (center frequency + bandwidth) which is independent of
the mode being used and can be understood by anyone no matter what mode
they're using. The channel is the same, no matter what the mode.

> Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do
>something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of
>technical convention. SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and
>has been that way ever since.

I think what the ITU standardized was a way to specify frequency assignments independent of the mode being used, which makes sense to me since, in general, the same frequency assignment could be used by many modes. It is the case that the particular assignments you're talking about are currently constrained to USB only for hams, but the mode restrictions could change without changing the frequency restrictions. If in future they decided to allow all authorized modes that fit in the same channels, then when changing modes on your ham transceiver from USB to CW to LSB you would also need to change the frequency on the dial, no matter how the channel frequencies were specified. If the channel frequency was specified with respect to the (untransmitted) USB carrier frequency, it would be wrong for CW and LSB despite the fact that the channel hasn't moved.

>There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
>modes. The reason as I just described is obvious. In fact, it is
>technically incorrect to do so. 5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
>ham radio readouts will have to show.

It seems to me the fundamental technical problem is that there is no way to specify a single readout frequency for your ham transceiver which will keep the transmitter output in the channel independent of the mode you set the transceiver to. Even though the channel doesn't move when the mode changes, you still need to twist the frequency knob on your transceiver when you change the mode switch.

I hence think that what you are complaining about is not a problem with the regulations but rather is a consequence of the fact that your ham transceiver wasn't designed for use in a channelized environment. A friendier radio for a channelized environment might center the transmitter output on the (ITU defined) assigned frequency independent of mode, or might even just show channel numbers instead of frequencies, but since your radio wasn't designed explicitly for this environment it does something else. It seems like that's okay, though, since you are a resourceful ham and should be able to make do with what you have available even if it means doing some math.

Dennis Ferguson

1316. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 18:46:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521144603.07843.00000138@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 67462

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>Date: 5/21/2003 11:36 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bbancvghnatit13oescbuj7b119pb8o5vv@4ax.com>

>Haven't looked at this group in some time.

Thank God. Anonymous trolls make it that much worse.

>You're a Bad Ham, Roll. Everybody knows it. Go
>soak your head.

No, not "everyone knows it". Larry is opinionated, but no more than
anyone else, and his opinions are backed up with practical experience.

I certainly don't agree with everything Larry has to say, but he's man
enough to put his name to his opinions and then stand behind them, and that's
enough for me.

Steve, K4CAP

1317. Re: Thoughts on Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 19:54:09 UTC
From: hikezilla@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <662db5ea.0305211154.69443e3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67464

Hey Ron...maybe if you weren't such a miserable asshole to everyone,
you'd have a better time at the hamfests.

"Ron \"Stompin\" James" <stomp@kenisbestersyo.org> wrote in message
news:<babkl1$6ur$0@pita.alt.net>...
> Which Dayton hamfest did you attend? Because you did
> not attend the same one I did!
>
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3EC92B20.80804@psu.edu...
> > I had a blast at Dayton, and thought I'd share some thoughts on it.
> >
> > I showed up Friday morning, and after registering, hit the flea market.
> > I was surprised at how big it was. Friday morning was also quite busy
> > outside. I think most people saw the weekend forecast and decided that
> > Friday was the day.
> >
>
> Flea market was bad news and much smaller than previous
> years. Prices were outrageous for the same junk idiots haul
> from fest to fest.
>
> > I was looking for a linear amp, and found quite a few for sale. Lots of
> > Heathkit SB-200 family amps there. After a round of the grounds, I found
> > a SB200 that needed some TLC. The paint on the case was bad, but the
> > face was only dirty. The previous owner had apparently been a smoker,
> > but I could take care of that. I got a good deal.
>
> There were many amps, but they were all for CB. Very few
> ham amps, and as expected, the sellers had wild ideas of what
> they were worth.
>
>
>
> >
> > I didn't want to lug that thing around, so I went out to the bus. What
> > this leads up to is "Take the bus!" I am amazed at how much better the
> > bus is compared to the parking lot at Hara's. Just a couple hundred foot
> > walk to the bus, then a couple more hundred to my van, and a lot of
> > steps saved. And 2 dollars versus 8 dollars a day leaves me with money
> > to spend on better things than parking. Also the parking lot was a muddy
> > mess due to all the rain. So Then I hop back on the bus to go back up to
> > Hara's.
>
> If you want to be in the boondocks, the bus is fine, I guess.

>
> >
> > Saturday was wet. Since it was forecast to rain, I planned on Saturday
> > as an inside day. I got lots of goodies from the commercial vendors
> > then. The rain slacked off, and I went back outside to try a deal on a
> > KW tuner I was eyeing to go along with the new amp. Guy wouldn't budge
> > on the price, so he got to keep it.
> >
>
> Yeah, that's right, nobody would budge on prices on anything.
> Goodies from vendors? You call all those slick color flyers
> goodies?
>
>
> > Sunday was just a hang-out day, and to see if any flea market bargains
> > cropped up.
>
> Same as day before, same junk, same high prices. Same obese
> slobs wanting outrageous prices for same junk they haul around all
> year to hamfests.
>
> >
> >
> > Now for the thoughts on the trip. I find it amusing that some hams here
> > and elsewhere gripe about the obese, bizarre, and smelly hams that some
> > obsess over. There were a few there to be sure. But not all that many.
> > So in fairness to the gripers, I saw:
>
> Every other ham was obese and stunk!
>
> >
> > The dude with the miniature tower and three element beam on a hard hat.
> >
> > The "Jungle Jim" guy who was wearing a pith helmet, a flowery shirt
> > that looked more like it was designed for his wife, and didn't change
> > nor shower all weekend.
> >
> > A few amazingly obese guys.
>
> A few!!??? You better get your eyes checked!
>
> >
> > A few amazingly old guys.
>
> A few!!??? It looked like several nursing homes sent all their
> residents to the hamfest!
>
>
> >
> >

> > BUT! They were very much the exception. As my first Dayton Hamvention,
> > I was keeping an eye out for the attendees, and found that in addition
> > to these characters I pointed out, that there were:
> >
> > Quite a few young hams in attendance. Many brought their young lady
> > friends.
>
> I saw no license Fwankie of BARF, and he never has a girl with
> him. That was it for young people. Lady friends??? What do
> you consider a lady?
>
>
> >
> > Female hams. The percentage was about what I expected. Not high, but
> > still there. This has been my experience in most technical fields, which
> > seem to have trouble attracting women. But the ones who were there were
> > happy enough to be there.
>
> The same three or four ugly oinkers you see at every hamfest.
>
>
> >
> > Normal looking hams with their normal looking families.
>
> You have a strange idea as to what "normal" is!
> Families? Saw a few guys dragging their filthy little screaming
> kids around. That was it. Probably because their old lady
> had to work that weekend.
>
>
> >
> > There were a fair amount of attractive ladies there. Not only the
> > ladies in the booths, but also walking about in the crowd.
>
> Attractive!!!!????? Whew!!! You DO need to get your
> eyes examined, pronto!
>
>
> >
> >
> > African American Hams. I didn't keep a count, but there ware a
> > significant number.
>
> Idiot! The few blacks you saw were employees on the custodial
> staff! I didn't see a single black ham. Dayton is a white thang,
> doncha know?
>
>
> >
> > All in all, I'd say that it looked like a normal cross-section of people.

>
>
> Like I said, get to an eye doctor ASAP!
>
> >
> > The guys with the weird hats were no different than the people who go
> > to football games and wear cheese wedge hats, or paint their chests in
> > team colors. In fact they are less goofy IMO.
> >
>
> Except the hams dress like that every day, whereas the sports fans
> only do it at games.
>
>
> > And I don't favor picking on the obese.
>
> Are you a liberal?
>
> >
> > Soooo, the only person I took real exception was the smelly guy.
> > Everyone can take a shower once in a while.
>
>
> There you go! You got one right! Except there were many
> smelly guys, hundreds!
>
>
> >
> >
> > Final score: Regular people I saw: 10's of thousands
>
> What do you consider "regular." I know I'm repeating but
> get for that eye exam soon!
>
> >
> >
> > People who really need to clean up their act: 1
>
> Who are you referring to?
>
> >
> > Personally, I think that when people gripe and complain about the
> > obese, smelly, old, nerdy, weird, all male, all white, antisocial hams,
> > they are saying a lot more about themselves than they say about those
> > they denigrate.
>
> No, what they are doing is sharing a lesson learned the hard way.
> Don't waste your money on Dayton, unless you are a psychology
> student doing a class project or better yet you get paid to be there.
>

> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >

1318. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 20:16:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bagmru$u68$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67465

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030521144603.07843.00000138@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: What's worse?
> >From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
> >Date: 5/21/2003 11:36 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bbancvghnatit13oescbuj7b119pb8o5vv@4ax.com>
>
> >Haven't looked at this group in some time.
>
> Thank God. Anonymous trolls make it that much worse.
>
> >You're a Bad Ham, Roll. Everybody knows it. Go
> >soak your head.
>
> No, not "everyone knows it". Larry is opinionated, but no more than
> anyone else, and his opinions are backed up with practical experience.
>
> I certainly don't agree with everything Larry has to say, but he's
man
> enough to put his name to his opinions and then stand behind them, and
that's
> enough for me.
>
> Steve, K4CAP
>
>
>
>

A big 'DITTO' to those comments Steve.

Dan/W4NTI

1319. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 20:40:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECBE4B1.FB879247@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67466

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The bottom line must be that some olde-tymers are just plain
> pished at not getting what they (rightfully) expected. BFD.

Here's a bottom line for you: You aren't involved in any way. You won't operate on the frequencies in question. You don't regulate the frequencies in question. You're just a senior citizen SWL with attitude.

> Nobody is forcing any US amateur to use those micro-bands. US
> amateurs didn't have any 60m frequencies before. FCC did NOT
> take anything away from US amateurs in that 60m region. A few
> brain-dead unadjustable olde-tymers will bitch, moan, and whine
> anyway...

What is any of this to you? You aren't involved in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

1320. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 20:50:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECBE726.7887DFCF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67467

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >>He claimed it was skill building for emergency comm skills. I claimed it is
> >>only incidental to emergency comm.
> >
> > That's because you do not know any better nor have any experience to
> >draw
> >an informed opinion from.
>
> One of my relatives worked as an EMT. This is experience to draw an informed
> opinion from. Perhaps, I should ask his opinion.

> >The goals may be different, but it's the same objective...The rapid,
> >accurate exchange of precisely accurate information.
>
> I agree with this.
>
> >The "contest" nature adds
> >the stress factor that one is under in "an emergency".
>
> I do not agree with that.
>
> It really depends on the situation. At the last Ham gathering, things like the
> wind blowing were a factor. At the event, they positioned vehicles, tents, etc
> to handle this situation. Antennas were put in place.

It isn't as if such decisions are real brain teasers, Vipul. Let common
sense lead your way.

> I learned, they perfected setting up and taking down quickly, by making
> adaptors, labelling setups, covering connectors, etc.

Every ham I know does this sort of thing on a routine basis. Don't you?

> This was sort of like an emergency, since if they did not handle the situation
> (the heavy wind) well, this would be disasterous.

If an emergency involves heavy winds, the antennas will still need to be
erected. If they fall, they'll have to be erected again.

> Contests by themselves do not train for that.

Who said they did? Doesn't your common sense tell you anything about
heavy wind? My location is at a little over 1500 feet at one of the
highest points in the area. We have heavy winds much of the time.

All of my antennas were put up with this in mind. If you wanted to
mount a very large triband yagi ten feet above the top of your tower and
wanted to stack VHF antennas below the tribander, what would you do to
minimize the chance of wind damage?

> Its where you set up which adds
> to the experience, not just the contest itself.

In some emergencies, you have little choice in where you set up. You
set up where the emergency is taking place.

> Do the same contest in a non-windy location, and its not much of a challenge.

Are we talking of challenges or preparedness?

> > It's not about what contesters "intentions" are, Vippy.
>
> I would agree if contesting tests those situations. The purpose of a contest is
> to have fun, not to test those situations. If you want to prepare for emergency
> communications, you do drills - not do a contest (a game).

By its very nature, contesting builds operating skills. Most contesters
do not limit their operation to contesting. Many are skilled traffic
handlers and many are involved in ARES.

This is another of those instances in which I feel you do not possess
sufficient experience or information on which to base a valid opinion.

Dave K8MN

1321. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 21:02:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305211302.4290c7b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67468

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3ECAE51E.4030104@adelphia.net>...

> Thanks for the good and detailed review, Jim.

I hardly scratched the surface. Are you subscribed to the reflector?

> I think I'm going to get one.

If you like it, it will ruin you for most manufactured stuff. You've
been warned.

> I'll probably take the stepped route to get everything.

Good approach - makes birthday and holiday present-buying easy for
your family. Which options you choose depends a lot on what you want
the rig to do.

If I had it to do over I would have done the "unmodule" thing, though.
That's where you install the option sockets ahead of time so you don't
have to unsolder jumpers and maybe mess with the heatsink.

Don't let anybody tell you hams aren't technical!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1322. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 21:05:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521170507.20456.00000088@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67469

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/21/2003 3:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ECBE4B1.FB879247@earthlink.net>

>You're just a senior citizen SWL with
>attitude.

Make that a senior citizen SWL with >>BAD<< attitude. =)

73

Steve, K4CAP

1323. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 21:06:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521170627.20456.00000089@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67470

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/21/2003 3:50 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ECBE726.7887DFCF@earthlink.net>

>It isn't as if such decisions are real brain teasers, Vipul. Let common
>sense lead your way.

He'll be chasing his tail for.....OH! I get it! Excuuuuuse me!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1324. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 21:17:59 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <b2Sya.8660$tq7.1240@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67471

Steve, amen to that! Anyone is free to post their opinions and all are free
to agree or disagree. It's sad that some folks have nothing better to do
than flame behind an anonymous post.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030521144603.07843.00000138@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: What's worse?
> >From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
> >Date: 5/21/2003 11:36 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bbancvghnatit13oescbuj7b119pb8o5vv@4ax.com>
>
> >Haven't looked at this group in some time.
>
> Thank God. Anonymous trolls make it that much worse.
>
> >You're a Bad Ham, Roll. Everybody knows it. Go
> >soak your head.
>
> No, not "everyone knows it". Larry is opinionated, but no more than
> anyone else, and his opinions are backed up with practical experience.
>
> I certainly don't agree with everything Larry has to say, but he's
man
> enough to put his name to his opinions and then stand behind them, and
that's
> enough for me.
>
> Steve, K4CAP
>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1325. Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 21:24:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521172446.20456.00000090@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67472

Anyone notice some strange goings-on in the Advanced and Novice categories
of the AH0A site? Last minute renewals?

Month Extra Advanced General Tech/Tech+ Novice ARS
Total
05/18/03 103,950 83,492 140,885 323,049 34,365
685,741
05/11/03 103,861 83,487 140,759 322,439 34,361
684,907
05/05/03 103,767 83,465 140,603 321,914 34,351
684,100

73

Steve, K4CAP

1326. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 21:45:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECBF364.BDBB8A44@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67473

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> Anyone notice some strange goings-on in the Advanced and Novice categories
> of the AH0A site? Last minute renewals?

Must be grace period reactivations.

1327. Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 22:13:50 UTC
From: Randy Thomas <TP@pradirandco.org>
Message-ID: <bagtn2$s5j$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the
blanks. Hope you washed your hands after shaking hands
with other hams.

Thanks,

Randy

1328. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 22:54:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521185441.18941.00000096@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67475

From Steve, K4CAP

>>You're better off with the bank.
>
> Oh...?!?!
>
> They are hovering around 3%. That's better?
>
>Steve, K4CAP

>From: K3UD K3UD@charter.net
>
>>Annualized growth rate: 0.6%.
>>Projected decade growth rate: 6%
>>At least there is still a positive growth rate.

Seems like the bank's rate is higher. 3% seems higher than 0.6%.

Also, note that this is a projected, not actual growth rate. I would need to see a Ham radio growth prospectus report.

However, I wouldn't want to bet on it. I heard someone got in trouble doing that.

1329. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 22:57:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bah0ea$i2g$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:baesevuci0@208.206.142.104...
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > > On 20 May 2003 02:53:29 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be
described
> > > >as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on
its
> > > >face.
> > >
> > > Go ahead, Dick, be contrary to the way that the rest of the
> > > comunications regulatory profession does things.
> >
> > Does it really matter how the channel is specified?
>
> Not to an appl;iance operator whose only interest is in dialing up a
frequency
> and shooting the breeze. If you're interested in what you're actually
doing and
> where you're doing it, it sure matters.

It isn't just an "appliance operator" situation. Consider what you do
if someone you are in a QSO suggests you shift to frequency NNN.
Do you set your rig's digital readout to an offset from NNN on the
assumption that NNN is the center frequency of an SSB signal or
do you set your readout to NNN and find you are exactly where
the other ham is expected to be?

The point is that the design and execution of today's transcievers
consider carrier frequency, not center frequency of an SSB signal.

I suppose the ARRL will simply not that the actual carrier frequency
for these new 5 mhz channels are NNN, YYY, ZZZ, etc and we'll all
then use that as opposed to worrying what the FCC regs actually
stated.

I haven't read the new rules, so I don't know what the actual mode(s)
allowed for these channels are, thus my SSB example may not actually be
applicable.

> > As long as we get our signals in the proper
> > place in the radio spectrum, it doesn't matter what we call it.
>
> True. But if you don't know that FCC insists on you misdialing your
frequency
> to be legal contrary to accurate technical convention as in this case, you
can
> easily be in violation and have not violated anything but a silly,
misleading
> rule. That may not matter to you but to me it sure does.

On this one, I agree with Dick. This is (IMHO) a practical issue of
writting
rules that take into account the accepted practice for a service. Indeed,
the
rules could easily have stated both a center freq and a carrier freq for
each
channel (again, assuming SSB is allowed mode).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1330. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:00:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bah0j8$o1r$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305210139050.2451@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Tue, 20 May 2003, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > ...
> > There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
> > modes. The reason as I just described is obvious. In fact, it is
> > technically incorrect to do so. 5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
> > ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a
> > fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be
> > that way, in the face of technical accuracy.
>
> Regardless of correctness, because of this mismatch between the ruling and
> custom, some are bound to "correct" it by tuning 1.4kHz down from the
> frequencies listed in the ruling while others will set their radios to
display
> those exact frequencies listed (thus tuning by the suppressed carrier and
being
> +1.4kHz above the rest). The bad designation, being in conflict with the
> common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem - and
that
> will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.

Agree completely. In fact, both the center freq AND the suppressed carrier
frequency could easily have been in the regs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1331. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:01:29 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521190129.18941.00000097@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67477

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>NO ONE said contesting is
>the end-all to emergency communications.

Okay sure. I agree.

>Contesting IS a form of a drill, Vippy. Case in point...Do you know what
>the "contest exchange" is for the ARRL Sweepstakes, and WHY it is what it is?
>
> (1) It is the NTS standard message traffic preamble format.
>
> (2) Using it as a "contest exchange" reinforces it's use as a traffic
>handling aid for NTS and EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS.
>
> In a contest, lack of speed and accuracy costs points.
>
> In an emergency, lack of speed and accuracy may cost lives.
>
> It really is THAT simple.

Okay, contesting builds some of the many skills needed. Contesting alone would
not be sufficient for emergency comm.

1332. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:07:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521190733.18941.00000098@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67479

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> I learned, they perfected setting up and taking down quickly, by making
>> adaptors, labelling setups, covering connectors, etc.
>
>Every ham I know does this sort of thing on a routine basis. Don't you?

Note that this is optional, as far as the contest rules are. It does affect how fast you can set up your station. However, it does not affect your contest score. So, only if Hams want to do this will they get better at it. The contest does not test for this.

>If an emergency involves heavy winds, the antennas will still need to be
>erected. If they fall, they'll have to be erected again.

The last Field day I went to was in a park'g lot (except for antennas of course). It was safe from winds and rain. Like I said, as far as the contest goes, the setup part is optional (not tested by the contest).

1333. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:12:31 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305212258080.2624@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67480

```
On Wed, 21 May 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305210149250.2451@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
> <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
> >On Tue, 20 May 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> In article <bac5b9$971$0@208.207.71.175>, "Dick Carroll;" writes:
> >> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >> >> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >> >> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
> >> >>
> >> >> Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
> >> >> finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
> >> >> you were in that category, Dick.
> >> >>
> >> >> One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
> >> >> the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
> >> >> the rule tells you to be.
> >> >>
> >> >> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
> >> >> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
> >> >> channel.
> >> >
> >> > And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're
> >> >discussing.
> >>
> >> The emission type specified in the new 97.303 is "2K8J3E."
> >> Not "FM." :-)
> >
> >Actually, that's missing a digit. 2k80J3E would be "more" correct, but we
> >probably all knew what you meant anyway. :-)
>
> Some of the keys on my computer keyboard must be sticky...from
> the laughing at the technical competence of these olde-tymers of
> many yarns in amateur radio. :-)
>
> On page 25 of FCC 03-105, the first sentence of the paragraph at
> the bottom of the page says, in parentheses:
>
> "...(emission type 2K8J3E)..."
>
> It does not say "2k80J3E." If you don't like the way the FCC said
```

> anything in FCC 03-105, just write them, not me. I don't regulate
> US civil radio and don't issue NPRMs or R&Os.

Apparently, they couldn't even get that correct! The bandwidth component is supposed to have THREE significant digits - and that one only has two. The trailing zero, although understood, is the third digit, so it's supposed to be there. As printed, it's not a valid emission identifier, so can this whole thing be moot anyway! :-)

> The NPRM 02-136 containing RM-10209 (the new 5 MHz band
> request) was issued May 15, 2002. FCC 03-105 was issued
> on May 14, 2003, just one day short of a full year. Everyone
> who cared to comment had almost a whole year to say what
> they wanted but only a few did. The Commenters are listed on
> pages 18, 19 of FCC 03-105. Their comments are in the public
> database at the FCC, accessible through the FCC ECFS.
>
> Feel free to start some new Memorandum at the FCC requesting
> a clarity of thought phrased in ham-speak on stating anything
> technical. The procedures to do so are also public knowledge
> from the FCC.

...That is, if I really gave a damn about HF to begin with.

> >> > Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do
> >> >something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of
> >> >technical convention.
> >>
> >> Nope. Commercial "sideband" began in the 1930s. Amateur
> >> "sideband" didn't start on its most-used mode ride until the late
> >> 1950s. By then the commercial and military "sideband" users
> >> were well entrenched in their technical use and descriptions.
> >>
> >> >SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and
> >> >has been that way ever since.
> >>
> >> Ahem...the dial indicator on most SSB-capable transceivers
> >> using PLL or DDS frequency control is offset to the center of
> >> the filter passband. Those will shift depending on upper or
> >> lower sideband selected.
> >>
> >> >It's the intelligent way to describe it.
> >>
> >> No, it's just a convention. Legally it will be more proper to
> >> specify band limits without regard to band width...and the rules
> >> state to operate within those band limits.
> >>
> >> >There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
> >> >modes. The reason as I just described is obvious.
> >>
> >> Amateur SSB is third on the long list of "sideband" users and

> >> amateurs were among the last to adopt SSB wholeheartedly.
> >> [small boat users may have been the last...] Amateurs were
> >> never ever the first to use SSB.
> >>
> >> >In fact, it is technically incorrect to do so.
> >>
> >> Make up your mind. ?
> >>
> >> >5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
> >> >ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a
> >> >fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be
> >> >that way, in the face of technical accuracy.
> >>
> >> Did you read R&O 03-105 and the new 97.303 content? Do so.
> >> It is at the bottom of page 25 of the R&O released May 14, 2003.
> >>
> >> Rather clear and explicit description of the five "mini-bands,"
> >> allocated emission type and "transmission occupies only the
> >> 2.8 KHz centered around each of these frequencies."
> >
> >Which means that the "carrier" frequency, if it were AM and not SSB, would be
> >1.4kHz below, and that's what some radios need to be tuned to in order for the
> >SSB signal to be where it should.... SSB is not a "centered" emission in that
> >it isn't usually specified by the center of its signal but by where the
> >suppressed carrier would be. That's the problem.
>
> There's NO problem in the FCC 03-105 R&O.
>
> There IS a problem in some amateurs' ability to read direct
> explicit English.
>
> FCC Rules aren't tailor-made to fit some current amateur radio
> designs of ready-built equipment as to frequency display, shift
> versus mode selection. FCC rules explicitly state a 2.8 KHz
> bandwidth, the center frequency of each micro-band, and that it
> is upper sideband.

I didn't say that I don't understand that; in fact I do. However, I bet that there are plenty of people who upon first read will set their suppressed carrier frequency to the number specified, not realizing that what was authorized was not f through f+2.8kHz, which is what needed to be said for that interpretation to be valid.

> Most of the brain-dead olde-tymers don't know squat about HOW
> their ready-built, ready-designed rigs operate behind their front
> panels. They don't bother to do a simple set-up to independently
> measure their performance because they don't know how to do it.
> Given an overt technical problem they would simply pack up their
> radios to send back to the manufacturer (probably with an enclosed
> angry note). That may be a new take on "advancing the state of the
> radio art" in US amateur radio.

The fact that they don't means that they will come up and operate 1.4kHz off
frequency - and that will be everyone's problem, not just theirs.

> >> > In the absense of a *very* good reason to change that attribute, it can
> >> >only be regarded as a dumb rule that will cause lots of confusion and
> >> >more importantly cause many, many radio frequency readouts to read
> >> >incorrectly - that is, assuming their operators have been apprised of
> >> >the ridiculous rule.
> >>
> >> US civil radio regulations aren't driven by the conventions of
> >> frequency displays on ready-built equipment in regards to
> >> transmission of RF energy. The shift of frequency DISPLAY
> >> is a user convenience convention...what concerns every other
> >> user of the EM spectrum is the precise frequency of ANY
> >> RF source.
> >
> >What frequency shift? For many radios, when they change modes, the displayed
> >frequency does not change. For many out there, that means set the displayed
> >frequency (and thus the location of the suppressed carrier) to the number
> >given, and for SSB, that means that the signal will be from frequency X to
> >X+2.8kHz.
>
> The internal "shift" varies with manufacturers, but was done by some
> of them to center the tuning in the different internal IF filters per a
> selected mode.
>
> FCC doesn't care HOW that is done. They just clearly specified 5
> little "micro-bands" a bit differently than QST or CQ might say in
> their publications. Olde-tymers seem to have difficulty of dealing
> with the unexpected way it is said, but that is the olde-tymers'
> problem, not the FCC. If the olde-tymers can't adjust, then they
> will go the way of all dinosaurs of the past...
>
> >> > If that's intelligent I sure don't see it.
> >>
> >> Pages 18 and 19 of R&O 03-105 list all the Commenters on
> >> the NPRMs preceding the R&O. "Richard Carroll" was not on
> >> that list.
> >>
> >> > Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be described
> >> >as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
> >> >face.
> >>
> >> Nooooo. It's just against the way YOU want it to be.
> >>
> >> You are thinking ONLY of single-channel SSB users and how a
> >> few manufacturers designed the ready-built transceivers YOU
> >> and thousands of others use (including the HF SSB transceivers
> >> now in use by small-boat owners). Try thinking of describing a
> >> commercial SSB spectral occupancy made up of four 3 KHz
> >> chunks, each one having modulation data that starts and ends

> >> in a 100 to 2800 KHz spectral distribution...the four taking up
> >> about 12 KHz of RF bandspace. :-) Those were there before
> >> amateurs were using "sideband" in large numbers.
> >>
> >> You now HAVE five little mini-bands in a frequency area not
> >> available to amateurs before (at least since the end of WW2).
> >> Why are you bitching so mightily?
> >
> >Probably because the order was written in such a way that there is confusion
> >over where to tune the radio in order to produce the desired emission....
>
> No. As I said, it is evident that olde-tymers just cannot adjust to
> clear, explicit English phrased differently than the "technical
> knowledge" spoon-fed them through ARRL publications.

You make this sound as if it's a problem of age. I bet that there are
20-year-olds and 40-year-olds who will be just as confused about this as your
"olde-tymers" (the 70+ crowd).

The regulation itself may be clear in what it literally says. The problem is
that it is NOT written with regards to the conventions that everyone
understands.

> The bottom line must be that some olde-tymers are just plain
> pished at not getting what they (rightfully) expected. BFD.
>
> ARRL's legal firm failed to convince the FCC that this "60m" band
> was justified. But, the FCC gave US amateurs five little "micro-
> bands" in that "60m" region...better than nothing at all, I'd say.
>
> Nobody is forcing any US amateur to use those micro-bands. US
> amateurs didn't have any 60m frequencies before. FCC did NOT
> take anything away from US amateurs in that 60m region. A few
> brain-dead unadjustable olde-tymers will bitch, moan, and whine
> anyway...

1334. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:16:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bah1i4$qd3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

With these new channels, I guess most of us will "snip the diode"
in our rigs to allow transmisison on frequencies not otherwise programed
as being amateur bands. I'll have to dig out my TS-690 manual which
I recall stated how to do it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1335. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:18:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521191843.20945.00000094@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67481

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/21/2003 6:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030521190129.18941.00000097@mb-m20.aol.com>

>Okay, contesting builds some of the many skills needed. Contesting alone
>would
>not be sufficient for emergency comm.

Finally.

Steve, K4CAP

1336. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:19:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bah22b$1g8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67484
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"W-157.203" <w157203@innovustenoinc.com> wrote in message
news:baeu6g$1jh$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> This entire 5 mHz allocation speaks so loud & clear as
> to the idiocy of the FCC. One can only guess as to the
> monumental incompetence found on the FCC employment
> roster these days. This is truly an agency is diarray, more
> like chaos.
>
> R. Wrigenfield, Ph. D., P.E.
> President & CEO
> Renetictech Technology, LTD.

Maybe not that bad, but it does reflect a beurocratic
attitude towards regs that seems to ignore the practical and
pragmatic. A few additional words and all would have been crystal
clear.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1337. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:24:50 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521192450.18941.00000099@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67483

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> "Utility Hams"...???
> I see...yeet another "vipinition".

No, its logical classification.

The word "contesting" is "Ham speak". Contest usually means a competetive activity.

In Ham radio, the word contesting is changed to mean to a radio contact chasing game. By the very definition, this is what a contest is. This limits other possibilities. It therefore becomes the defining activity for Ham radio.

1338. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:27:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf7sh71.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67485
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>The bad designation, being in conflict with the
>common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem - and that
>will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.

What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at
5xxx, one has no business operating that transmitter.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1339. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:27:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf7swu2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67486
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 21 May 2003 04:02:49 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams
>will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way
>every time.

Ignorance of the law is no defense.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1340. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:40:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bah2vo$f12$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67487
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf7sh71.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
> >The bad designation, being in conflict with the
> >common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem -
and that
> >will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.
>
> What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
> band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
> suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at
> 5xxx, one has no business operating that transmitter.

The carrier offset depends on the actual signal bandwidth for
the SSB signal produced by a specific rig. Just because 2.8 is
pretty common, doesn't mean all rigs have a 2.8 bandwidth
implemented.

It seems to me the only way to assure that my carrier and yours
are in sync is if we specifically agree to a 1.4KHz center frequency as
an assumption. My signal may not actually be 2.8 wide and the
center frequency of my signal might actually be only 1.3 or less
up from my suppressed carrier freq.

Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
(offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1341. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-21 23:52:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECC1162.2030404@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67488

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>>NO ONE said contesting is
>>the end-all to emergency communications.
>

> Okay sure. I agree.

<Some snippage>

> Okay, contesting builds some of the many skills needed. Contesting alone would
> not be sufficient for emergency comm.

Bingo! That's all we were saying, Vipul!

We'll argue you into liking us yet! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1342. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 00:05:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECC1471.7040902@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67489

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>> "Utility Hams"...???
>> I see...yeet another "vipinition".
>
>
> No, its logical classification.
>
> The word "contesting" is "Ham speak". Contest usually means a competetive
> activity.
>
> In Ham radio, the word contesting is changed to mean to a radio contact chasing
> game. By the very definition, this is what a contest is. This limits other
> possibilities. It therefore becomes the defining activity for Ham radio.
>

Oh man, Vipul. Contesting is extremely competitive. You think I stay up
all night during Field day just to be antisocial? I'm racking up points
all night long. Another event I'm involved heavily in, the PAQSO party,
is super competitive too. And all the others I do seem just about the same.

It just seems you don't understand it at all. Note this is not the same
as liking it. No one has to like contesting or any other form of ham
activity at all.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1343. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 00:16:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521201659.15462.00000171@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67491

In article <baet74vnm0@208.206.142.70>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> As I see it, what you missed is the difference between a discrete frequency
>channel and the accompanying tolerance (which AFAIK hasn't yet been
>announced) and which your TS440
>was NOT designed to meet, and commercial gear which was.

The fact that no tolerance is specified means that we don't have to worry about
it much. As long as we're within a couple of hundred Hz, I don;t think FCC is
going to get upset.

>If you can't put numbers on the
>situation you can't be certain you're within tolerance. I guess "close" is
>gonna be good enough, then.

Take the announced center freqs and subtract 1.5 kHz. Tune around each freq for
some non-amateurs and zero them in. Note dial readings. Job done.
>
>And, you seem to be competent to take care of this problem. Most
>"ordinary" hams are not.

I disagree!

You've been reading too many of Len Over 21's posts, Dick. Most of the hams I
know will be able to comply with the rules once they have the information. No
big deal.

>The relaxed tests notwithstanding, looks like they better learn..
>
They will.

Sure, it makes more sense to define SSB by the suppressed carrier freq,
regardless of whether it's USB, LSB, ISB or whatever. One good reason is that
if everyone uses the suppressed carrier as the defining freq, then when you set
the rig on freq, you KNOW it's tuned right.

But the folks who are primary users of 60 meters don't do it that way. So we
have to play by their rules. If it were up to the primary users we probably
wouldn't have any access to 60 meters at all. 60 can be a good test of how
adaptable hams are.

From what I see in the R&O, it's clear that 9/11 had a big effect on the views
of NTIA towards assets like HF allocations.

--

What most folks are missing is that it's an insidious secret plot to stamp out LSB below 10 MHz....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1344. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 00:17:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521201700.15462.00000172@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67490

In article <20030520222207.27532.00000053@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> I also now see a line of transverters for 6, 2 and 1.25M.

$349 each. Not for the timid....

>This thing just keeps getting better and better!

Yep.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1345. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 01:50:54 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305220147080.2735@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67492
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> >The bad designation, being in conflict with the
> >common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem - and that
> >will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.
>
> What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
> band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
> suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at
> 5xxx, one has no business operating that transmitter.

The vagueness is due to the custom of specifying a frequency by where the supressed carrier would fall (had it not been supressed). That's not what the FCC did but that's how plenty of people will interpret it - because they won't read it the same way as we do.

1346. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 01:51:25 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305220151290.2735@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67493
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On 21 May 2003 04:02:49 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams
> >will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way
> >every time.
>
> Ignorance of the law is no defense.

But poor writing of it is.

1347. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 01:53:48 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305220152350.2735@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67494
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 May 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf7sh71.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> >
> > >The bad designation, being in conflict with the
> > >common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem -
> and that
> > >will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.
> >
> > What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
> > band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
> > suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at
> > 5xxx, one has no business operating that transmitter.
>
> The carrier offset depends on the actual signal bandwidth for
> the SSB signal produced by a specific rig. Just because 2.8 is
> pretty common, doesn't mean all rigs have a 2.8 bandwidth
> implemented.
>
> It seems to me the only way to assure that my carrier and yours
> are in sync is if we specifically agree to a 1.4KHz center frequency as
> an assumption. My signal may not actually be 2.8 wide and the
> center frequency of my signal might actually be only 1.3 or less
> up from my suppressed carrier freq.
>
> Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)

And what of non-ARRL members? They don't do a THING via the ARRL (except
perhaps protest it).

1348. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:19:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <btWya.8691$7b1.6343@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67495

Um, let's see. Ham radio means contests? I was first licensed in 1962 (WN2CJV), general in 1964 and extra in 1966 (WB2OSP). Then WA3RJX and N2JH. I dropped the tickets and get back in 1993 as AA2QA. I've enjoyed chatting with folks all over the world via CW, AM, SSB, RTTY, and FM. I've *never* entered any contests. Handled a number of phone patch traffic and handled emergency traffic, but never been involved in a contest. Must be I'm not a ham :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1349. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:21:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <TuWya.8692$ib1.749@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67496

Either that our they hired some former Enron accountants :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3ECBF364.BDBB8A44@ix.netcom.com...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Anyone notice some strange goings-on in the Advanced and Novice
categories
> > of the AH0A site? Last minute renewals?
>
> Must be grace period reactivations.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1350. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:24:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521222407.29002.00000127@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67497

In article <20030521172446.20456.00000090@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Anyone notice some strange goings-on in the Advanced and Novice categories
>of the AH0A site? Last minute renewals?
>
>Month Extra Advanced General Tech/Tech+ Novice ARS
>Total
>05/18/03 103,950 83,492 140,885 323,049 34,365
>685,741
>05/11/03 103,861 83,487 140,759 322,439 34,361
>684,907
>05/05/03 103,767 83,465 140,603 321,914 34,351
>684,100

Nothing strange about it at all, Steve.

As explained on the site, AH0A's computing methods subtract all expirations that occur in a given month, and treat them as if they all occur on the first of that month. That's why the first weekly total is so much lower than the end-of-month total of the previous month. It all comes out in the wash, though.

Because a straight renewal can only be done within 90 days of the expiration date, a fair number of those renewing are going to be counted as expirations using AH0A's method.

Here's a trivia question in the making: Which of the closed-to-new-licenses classes will disappear first? We know that Tech Plus will go away in approximately 6 years and 10 months even if the rules don't change, because by then all Tech Pluses will have either been renewed as Techs, upgraded or expired. But will Novice or Advanced disappear first?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1351. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:32:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030521223253.27503.00000117@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67499

In article <20030521172446.20456.00000090@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Anyone notice some strange goings-on in the Advanced and Novice categories
>of the AH0A site? Last minute renewals?
>
>Month Extra Advanced General Tech/Tech+ Novice ARS
>Total
>05/18/03 103,950 83,492 140,885 323,049 34,365
>685,741
>05/11/03 103,861 83,487 140,759 322,439 34,361
>684,907
>05/05/03 103,767 83,465 140,603 321,914 34,351
>684,100
>

Steve:

The Novice and Advanced categories don't look any "stranger" to me
than any of the rest. Overall, the increases are so tiny, they would seem
to consist mainly of last minute renewals within the two-year grace
period, as Bob Casey has already surmised.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1352. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:32:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030521223253.27503.00000118@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67500

In article <20030521024341.09515.00000076@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>
> I don't think it's so much that the written tests are any easier in
>thier
>own right...It's just that we have mandated giving the answers away. THAT is
>the problem.
>
>Steve, K4CAP

Steve:

Precisely. Anyone who has seen the answers enough times can usually pick them out from short-term memory. This is infinitely easier than learning the material in the first place, and is the kind of short-cut that goes hand-in-
hand with reducing/eliminating the code testing requirements. It all boils down to reducing the time it takes to develop practical knowledge and operating skill, and simply getting a license into the hot little hand of someone who will hopefully become an ARRL member and buyer of high-
priced ham gear!

I am definitely not opposed to growth in the ARS, but I would have preferred to see it come about the right way -- with our previous licensing system which incrementally awarded increased knowledge and operational skill with increased privileges.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1353. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:32:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030521223254.27503.00000119@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67498

In article <bbancvghnatit13oescbuj7b119pb8o5vv@4ax.com>, Freddy the Freeloader
<bogus@fake.com> writes:

>>Reminds me of a line from a Harry Chapin song: "...And she walked away
>>in silence; It's strange but you'd never know; We'd both gotten what we'd
>>asked for, Such a long, long time ago." Unfortunately, for us hams, as it
>was
>>for Harry and Sue, "getting what we'd asked for" didn't bring a happy
>ending.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Haven't looked at this group in some time. It's sad to see that the
>king of idiots, Larry Roll, is still spouting his hate and derision
>of anyone who doesn't want to pound two pieces of brass together to
>make di-duh sounds. You're a Bad Ham, Roll. Everybody knows it. Go
>soak your head.

Freddie the Fake Bogus Freeloader:

I always like this kind of response; it lets me know that I've accomplished
my mission: To get right up the nose of some no-coder non-ham like you.
Kiss my gleaming white ass.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1354. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:48:30 UTC
From: Randy Thomas <TP@pradirandco.org>
Message-ID: <bahdq6poe0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67551
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf7sh71.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
> >The bad designation, being in conflict with the
> >common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem -
and that
> >will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.
>
> What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
> band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
> suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at
> 5xxx, one has no business operating that transmitter.
>
>
Assuming this assertion is valid, then conservatively speaking,
85% of today's ham radio operators have no business operating
a transmitter. I offer as proof my posting about the stolen toilet
paper at the Dayton Hamfest. If hams assume that toilet paper
in the Dayton rest rooms is there for the taking and just another
perceived "freebie," then that is clear example of the mentality in
today's amateur radio rank and file. Pretty scary, isn't it?

Randy

--
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

1355. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:50:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECC3AE3.7E4533B2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67552
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Randy Thomas wrote:

> Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
> at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
> mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
> hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
> the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
> cases and hams having to take a dump.....

What, nobody made the expected snide remarks about give
away cbplusser licenses yet? This is rrap after all.... :-)

1356. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:52:41 UTC
From: Randy Thomas <TP@pradirandco.org>
Message-ID: <bahe20$q7u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67553
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf7swu2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 21 May 2003 04:02:49 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams
> >will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way
> >every time.
>
> Ignorance of the law is no defense.
>
But gross incompetence in writing regualtions is? Sorry, that
won't pass muster here or anywhere.

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

1357. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 02:57:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521225744.01971.00000103@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67554

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/21/2003 6:52 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ECC1162.2030404@adelphia.net>

>> Okay, contesting builds some of the many skills needed. Contesting alone
>would
>> not be sufficient for emergency comm.
>
> Bingo! That's all we were saying, Vipul!
>
> We'll argue you into liking us yet! 8^)

Uuuuuuuhhhhhhh........

Steve, K4CAP

1358. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 03:09:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521230930.01971.00000104@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67555

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/21/2003 6:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030521192450.18941.00000099@mb-m20.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>> "Utility Hams"...???
>> I see...yeet another "vipinition".
>
>No, its logical classification.

To YOU it's "logical". You invented the term in order to make it "right" in your mind, Vippy. Many others call it "Honeydew" traffic..."Honey do this...Honey do that..."

>The word "contesting" is "Ham speak". Contest usually means a competetive
>activity.

"Ham speak"...?!?!

"Usually" means a competitive activity...?!?!?

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! !

>In Ham radio, the word contesting is changed to mean to a radio contact
>chasing
>game.

Stand up at a meeting of the YCCC and call it a "game", Vippy. They're in your backyard...you can drop in anytime...Or maybe you'd care to drive down to Philly and do the same thing at the FRC..?!?!

By the very definition, this is what a contest is. This limits other
>possibilities. It therefore becomes the defining activity for Ham radio.

>This limits other
>possibilities. It therefore becomes the defining activity for Ham radio.

Contesting is a lot of fun and perpetuates development of many of the higher-performance radios we see on the market today, Vippy. Read tha ads...Talk with the manufacturer reps. Ask them if they'd put that kind of R&D money into a "game" unless there was more than just a few people doing it.

And as much fun as it is, it is hardly "the" defining activitiy for Amateur Radio.

Steve, K4CAP

1359. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 03:14:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521231424.01971.00000105@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67556

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/21/2003 7:17 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030521201700.15462.00000172@mb-m06.aol.com>

>In article <20030520222207.27532.00000053@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> I also now see a line of transverters for 6, 2 and 1.25M.
>
>$349 each. Not for the timid....

Yeah...the price bites. It used to be you bought a kit and saved money cuz
you did the lion's share of the work. Now you buy a kit and pay a premium for
the "fun" you are going to have doing it!

I priced out the K2 with the options I'd ant and one (six meters)
transverter kit and came in just over $1100. Like you said...NOT for the
timid!

But I WANT one!

Steve, K4CAP

1360. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 03:17:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030521231748.01971.00000106@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67557

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 5/21/2003 9:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030521223254.27503.00000119@mb-m24.aol.com>

>Freddie the Fake Bogus Freeloader:
>
>I always like this kind of response; it lets me know that I've accomplished
>my mission: To get right up the nose of some no-coder non-ham like you.
>Kiss my gleaming white ass.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Like I said...I don't always agree with what Larry says, (or in this case
HOW he says it!), but by God the man will stand behind what he says...

Steve, K4CAP

1361. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 03:19:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bahfpu$4u5$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305220152350.2735@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 21 May 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf7sh71.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> > >
> > > >The bad designation, being in conflict with the
> > > >common understanding by custom, will cause this interference
problem -
> > and that
> > > > >will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.
> > >
> > > What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
> > > band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
> > > suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at
> > > 5xxx, one has no business operating that transmitter.
> >
> > The carrier offset depends on the actual signal bandwidth for
> > the SSB signal produced by a specific rig. Just because 2.8 is
> > pretty common, doesn't mean all rigs have a 2.8 bandwidth
> > implemented.
> >
> > It seems to me the only way to assure that my carrier and yours
> > are in sync is if we specifically agree to a 1.4KHz center frequency as
> > an assumption. My signal may not actually be 2.8 wide and the
> > center frequency of my signal might actually be only 1.3 or less
> > up from my suppressed carrier freq.
> >
> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
>
> And what of non-ARRL members? They don't do a THING via the ARRL (except
> perhaps protest it).

Odds are they won't even know the channels exist...but seriously,
the issue goes to what constitutes good regulations as to the regs
being understandable, clear and concise.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1362. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 03:23:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bahg1d$me4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67559
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305220151290.2735@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 21 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> > On 21 May 2003 04:02:49 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > >Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams
> > >will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way
> > >every time.
> >
> > Ignorance of the law is no defense.
>
> But poor writing of it is.

And poorly written laws have often lead to a person
not being found in violation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1363. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 03:28:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bahgaprpj1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67560

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030521222407.29002.00000127@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <20030521172446.20456.00000090@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >Anyone notice some strange goings-on in the Advanced and Novice
categories
> >of the AH0A site? Last minute renewals?
> >
> >Month Extra Advanced General Tech/Tech+ Novice
ARS
> >Total
> >05/18/03 103,950 83,492 140,885 323,049 34,365
> >685,741
> >05/11/03 103,861 83,487 140,759 322,439 34,361
> >684,907
> >05/05/03 103,767 83,465 140,603 321,914 34,351
> >684,100
>
> Nothing strange about it at all, Steve.
>
> As explained on the site, AH0A's computing methods subtract all
expirations
> that occur in a given month, and treat them as if they all occur on the
first
> of that month. That's why the first weekly total is so much lower than the
> end-of-month total of the previous month. It all comes out in the wash,
though.
>
> Because a straight renewal can only be done within 90 days of the
expiration
> date, a fair number of those renewing are going to be counted as
expirations
> using AH0A's method.
>
> Here's a trivia question in the making: Which of the
closed-to-new-licenses
> classes will disappear first? We know that Tech Plus will go away in
> approximately 6 years and 10 months even if the rules don't change,
because by
> then all Tech Pluses will have either been renewed as Techs, upgraded or
> expired. But will Novice or Advanced disappear first?

Neither novice nor advanced will disappear in the next 10 years as many have actually been renewed and 100s more are renewed every month giving those renewals another 10 years of existence....unless they all suddenly upgrade.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1364. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 03:54:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECC4A58.B0278FBE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67561

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> > "Utility Hams"...???
> > I see...yeet another "vipinition".
>
> No, its logical classification.

...of a term made up by you.

> The word "contesting" is "Ham speak".

No, it is not.

> Contest usually means a competetive
> activity.

I contest your homemade definitions. My use of the word "contest" did
not involve a competitive activity.

> In Ham radio, the word contesting is changed to mean to a radio > contact chasing game.

No, the meaning of the word is not changed and amateur radio contesting
is not simply "contact chasing game". To do well, you'll need both
contacts and multipliers. In some contests, you'll gain fewer points
with contacts on your own continent than you will by working stations on
a different continent. If you bust a call or the exchange, you'll not
get credit for the contact. Too many busted calls or exchanges and
you'd be disqualified.

> By the very definition, this is what a contest is.

If your definition is wrong (and it is) your latest rant will evaporate.

> This limits other possibilities.

What limits other possibilities?

> It therefore becomes the defining activity for Ham radio.

Darn it! You're wrong yet again.

Vipul, are you an adult?

Dave K8MN

1365. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 04:01:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECC4BE3.61CA6CA8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67562

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> I learned, they perfected setting up and taking down quickly, by making
> >> adaptors, labelling setups, covering connectors, etc.
> >
> >Every ham I know does this sort of thing on a routine basis. Don't you?
>
> Note that this is optional, as far as the contest rules are.

No kidding? Of what value would it be to include labeling your
connectors in contest rules?

> It does affect
> how fast you can set up your station.

No kidding?

> However, it does not affect your contest
> score.

You'd better read those Field Day rules again.

> So, only if Hams want to do this will they get better at it. The > contest does not test
for this.

Outside of the test you took to obtain your license, nothing tests for
anything in amateur radio.

> >If an emergency involves heavy winds, the antennas will still need to be
> >erected. If they fall, they'll have to be erected again.
>
> The last Field day I went to was in a park'g lot (except for antennas of
> course).

Maybe you were participating in "Parking Lot Day". Can't antennas be
put up in a parking lot?

> It was safe from winds and rain.

Oh? Was it perhaps a parking garage?

> Like I said, as far as the contest
> goes, the setup part is optional (not tested by the contest).

Contests don't "test" to see if your pencil is sharpened or your laptop
batteriers are charged either. What is your point?

Dave K8MN

1366. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 04:20:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bahj5q$48q$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 67563
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> >> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >>
> >> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
> >> >
> >> > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
> >> >
> >> > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
> >>
> [...]
> >> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
> >> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
> >> channel.
> >
> > And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're
> >discussing.
>
> Here are the rules being talked about, from the definitions section
> of Part 2. The (RR) means they were cribbed from the Radio Regulations:
>
> Assigned Frequency. The centre of the frequency band assigned to a
> station. (RR)
> Assigned Frequency Band. The frequency band within which the
> emission of a station is authorized; the width of the band equals the
> necessary bandwidth plus twice the absolute value of the frequency
> tolerance. Where space stations are concerned, the assigned frequency
> band includes twice the maximum Doppler shift that may occur in relation
> to any point of the Earth's surface. (RR)
>
> Notice that they make no mention of any mode at all. That's because, in
> general, an "assigned frequency band" is not necessarily associated with
> any particular mode, it is just an assignment of a slice of spectrum, and
> that spectrum doesn't move when the mode changes. The channel is hence
> specified in a way (center frequency + bandwidth) which is independent of
> the mode being used and can be understood by anyone no matter what mode
> they're using. The channel is the same, no matter what the mode.
>
> > Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do
> >something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of

> >technical convention. SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and
> >has been that way ever since.
>
> I think what the ITU standardized was a way to specify frequency
> assignments independent of the mode being used, which makes sense to
> me since, in general, the same frequency assignment could be used by
> many modes. It is the case that the particular assignments you're
> talking about are currently constrained to USB only for hams, but the
> mode restrictions could change without changing the frequency restrictions.
> If in future they decided to allow all authorized modes that fit in the
> same channels, then when changing modes on your ham transceiver from USB
> to CW to LSB you would also need to change the frequency on the dial, no
> matter how the channel frequencies were specified. If the channel frequency
> was specified with respect to the (untransmitted) USB carrier frequency,
> it would be wrong for CW and LSB despite the fact that the channel hasn't
> moved.
>
> >There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
> >modes. The reason as I just described is obvious. In fact, it is
> >technically incorrect to do so. 5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
> >ham radio readouts will have to show.
>
> It seems to me the fundamental technical problem is that there is no
> way to specify a single readout frequency for your ham transceiver
> which will keep the transmitter output in the channel independent of
> the mode you set the transceiver to.

That obviously depends on the width of the channel. At 2.8 khz of course you're correct. At 6 khz, no. Both SSSC sidebands, most digital modes, and the CW carrier would all be covered, and there would of course be empty space within the channel depending on the mode. So, by restricting the mode to 2.8 khz, we're forced to the commercial definition of "channel". The root of the problem, and AFAIC it is a problem. Any change which causes me that much discomfiture is a problem. :-) And I'll say it one more time, I'm mostly concerned that many hams will wander into violation of the rules simply because this is a totally new way to define operating frequency within the ARS.

> Even though the channel doesn't
> move when the mode changes, you still need to twist the frequency knob
> on your transceiver when you change the mode switch.

> Of course this is the big difference. This is the first instance in my memory
> where an amateur channel was determined in this way. And as with anything that
> new and different, many will not get the word. It's not so much a matter of
> doing it differently as knowing that the rules require you to. It's that much
> different.

>
>
> I hence think that what you are complaining about is not a problem with
> the regulations but rather is a consequence of the fact that your ham

> transceiver wasn't designed for use in a channelized environment. A
> friendier radio for a channelized environment might center the transmitter
> output on the (ITU defined) assigned frequency independent of mode, or
> might even just show channel numbers instead of frequencies, but since
> your radio wasn't designed explicitly for this environment it does
> something else. It seems like that's okay, though, since you are a
> resourceful ham and should be able to make do with what you have available
> even if it means doing some math.

I think you have just given the expanded and eminently clear version of what Phil had to say. :-)

Of course none of this was an issue until the instant case which just happens to be the original amateur radio assignment (at least in the US) where FCC has assigned discrete frequency channels, as far as I'm aware

And again, it's not me that needs to be concerned-so long as I've been informed that, with these assignments only, I need to be concerned with FCC's commercial definition of "assigned frequency" and how it differs from 100 years of amateur radio practice. I'm rather certain that a fairly large percentage of hams will miss that important piece of information.

Dick

1367. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 04:47:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bahkok$73c$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 67564
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 21 May 2003 04:02:49 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams
> >will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way
> >every time.
>
> Ignorance of the law is no defense.

Ignoring convention and failing to clarify new rules when they
radically depart from 100 years of that convention would seem to be poor
administration, too.

1368. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 04:52:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522005259.24390.00000176@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67565

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305212258080.2624@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Wed, 21 May 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305210149250.2451@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
>> <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
>> >On Tue, 20 May 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> In article <bac5b9$971$0@208.207.71.175>, "Dick Carroll;" writes:
>> >> >Phil Kane wrote:
>> >> >> On 19 May 2003 04:14:41 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>> >> >> >> The Rules are specific on what "assigned frequency" means.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Phil, no matter what the source---it's STILL stupid.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > A stupid can be nothing more than a stupid rule.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Calling a rule "stupid" is one usual defense when one
>> >> >> finds it inconvenient to comply with it. I didn't think that
>> >> >> you were in that category, Dick.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> One should not blame "the rule" for one's deficiency in making
>> >> >> the computation as to where to set a particular rig to be where
>> >> >> the rule tells you to be.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> The rule is clear - the "numbers" represent the center of the
>> >> >> channel, just like 146.90 MHz represents the center of THAT
>> >> >> channel.
>> >> >
>> >> > And that, Phil, is why I regard the rule as stupid. It's not FM we're
>> >> >discussing.
>> >>
>> >> The emission type specified in the new 97.303 is "2K8J3E."
>> >> Not "FM." :-)
>> >
>> >Actually, that's missing a digit. 2k80J3E would be "more" correct, but we
>> >probably all knew what you meant anyway. :-)
>>
>> Some of the keys on my computer keyboard must be sticky...from
>> the laughing at the technical competence of these olde-tymers of
>> many yarns in amateur radio. :-)
>>
>> On page 25 of FCC 03-105, the first sentence of the paragraph at
>> the bottom of the page says, in parentheses:
>>

>> "...(emission type 2K8J3E)..."
>>
>> It does not say "2k80J3E." If you don't like the way the FCC said
>> anything in FCC 03-105, just write them, not me. I don't regulate
>> US civil radio and don't issue NPRMs or R&Os.
>
>Apparently, they couldn't even get that correct! The bandwidth component is
>supposed to have THREE significant digits - and that one only has two. The
>trailing zero, although understood, is the third digit, so it's supposed to be
>there. As printed, it's not a valid emission identifier, so can this whole
>thing be moot anyway! :-)

Write or e-mail the FCC.

If you get really angry, hop up and down to your congressperson
or Barbara and Dianne.

>> The NPRM 02-136 containing RM-10209 (the new 5 MHz band
>> request) was issued May 15, 2002. FCC 03-105 was issued
>> on May 14, 2003, just one day short of a full year. Everyone
>> who cared to comment had almost a whole year to say what
>> they wanted but only a few did. The Commenters are listed on
>> pages 18, 19 of FCC 03-105. Their comments are in the public
>> database at the FCC, accessible through the FCC ECFS.
>>
>> Feel free to start some new Memorandum at the FCC requesting
>> a clarity of thought phrased in ham-speak on stating anything
>> technical. The procedures to do so are also public knowledge
>> from the FCC.
>
>...That is, if I really gave a damn about HF to begin with.

Real hams work DX on HF with CW. :-)

"Gigahertz are for gigasquirts." - KH2D

>> >> > Some functionary somewhere, maybe ITU for all I know, decided to do
>> >> >something with his boring day and arbitrarily changed decades of
>> >> >technical convention.
>> >>
>> >> Nope. Commercial "sideband" began in the 1930s. Amateur
>> >> "sideband" didn't start on its most-used mode ride until the late
>> >> 1950s. By then the commercial and military "sideband" users
>> >> were well entrenched in their technical use and descriptions.
>> >>
>> >> >SSB began referenced to the carrier frequency and
>> >> >has been that way ever since.
>> >>
>> >> Ahem...the dial indicator on most SSB-capable transceivers
>> >> using PLL or DDS frequency control is offset to the center of
>> >> the filter passband. Those will shift depending on upper or
>> >> lower sideband selected.

>> >>
>> >> >It's the intelligent way to describe it.
>> >>
>> >> No, it's just a convention. Legally it will be more proper to
>> >> specify band limits without regard to band width...and the rules
>> >> state to operate within those band limits.
>> >>
>> >> >There is no good reason to describe SSB in equivalent terms with other
>> >> >modes. The reason as I just described is obvious.
>> >>
>> >> Amateur SSB is third on the long list of "sideband" users and
>> >> amateurs were among the last to adopt SSB wholeheartedly.
>> >> [small boat users may have been the last...] Amateurs were
>> >> never ever the first to use SSB.
>> >>
>> >> >In fact, it is technically incorrect to do so.
>> >>
>> >> Make up your mind. ?
>> >>
>> >> >5532 USB is NOT 5329.6 but that's what
>> >> >ham radio readouts will have to show. It is simply oncorrect, and is a
>> >> >fine example of arbitrary ruling just because someone wanted it to be
>> >> >that way, in the face of technical accuracy.
>> >>
>> >> Did you read R&O 03-105 and the new 97.303 content? Do so.
>> >> It is at the bottom of page 25 of the R&O released May 14, 2003.
>> >>
>> >> Rather clear and explicit description of the five "mini-bands,"
>> >> allocated emission type and "transmission occupies only the
>> >> 2.8 KHz centered around each of these frequencies."
>> >
>> >Which means that the "carrier" frequency, if it were AM and not SSB, would
>be
>> >1.4kHz below, and that's what some radios need to be tuned to in order for
>the
>> >SSB signal to be where it should.... SSB is not a "centered" emission in
>that
>> >it isn't usually specified by the center of its signal but by where the
>> >suppressed carrier would be. That's the problem.
>>
>> There's NO problem in the FCC 03-105 R&O.
>>
>> There IS a problem in some amateurs' ability to read direct
>> explicit English.
>>
>> FCC Rules aren't tailor-made to fit some current amateur radio
>> designs of ready-built equipment as to frequency display, shift
>> versus mode selection. FCC rules explicitly state a 2.8 KHz
>> bandwidth, the center frequency of each micro-band, and that it
>> is upper sideband.

>
>I didn't say that I don't understand that; in fact I do. However, I bet that
>there are plenty of people who upon first read will set their suppressed
>carrier frequency to the number specified, not realizing that what was
>authorized was not f through f+2.8kHz, which is what needed to be said for
>that interpretation to be valid.

The writing in the R&O is English.

What is to "interpret?"

>> Most of the brain-dead olde-tymers don't know squat about HOW
>> their ready-built, ready-designed rigs operate behind their front
>> panels. They don't bother to do a simple set-up to independently
>> measure their performance because they don't know how to do it.
>> Given an overt technical problem they would simply pack up their
>> radios to send back to the manufacturer (probably with an enclosed
>> angry note). That may be a new take on "advancing the state of the
>> radio art" in US amateur radio.
>
>The fact that they don't means that they will come up and operate 1.4kHz off
>frequency - and that will be everyone's problem, not just theirs.

There you have it. Some brain-dead types can't "interpret"
English and clear, explicit descriptions.

How can you expect them to "interpret" regulations which have
not changed in years?

>> >> > In the absense of a *very* good reason to change that attribute, it
>can
>> >> >only be regarded as a dumb rule that will cause lots of confusion and
>> >> >more importantly cause many, many radio frequency readouts to read
>> >> >incorrectly - that is, assuming their operators have been apprised of
>> >> >the ridiculous rule.
>> >>
>> >> US civil radio regulations aren't driven by the conventions of
>> >> frequency displays on ready-built equipment in regards to
>> >> transmission of RF energy. The shift of frequency DISPLAY
>> >> is a user convenience convention...what concerns every other
>> >> user of the EM spectrum is the precise frequency of ANY
>> >> RF source.
>> >
>> >What frequency shift? For many radios, when they change modes, the
>displayed
>> >frequency does not change. For many out there, that means set the
>displayed
>> >frequency (and thus the location of the suppressed carrier) to the number
>> >given, and for SSB, that means that the signal will be from frequency X to
>> >X+2.8kHz.
>>
>> The internal "shift" varies with manufacturers, but was done by some

>> of them to center the tuning in the different internal IF filters per a
>> selected mode.
>>
>> FCC doesn't care HOW that is done. They just clearly specified 5
>> little "micro-bands" a bit differently than QST or CQ might say in
>> their publications. Olde-tymers seem to have difficulty of dealing
>> with the unexpected way it is said, but that is the olde-tymers'
>> problem, not the FCC. If the olde-tymers can't adjust, then they
>> will go the way of all dinosaurs of the past...
>>
>> >> > If that's intelligent I sure don't see it.
>> >>
>> >> Pages 18 and 19 of R&O 03-105 list all the Commenters on
>> >> the NPRMs preceding the R&O. "Richard Carroll" was not on
>> >> that list.
>> >>
>> >> > Yerah, I know---it made perfect sense for every channel to be
>described
>> >> >as its center frequency. But in the case of SSB it is inaccurate on its
>> >> >face.
>> >>
>> >> Nooooo. It's just against the way YOU want it to be.
>> >>
>> >> You are thinking ONLY of single-channel SSB users and how a
>> >> few manufacturers designed the ready-built transceivers YOU
>> >> and thousands of others use (including the HF SSB transceivers
>> >> now in use by small-boat owners). Try thinking of describing a
>> >> commercial SSB spectral occupancy made up of four 3 KHz
>> >> chunks, each one having modulation data that starts and ends
>> >> in a 100 to 2800 KHz spectral distribution...the four taking up
>> >> about 12 KHz of RF bandspace. :-) Those were there before
>> >> amateurs were using "sideband" in large numbers.
>> >>
>> >> You now HAVE five little mini-bands in a frequency area not
>> >> available to amateurs before (at least since the end of WW2).
>> >> Why are you bitching so mightily?
>> >
>> >Probably because the order was written in such a way that there is
>confusion
>> >over where to tune the radio in order to produce the desired emission....
>>
>> No. As I said, it is evident that olde-tymers just cannot adjust to
>> clear, explicit English phrased differently than the "technical
>> knowledge" spoon-fed them through ARRL publications.
>
>You make this sound as if it's a problem of age. I bet that there are
>20-year-olds and 40-year-olds who will be just as confused about this as your
>"olde-tymers" (the 70+ crowd).

I'm using BRAIN age. Lots of 40+ olde-tymers around who are
brain dead intellectually.

Their problem, not yours or mine.

>The regulation itself may be clear in what it literally says. The problem is
>that it is NOT written with regards to the conventions that everyone
>understands.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. R&O 03-105 is written in English.

1369. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 07:07:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522030739.20456.00000116@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67566

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/21/2003 11:52 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030522005259.24390.00000176@mb-m19.aol.com>

>"Gigahertz are for gigasquirts." - KH2D

"I am going to get my Extra Lite right out of the box". Leonard H.
Anderson

Steve, K4CAP

1370. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 08:08:46 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93832A26999A2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 67567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:bah2vo$f12$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net:

>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf7sh71.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>
>> >The bad designation, being in conflict with the common understanding
>> >by custom, will cause this interference problem - and that will be the
>> >FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.
>>
>> What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
>> band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
>> suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at 5xxx,
>> one has no business operating that transmitter.
>
> The carrier offset depends on the actual signal bandwidth for
> the SSB signal produced by a specific rig. Just because 2.8 is
> pretty common, doesn't mean all rigs have a 2.8 bandwidth
> implemented.
>
> It seems to me the only way to assure that my carrier and yours
> are in sync is if we specifically agree to a 1.4KHz center frequency as
> an assumption. My signal may not actually be 2.8 wide and the
> center frequency of my signal might actually be only 1.3 or less
> up from my suppressed carrier freq.
>
> Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

Except it should be 1.5!

1371. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 08:36:26 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <baifnh$32vp$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67575

I am waiting for those "caffiene" IV's! There are days where those would
come in handy.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >Also, the ability to stay awake. Caffene helps.
>
> Caffiene is a bandaid, and a poor one at that.
>
> Try again.
>
> Steve, K4CAP
>
>

1372. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 08:39:24 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <baifnj$32vp$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67577

> >
> >>How the hell does one learn CW??
> >>
> >>Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> > With extreme patience, grasshpper...
>
> No doubt with the same patience that one learns how to spell
> "grasshopper".
>
> And one does not "learn" CW...One learns Morse Code.
>

BINGO!

Ryan KC8PMX

1373. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 08:43:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <baifnk$32vp$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67576

Yeah.... like where are they getting NEW novices?? Last I understood there
were not any more licenses being offered and those numbers should either
stay the same over time or diminish over time.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030521172446.20456.00000090@mb-m01.aol.com...
> Anyone notice some strange goings-on in the Advanced and Novice
categories
> of the AH0A site? Last minute renewals?
>
> Month Extra Advanced General Tech/Tech+ Novice
ARS
> Total
> 05/18/03 103,950 83,492 140,885 323,049 34,365
> 685,741
> 05/11/03 103,861 83,487 140,759 322,439 34,361
> 684,907
> 05/05/03 103,767 83,465 140,603 321,914 34,351
> 684,100
>
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP
>
>
>
>
>

1374. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 08:45:15 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <baifnl$32vp$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67574

I would go with the hams that think everyone who is coming into the ARS as the worse of the two.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3ECA5D81.3080702@psu.edu...
> What is worse for the future of the ARS? Hams who think everyone who is
> coming into the service now is an idiot, Or all the idiots coming into
> the service now?
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

1375. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 09:56:34 UTC
From: Rene <deleterene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bai6si$t44k0$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Randy Thomas" <TP@pradirandco.org> wrote in message
news:bagtn2$s5j$0@pita.alt.net...
> Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
> at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
> mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
> hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
> the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
> cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the

Is that why they call it 'dump stores' ?

Rene

1376. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 10:43:14 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0305220243.2baa1421@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67572
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>

>
> What about beams? Can I concentrate my effective radiated
> power in one direction,

Yes, so long as it does not exceed 50W in that direction. In other words you can have a 10W transmitter, a transmission line with 3dB of loss, and a directional antenna with 10dB of gain, to give you 50W erp off the front of the beam. (You CANNOT use that antenna/feedline system with a 100W transmitter, however, since your erp in that case would be 500W.)

Good luck on this one now,

de Hans, DL1/K0HB
Dusseldorf

1377. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 12:44:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522084411.01898.00000091@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67578

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" kc8pmx@diamondcs.net
>Date: 5/22/2003 3:36 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <baifnh$32vp$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
>
>I am waiting for those "caffiene" IV's! There are days where those would
>come in handy.

I got some other nifty stuff in our bag of tricks in the ER that would be a
LOT better! Not as satisfying to the palate, but if you want "good taste",
call Charlie the Tuna ! ! ! ! =)

73

Steve, K4CAP

1378. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 12:55:05 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0305220455.34fe9569@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67579

Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote

> This thing just keeps getting better and better!

Looked at the literature for the new Icom 7800 when I was in Belgium yesterday. I'm seriously in love! With the strength of the Euro/Yen over the dollar, I might bring one home. Also, they will probably hit the shelves here before FCC blesses them.

73, de Hans, DL1/K0HB

1379. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 13:58:38 UTC
From: hikezilla@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <662db5ea.0305220558.794cca14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67580

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message news:<LpVva.860928$S_4.877248@rwcrnsc53>...

Hey Tom...I've been running QRP since 1998, all via a nice 1/2 wave
40m dipole cut just a little bit long, in my attic.

I can tune it on 15, 20, 30, 40, and a small part of 80. In 98-99 I
got WAS using this meager wire and a Norcal 40A at 1.2 watts. I am
now running a 5W K1 to same and still having a ball. I'll never be on
the top of DXCC but I'm up to around 52 confirmed DX contacts since I
got back on the air in 1998.

Go for it and have a ball.

73

> Hello Robert .... I couldn't even put this in the non-sequitur bin. I use a
> key board all the time..straight baudot etc. FEC is a very under utilized
> mode with which I have had a lot of fun with over the years. Unfortunately
> my PK 232 bit the dust and all my attempts at repair have failed. Also
> unfortunately is the fact that my tower and antennas are coming down after
> 28 years. I will be on with a $3 dollar piece of wire and having fun on
> ...you guessed it CW with my K2.
> I'll be waiting ....God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr Pittsburgh

1380. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 13:58:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522095847.01936.00000140@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67581

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB)
>Date: 5/22/2003 7:55 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <e79dbd9b.0305220455.34fe9569@posting.google.com>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
>
>> This thing just keeps getting better and better!
>
>Looked at the literature for the new Icom 7800 when I was in Belgium
>yesterday. I'm seriously in love! With the strength of the Euro/Yen
>over the dollar, I might bring one home. Also, they will probably hit
>the shelves here before FCC blesses them.

Howdy in Deutschland, Hans!

I hear they are topping $8K for them, Hans? Makes the $1200 I am
considering dropping on the K2 and options paltry! But it is pretty!

STeve, K4CAP

1381. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 14:31:59 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0305220631.5980088a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67582

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote

> If I operated HF, I'd do it in digital modes, because
> that's what interests me and where my professional
> communications skills lie.

I try my level best to keep my vocational and avocational interests separated, thus I don't find myself very interested in amateur digital modes.

73, de Hans, DL1/K0HB
Dusseldorf

1382. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 14:36:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bain93ulm0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 67583

Dave Heil wrote:

> What is your point?

Could it be his neat little cap?

1383. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 15:24:06 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECCEB96.66B05E0C@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67573
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Randy Thomas wrote:
>
> Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
> at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
> mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
> hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
> the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
> cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the
> blanks. Hope you washed your hands after shaking hands
> with other hams.

You're too young to remember Sear's catalogs in the outhouse??

Take that 8.5x11 sheet of paper that WAS a free handout and fold it both ways so it is 1/4 its original size. Tear off one corner leaving a hole in the center when the paper is unfolded. Save the piece you tore out. Put your finger thru the hole and clean yourself with it. Wipe the finger as you remove the paper then clean under the nail with the small piece you saved. If you favor Morse testing, you may want to suck the finger clean to avoid getting your key dirty.

73 & good humor
K3DWW

1384. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 15:54:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522115435.06733.00000083@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67584

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>Date: 5/22/2003 9:36 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bain93ulm0@208.207.71.131>

>Dave Heil wrote:
>
>> What is your point?
>
>Could it be his neat little cap?

That was a cap...?!?!?

Steve, K4CAP

1385. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 16:40:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522124005.18497.00000160@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67586

In article <bad63l$f33$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote
>
> [I wrote: >>]
>
>> "Packet Radio may very well enhance the
>> > survivability of digital communications and the internet in the event of
>> > catastrophe." Hurray, and "So what?" Should everybody be required to be
>> able
>> > to set up a node? Hardly, no more than they should be required to fiddle
>> > about with CW.
>>
>> Bob I cringe at the prospects of this happening on a national level
>......
>> either we will shine as Americans and people in general or degenerate
>into
>> what is happening in other parts of the world ....I wish I knew the
>answer.
>
> Not sure which you're talking about - dropping CW?
>
>> You can require CW until the end of time, but if nobody's
>> > interested,
>>
>> Glittering generality ..... nobody I guess all the thousands of stations I
>> have worked over the years were either my imagination or non interested
>ops.
>
> You miss the point - what's happening _now_? How many people are
>upgrading their licenses? How many people are _learning_ CW?
>
>> I had a chat with a fellow on 2 meters one day on this same point. He
>> repeatedly told me nobody operates CW with all the modern modes out there.
>> I had asked if he had tuned about for several nights with good propagation
>> on his HF rx in the CW bands. No reply ... I suggested that he try and
>see
>> for himself. Granted I feel that there are not the number of staions out
>> there that used to be on in general but you really can't tell that on a
>> contest weekend. BTW which I avoid.
>
> Which indicates that the ARS is, (excepting the Technician class) at
>best, stagnant, if not actually declining.
>

>
>> it's irrelevant how grand it is, or how reliable it is, or
>> > anything else. Heck, you'd probably get more licensees working this
>> question
>> > backwards. Let 'em get on HF and maybe _that'll_ give 'em the CW bug.
>>
>> With what Bob ?? ... SSB ...digital ...etc with out even the least bit
>of
>> ......gee I hate this word ....profeciency with CW.
>
> Why not? Without the least bit of knowledge of CW, I've operated HF
>teletype over 1KW, encrypted; cut tapes, caught the sked, did all the things
>necessary as supervisor of radio room, including working other modes over
>the whole spectrum - VLF to UHF on the boat and VHF to SHF on shore duty, AM
>and FM phone, FSK, PSK, encrypted voice and teletype, you name it. Whenever
>I went to learn anything about radio systems (operating anywhere in the
>spectrum) nobody ever asked me if I knew CW, or implied that knowing it was
>somehow beneficial to my ability to operate the equipment or run the shack,
>nor is it (or was) a prerequisite for any of the tech schools I went to.

You know that, I know that, thousands upon thousand of non-
amateur radio operators know that...but it does NOT apply to
US amateur radio.

The major skill necessary in US amateur radio is to become
skilled/proficient in on-off keying morse coding mode. That is an
absolute. It may not disagreed with among the denizens of this
din of inequity.

US amateur radio will be the last bastion of morse code in radio,
the Masada of Morse, defended by brain-dead fanatics against
all odds, against all logic, against the wishes of the majority.

The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society shall not fall...

1386. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 16:40:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522124006.18497.00000161@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 67585

In article <bahkok$73c$0@208.206.142.101>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 21 May 2003 04:02:49 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> >Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams
>> >will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way
>> >every time.
>>
>> Ignorance of the law is no defense.
>
> Ignoring convention and failing to clarify new rules when they
>radically depart from 100 years of that convention would seem to be poor
>administration, too.

The FCC has only been in existance for 69 years, not "100."

Single sideband on radio was first tried about 1928...75 years
ago, not "100."

The very first US radio regulating agency was created in 1912,
91 years ago, not "100."

Can olde-tymer Dickie state when radio regulation first used
"convention" of calling out frequency instead of wavelength?
[hint: it wasn't even close to "100 years" ago]

Dickie has a difficult time in reading federal radio regulations.
To help him out, a noted amateur radio organization should
strive to have Part 97 rewritten to be more like the Q&A
"rules" given in Part 95. :-)

1387. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 16:42:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf99156.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67587
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 May 2003 19:00:14 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Agree completely. In fact, both the center freq AND the suppressed carrier
>frequency could easily have been in the regs.

Neither of us has any problem in calculating either. Those
who have problems have no business being on tha air with a
transmitter that has a "VFO" whether synthesized or not.

My gut feeling is that those here who are doing the complaining
are perfectly capable of making that computation without any
"brain smoke".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1388. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 16:42:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hf98n25.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67589
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 May 2003 12:49:06 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:

>QST, when they publish the fact that we will be getting this
>allocation, should mention how the FCC specifies the frequencies,
>and point out that most ham rigs traditionally display the suppressed
>carrier freq, and that we need to dial up the rig so the display
>reads 1.5KHz lower than the FCC numbers. And, as there are only
>5 freqs, just list the numbers translated into "ham" from "FCC/NATO".

Why is this necessary versus the knowledge that any real
"technically qualified" user of "non-traditional" HF spectrum
in the amateur service should know by now?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1389. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 16:42:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfabc87.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67588

On Wed, 21 May 2003 23:12:31 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>You make this sound as if it's a problem of age. I bet that
>there are 20-year-olds and 40-year-olds who will be just as
>confused about this as your "olde-tymers" (the 70+ crowd).

And I'll bet that there will be many in the 60+ crowd (which
includes me and a lot of hams who I know) who will say "hey,
that's easy to do, just set the dial for 1.5 kHz lower...".

But then again. for years "Channel 00" on my Kenwood has been
set to display 517.93 kHz to receive NAVTEX/SITOR advertised
world-wide as being on "518 kHz".

>The regulation itself may be clear in what it literally says.

That's all that is necessary for it to be valid.

>The problem is that it is NOT written with regards to the
>conventions that everyone understands.

Then it's up to us who do know to teach those who don't know.

"Elmer-ing" doesn't stop when the license is issued to the
"Elmer-ee". Just like graduation from school, it's a beginning,
not an end.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1390. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 16:42:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfah5a8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67590

On 21 May 2003 06:43:41 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>I don't think it's so much that the written tests are any easier
>in thier own right...It's just that we have mandated giving the
>answers away. THAT is the problem.

The nationwide "Multistate Bar Exam" consists of two hundred multiple-choice questions, with about half of them coming from "The Green Book" of 600 questions and answers published by the givers of the test. These questions cover "black letter" law in six specific fields.

For all 200 questions, the only thing that the candidate "really needs to know" is "a", "b", "c", or "d", and yes, for all 200, the correct answer is right there in front of you.

Yet, 135 out of 200 is a very good score, and in most states 150 or more is a guranteed "pass" regardless of one's performance on the essay questions which cover ability to apply and express legal principles.

The difference between the MBE and the ARS test, of course, is the difficulty of the questions and the fact that two out of the four possible answers are very close, so the candidate must have the ability to separate them and find the most correct answer.

In sum, it's not the fact that the answers are published, it's the quality of the questions and answers.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1391. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 17:42:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD0BE5.849C61EA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67591

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
> >From: k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB)
> >Date: 5/22/2003 7:55 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <e79dbd9b.0305220455.34fe9569@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
> >
> >> This thing just keeps getting better and better!
> >
> >Looked at the literature for the new Icom 7800 when I was in Belgium
> >yesterday. I'm seriously in love! With the strength of the Euro/Yen
> >over the dollar, I might bring one home. Also, they will probably hit
> >the shelves here before FCC blesses them.
>
> Howdy in Deutschland, Hans!
>
> I hear they are topping $8K for them, Hans? Makes the $1200 I am
> considering dropping on the K2 and options paltry! But it is pretty!

I have only one word for Hans: "Orion".

Dave K8MN

1392. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 17:47:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD0D23.F6C00CFD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67592

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > What is your point?
>
> Could it be his neat little cap?

No, but it could be under his neat little cap. Vipul spent the time and effort to obtain a license only to spend his time slamming amateur radio and radio amateurs. If he doesn't find amateur radio to his liking and if he dislikes being around those who are old, fat and not interested in the things he likes, perhaps he should sell his 2m rig and move on to another interest. Stamp collecting bored me. I gave away my stamp collection and moved on. I didn't waste my time in finding fault with stamp collectors.

Dave K8MN

1393. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 19:55:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfaovdj.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67593

On 22 May 2003 00:16:59 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>But the folks who are primary users of 60 meters don't do it
>that way. So we have to play by their rules. If it were up to the
>primary users we probably wouldn't have any access to 60 meters
>at all. 60 can be a good test of how adaptable hams are.

Right on target (or center frequency - take your choice).

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1394. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 19:55:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfaopei.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 May 2003 22:52:41 -0400, Randy Thomas wrote:

>> Ignorance of the law is no defense.
>>
> But gross incompetence in writing regualtions is? Sorry, that
>won't pass muster here or anywhere.

The regulation "as written" is technically correct.

Remember that these channels are not the FCC's to give away
free and clear. I suspect strongly that NTIA specified how the
channels were to be designated and what they were to be used for.

We're playing in the "big boy" leagues now.

Funny that most of the gripers here are folks who deal in
professional comms....they should know better.

Hey, it was hard forty years ago getting used to properly
specify frequencies as "cycles per second" rather than as
"cycles" and then only a short time later as "Hertz".

We all have to grow.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1395. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 19:55:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfapeek.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 22 May 2003 04:20:10 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Of course none of this was an issue until the instant case
> which just happens to be the original amateur radio assignment
> (at least in the US) where FCC has assigned discrete frequency
> channels, as far as I'm aware

Not so - see Sect. 97.401(d). This has ben "on the books" for
many years.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1396. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 19:55:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfapmxl.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67596
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 22 May 2003 04:47:16 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>> >Yes, but how about all those who don't get QST? Sure, most hams
>> >will get the word somehow, but plenty will not. Happens that way
>> >every time.
>>
>> Ignorance of the law is no defense.
>
> Ignoring convention and failing to clarify new rules when they
>radically depart from 100 years of that convention would seem to be poor
>administration, too.

I and other hams who work in frequency management had no
problem at all. It's clear and legible. Even folks who have
never seen this sort of designation before can't miss seeing
the "center frequency" bit. If they ignore it and just plow
"full steam ahead" that's their problem 100%.

We're in the "big boy" leagues now.....I would have been very
upset to have seen it designated in "comic book level" terms.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1397. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 19:55:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfaprnm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 22 May 2003 08:08:46 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>Except it should be 1.5!

Don't worry, Alun. If they don't know enough why it has to be
offset in the first place, they won't appreciate that it really
is 1.5.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1398. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 19:55:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfaq4wn.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67598

On Thu, 22 May 2003 04:01:00 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>No kidding? Of what value would it be to include labeling your
>connectors in contest rules?

Would you believe that some Brave Fireman ruined the embedded
N-connector in a multiband VHF/UHF antenna by trying to force a
UHF plug into it during our recent exercise with them?

We're seriously considering color-coding all connectors for
that reason. A lot easier than having to climb their hose
tower....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1399. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 19:55:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfaq7lo.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67599

On 22 May 2003 12:44:11 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>I am waiting for those "caffiene" IV's! There are days where those would
>>come in handy.
>
> I got some other nifty stuff in our bag of tricks in the ER
>that would be a LOT better! Not as satisfying to the palate, but
>if you want "good taste", call Charlie the Tuna ! ! ! ! =)

A little Versed goes a long way.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1400. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 20:28:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECD32D0.4F64CE98@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67600
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

>
> Remember that these channels are not the FCC's to give away
> free and clear.

Some of us would think that the FCC is the radio equivalent of
Saddam Hussein, radio dictator. As if they wanted to, they could
put a ham repeater in the middle of the FM broadcast band.
Silly rules about how to feed an FM translator on the FM broadcast
band (they don't like it if a phone line is used instead of a local
radio receiver to feed the audio to the transmitter). Okay, so
someone from the other end of the country doesn't feed it. But
who cares if the parent station owns the translator or not.

Other rules that look silly at first turn out to protect the ham bands
from being invaded by business users (the "no pecuniary interest"
rule.).

1401. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 20:30:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECD3365.6664A5AF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

>
> Why is this necessary versus the knowledge that any real
> "technically qualified" user of "non-traditional" HF spectrum
> in the amateur service should know by now?

Shouldn't be necessary, but some hams may screw it up
if it's not mentioned. We want to be good neighbors to
the NTIA users in this band.

1402. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 21:00:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305221300.332c02e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67502

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030522095847.01936.00000140@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
> >From: k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB)
> >Date: 5/22/2003 7:55 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <e79dbd9b.0305220455.34fe9569@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
> >
> >> This thing just keeps getting better and better!
> >
> >Looked at the literature for the new Icom 7800 when I was in Belgium
> >yesterday. I'm seriously in love! With the strength of the Euro/Yen
> >over the dollar, I might bring one home. Also, they will probably hit
> >the shelves here before FCC blesses them.
>
> Howdy in Deutschland, Hans!
>
> I hear they are topping $8K for them, Hans?

Better not be $8k here or they're gonna go over like the proverbial
lead balloon. Feature for feature the 7800 is direct competition for
the FT-1000MP MkV which sells for $2600-2800, they're almost twins in
most respects. Except that the 7800 can run 6M, has all-DSP rcvrs and
it has a "bandscope". Which in practice is about as useful as tits on
a bull. I do NOT like all-DSP rigs, xtal filters eat DSP filters alive
particularly when it comes to CW. Been there, you can have 'em.

> Makes the $1200 I am
> considering dropping on the K2 and options paltry!

Before you go down that path check out used FT-1000MPs which can be
had for $1500 and sometimes less. 200W out, two completely independent
gen'l coverage rcvrs, long list. These puppies are the standard big
gun dx contester's choice in these parts and money is no object with
this bunch. I'm headed for one eventually.

> But it is pretty!
>
> STeve, K4CAP

Got *THE* callsign huh? Congratulations!

w3rv

1403. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 21:06:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> > ...
> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
>
> Except it should be 1.5!

If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.

Another candidate for "stereo-quality SSB?" :-)

If we can't even agree on this, that is an indication of the problem right there.

1404. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 21:10:23 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222110100.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 22 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Wed, 21 May 2003 19:00:14 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >Agree completely. In fact, both the center freq AND the suppressed carrier
> >frequency could easily have been in the regs.
>
> Neither of us has any problem in calculating either. Those
> who have problems have no business being on tha air with a
> transmitter that has a "VFO" whether synthesized or not.
>
> My gut feeling is that those here who are doing the complaining
> are perfectly capable of making that computation without any
> "brain smoke".

Perhaps, but we're also smart enough to recognize that no everyone is as
intelligent and that there is a high possibility of someone screwing this up.

1405. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 21:11:30 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222111380.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67505

On Thu, 22 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> ...
> >The problem is that it is NOT written with regards to the
> >conventions that everyone understands.
>
> Then it's up to us who do know to teach those who don't know.
>
> "Elmer-ing" doesn't stop when the license is issued to the
> "Elmer-ee". Just like graduation from school, it's a beginning,
> not an end.

Just as long as it's not "Elmer Fudd" style. :-)

1406. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 21:46:35 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522174635.05629.00000103@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67506

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/21/03 1:18 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030521011839.17162.00000147@mb-m16.aol.com>

writes:
>
> Some of the keys on my computer keyboard must be
> sticky...from
> the laughing at the technical competence of these olde-tymers of
> many yarns in amateur radio. :-)
>
> Most of the brain-dead olde-tymers don't know squat about HOW
> their ready-built, ready-designed rigs operate behind their front
> panels. They don't bother to do a simple set-up to independently
> measure their performance because they don't know how to do
> it.
> Given an overt technical problem they would simply pack up their
> radios to send back to the manufacturer (probably with an
> enclosed
> angry note). That may be a new take on "advancing the state of > the
> radio art" in US amateur radio.
>
> Olde-tymers seem to have difficulty of dealing
> with the unexpected way it is said, but that is the olde-tymers'
> problem, not the FCC. If the olde-tymers can't adjust, then they
> will go the way of all dinosaurs of the past...
>
> As I said, it is evident that olde-tymers just cannot adjust to
> clear, explicit English phrased differently than the "technical
> knowledge" spoon-fed them through ARRL publications.
>
> The bottom line must be that some olde-tymers are just plain
> pished at not getting what they (rightfully) expected. BFD.
>
> A few
> brain-dead unadjustable olde-tymers will bitch, moan, and whine
> anyway...
>
Gee, Len, who pished in your cornflakes?

You write as if your only purpose here is to insult hams.

Hmmmm.......

1407. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:02:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD48D5.FAFAC1AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67507

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 May 2003 04:01:00 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >No kidding? Of what value would it be to include labeling your
> >connectors in contest rules?
>
> Would you believe that some Brave Fireman ruined the embedded
> N-connector in a multiband VHF/UHF antenna by trying to force a
> UHF plug into it during our recent exercise with them?

clunk (my head hitting the monitor). For those gents, labelling would
have been a wasted effort.

> We're seriously considering color-coding all connectors for
> that reason. A lot easier than having to climb their hose
> tower....

That'll work until you run into the first one who is color blind *grin*.

Dave K8MN

1408. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:12:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522181243.01912.00000171@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 67508

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/22/2003 2:55 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfaq7lo.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>A little Versed goes a long way.....

True, but not in the direction that someone who's looking to stay awake
wants!

Steve, K4CAP

1409. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:16:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD4C02.962C2F15@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67509

No CW Test wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 5/21/03 1:18 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030521011839.17162.00000147@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
> writes:
> >
> > Some of the keys on my computer keyboard must be
> > sticky...from
> > the laughing at the technical competence of these olde-tymers of
> > many yarns in amateur radio. :-)
> >
> > Most of the brain-dead olde-tymers don't know squat about HOW
> > their ready-built, ready-designed rigs operate behind their front
> > panels. They don't bother to do a simple set-up to independently
> > measure their performance because they don't know how to do
> > it.
> > Given an overt technical problem they would simply pack up their
> > radios to send back to the manufacturer (probably with an
> > enclosed
> > angry note). That may be a new take on "advancing the state of > the
> > radio art" in US amateur radio.
> >
> > Olde-tymers seem to have difficulty of dealing
> > with the unexpected way it is said, but that is the olde-tymers'
> > problem, not the FCC. If the olde-tymers can't adjust, then they
> > will go the way of all dinosaurs of the past...
> >
> > As I said, it is evident that olde-tymers just cannot adjust to
> > clear, explicit English phrased differently than the "technical
> > knowledge" spoon-fed them through ARRL publications.
> >
> > The bottom line must be that some olde-tymers are just plain
> > pished at not getting what they (rightfully) expected. BFD.
> >
> > A few
> > brain-dead unadjustable olde-tymers will bitch, moan, and whine
> > anyway...
> >
> Gee, Len, who pished in your cornflakes?
>
> You write as if your only purpose here is to insult hams.

>
> Hmmmm.......

As Leonard has lectured on numerous occasions, his only interest here is in civil debate on the removal of morse code testing. He is, as you are no doubt aware, a self-appointed advocate for the removal of morse testing and the elimination of licensing for children.

Those items aside, Len will launch random insults as the opportunity presents itself.

Leonard doesn't play well with others.

Dave K8MN

1410. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:17:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522181729.01912.00000172@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 67510

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/22/2003 11:40 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030522124006.18497.00000161@mb-m05.aol.com>

>The FCC has only been in existance for 69 years, not "100."

Who cares?

> Single sideband on radio was first tried about 1928...75 years
> ago, not "100."

Who cares?

>The very first US radio regulating agency was created in 1912,
> 91 years ago, not "100."

Who cares?

>Can olde-tymer Dickie state when radio regulation first used
> "convention" of calling out frequency instead of wavelength?
> [hint: it wasn't even close to "100 years" ago]

Who cares?

>Dickie has a difficult time in reading federal radio regulations.
> To help him out, a noted amateur radio organization should
> strive to have Part 97 rewritten to be more like the Q&A
> "rules" given in Part 95.

I am very sure you are quite familiar with Part 95, Lennie, in as much as
it is only one of two radio services in which you may LEGALLY operate a radio
transmitter.

10-4 Good Buddy?

Steve, K4CAP

1411. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:20:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522182051.08597.00000135@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67511

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> It was safe from winds and rain.
>
>Oh? Was it perhaps a parking garage?

Yes, thats what I meant. The setup was under a parking garage. The antennas were above the garage.

>Contests don't "test" to see if your pencil is sharpened or your laptop
>batteriers are charged either. What is your point?

That contests alone don't build those skills.

1412. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:23:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522182308.08597.00000136@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67512

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>>A little Versed goes a long way.....

> True, but not in the direction that someone who's looking to stay awake
>wants!

Perhaps, one day they may start testing contesters for drugs, much like they
test in <real> sports.

1413. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:25:56 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522182556.08597.00000137@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67513

From: Dave Heil k8mn

> If he doesn't find amateur radio to his liking and
>if he dislikes being around those who are old, fat and not interested in
>the things he likes, perhaps he should sell his 2m rig and move on to
>another interest.

The gathering I last went to was fun. It did not matter that most of them were fat.

If they were anti-social, next time I will plan around that.

1414. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:26:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522182651.08597.00000138@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67514

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> No, its logical classification.
>
>...of a term made up by you.

I didn't make the "Utilitty Ham" term up. Someone else did.

>> The word "contesting" is "Ham speak".
>
>No, it is not.

Its changing the meaning of a word from what one expects (general competition)
to what Hams want it to mean (a SPECIFIC game activity).

By limiting to a specific activity, it limits other possibilities.

Thats almost Orwellian.

>Vipul, are you an adult?

Yes.

1415. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:27:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522182717.08597.00000139@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67515

Subject: Re: What's worse?
From: "Phil Kane"

> In sum, it's not the fact that the answers are published, it's
> the quality of the questions and answers.

The subject matter on the test is very good, I must admit. Its balanced, comprehensive, relative to amateur radio.

The manner of the phrasings of the questions may not be. Many questions are very similar to others. Some are the same with the answer asked as a question. Others are easy to memorize by word association, so one does not have to know the material.

One can pass the test easily, often in 1 day, using these methods. This does not require learning the material.

1416. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:35:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Ugcza.2471$4G.789415@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67517

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030522182308.08597.00000136@mb-m24.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
> >>A little Versed goes a long way.....
>
> > True, but not in the direction that someone who's looking to stay awake
> >wants!
>
> Perhaps, one day they may start testing contesters for drugs, much like
they
> test in <real> sports.

Why do you insist on limiting the definition of contest to sports?? Every state fair in the country has contests in things like quilts, jams and jellies, size of vegetables, quality of cattle raised, etc. There are music contests throughout this country too. A contest is simply people trying to be better than the other people in the contest. It is not and never has been limited to sports.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1417. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:35:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfazlhs.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67516
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 22 May 2003 16:30:29 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:

>> Why is this necessary versus the knowledge that any real
>> "technically qualified" user of "non-traditional" HF spectrum
>> in the amateur service should know by now?
>
>Shouldn't be necessary, but some hams may screw it up
>if it's not mentioned. We want to be good neighbors to
>the NTIA users in this band.

NTIA's version of "good neighbors" is 0 W ERP.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

>

1418. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:40:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mlcza.2473$4G.791114@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67518

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030522182651.08597.00000138@mb-m24.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> No, its logical classification.
> >
> >...of a term made up by you.
>
> I didn't make the "Utilitty Ham" term up. Someone else did.
>
> >> The word "contesting" is "Ham speak".
> >
> >No, it is not.
>
> Its changing the meaning of a word from what one expects (general
competition)
> to what Hams want it to mean (a SPECIFIC game activity).

Every activity does the same thing. People interested in autos have specific activities that they mean by a contest. The two that I am aware of are racing and the accuracy of restoring collectable vehicles to original condition. These are very specific.

>
> By limiting to a specific activity, it limits other possibilities.
>

No it doesn't. It's just that if you want to set up a contest, certain types of activities are more suitable for contesting than others. Thus the inherent nature of the activities available limit the types of contests that can be developed not the other way around.

Nor does the competition set up limit on a ham's activities outside of the contests.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1419. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 22:45:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bajk72lga1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf99156.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 21 May 2003 19:00:14 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Agree completely. In fact, both the center freq AND the suppressed
carrier
> >frequency could easily have been in the regs.
>
> Neither of us has any problem in calculating either. Those
> who have problems have no business being on tha air with a
> transmitter that has a "VFO" whether synthesized or not.

ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
folks here...so what willit be?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1420. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:01:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD56E3.7030100@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67520

Dave Heil wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>
>>> What is your point?
>>
>>Could it be his neat little cap?
>
>
> No, but it could be under his neat little cap. Vipul spent the time and
> effort to obtain a license only to spend his time slamming amateur radio
> and radio amateurs. If he doesn't find amateur radio to his liking and
> if he dislikes being around those who are old, fat and not interested in
> the things he likes, perhaps he should sell his 2m rig and move on to
> another interest. Stamp collecting bored me. I gave away my stamp
> collection and moved on. I didn't waste my time in finding fault with
> stamp collectors.

Now I could be waaay of base with this, but maybe, just maybe, he IS
getting what he wants out of ham radio. THe chance to whine, and to
troll people might be just about as much fun as some people can handle.
Not my thing, mind you, but there are all kinds..... Whattya think Vipul?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1421. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:03:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD578E.8040906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67521

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>
>>If he doesn't find amateur radio to his liking and
>>if he dislikes being around those who are old, fat and not interested in
>>the things he likes, perhaps he should sell his 2m rig and move on to
>>another interest.
>
>
> The gathering I last went to was fun. It did not matter that most of them were
> fat.

That is correct, it doesn't matter. Why do you keep bringing that up?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1422. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:05:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD57F0.4090701@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67522
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Vito wrote:
> Randy Thomas wrote:
>
>> Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
>>at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
>>mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
>>hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
>>the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
>>cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the
>>blanks. Hope you washed your hands after shaking hands
>>with other hams.
>
>
> You're too young to remember Sear's catalogs in the outhouse??
>
> Take that 8.5x11 sheet of paper that WAS a free handout and fold it both
> ways so it is 1/4 its original size. Tear off one corner leaving a hole
> in the center when the paper is unfolded. Save the piece you tore out.
> Put your finger thru the hole and clean yourself with it. Wipe the
> finger as you remove the paper then clean under the nail with the small
> piece you saved. If you favor Morse testing, you may want to suck the
> finger clean to avoid getting your key dirty.

Thank you for ruining a prefectly good dinner, Vito.

It was still funny.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1423. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:13:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD59B5.4060302@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67523

Vshah101 wrote:

> Its changing the meaning of a word from what one expects (general competition)
> to what Hams want it to mean (a SPECIFIC game activity).
>
> By limiting to a specific activity, it limits other possibilities.

Well, you've vipniated on contesting for us now. But what exactly would
YOU call it?

> Thats almost Orwellian.

While you seem Simpsonian........

- Mike KB3EIA -

1424. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:21:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfb0xbt.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67524

On 22 May 2003 22:17:29 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Dickie has a difficult time in reading federal radio regulations.
>> To help him out, a noted amateur radio organization should
>> strive to have Part 97 rewritten to be more like the Q&A
>> "rules" given in Part 95.
>
> I am very sure you are quite familiar with Part 95, Lennie, in
> as much as it is only one of two radio services in which you may
> LEGALLY operate a radio transmitter.

How soon we forget.

In the late 1970s, shortly after the ascent of Charlie Ferris,
Tip O'Neill's bag carrier, as FCC Chairman, the "public
information and contact" mission of the FCC was expanded greatly.
Not only was every field office "blessed" by the addition of a
non-technical "public contact" person who had to be handled
with kid gloves lest she tell Washington that we weren't "with
the program", there was a position in Washington created to
rewrite the rules used by "the vast majority of people" into
"plain language" format.

The existing Part 95 Rules format and content resulted from
that. Then she tried that with the Amateur Radio Service
Rules. The entire spectrum of the amateur community from the
violently pro-ARRL hams to the violently anti-ARRL hams ganged
up on that idea and the project was dropped. It was called the
"Comic Book Rules" in the ham community.

Eventually the incumbent moved on and was not replaced, and
"plain lanmguage rules" in the ARS passed into history.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1425. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:21:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfb1l4v.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67525

On 22 May 2003 22:12:43 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>A little Versed goes a long way.....
>
>True, but not in the direction that someone who's looking to stay awake
>wants!

Oh, I was awake but floating on Planet "Don't Care"..... <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1426. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:21:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfb1i2u.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67526

On Thu, 22 May 2003 22:02:15 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>> We're seriously considering color-coding all connectors for
>> that reason. A lot easier than having to climb their hose
>> tower....
>
>That'll work until you run into the first one who is color blind *grin*.

My wife, who has been an artist over 50 years even though she
is color blind (and her stuff -does- sell), was at the ARES/RACES
meeting where this came up. We were treated to a discourse on the
types of color-blindness and the color pairs that are best used in
such an application. She's researched the matter professionally
because she works as an electrical power and instrumentatsion
designer and has to specify such things.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1427. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:53:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67527
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
>folks here...so what willit be?

1.5 puts a 3000 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
and a 200 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.

1.4 puts a 2800 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
and a 0 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.

I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.

What does the Bell standards say?

What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
filters?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1428. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-22 23:53:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfb33xz.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67528

On Thu, 22 May 2003 22:35:33 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>Why do you insist on limiting the definition of contest to sports??

In many foreign countries, amateur radio contesting is referred
to as "radiosport".

Vippy, it seems, communicates in a variety of English which is
foreign to us American-speakers (but then again I speak in Noo
Yawk-ese which is also "foreign").

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1429. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 00:24:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522202438.25815.00000169@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67530

In article <20030521231424.01971.00000105@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 22 May 2003 03:14:24 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 5/21/2003 7:17 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030521201700.15462.00000172@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>In article <20030520222207.27532.00000053@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>> I also now see a line of transverters for 6, 2 and 1.25M.
>>
>>$349 each. Not for the timid....
>
> Yeah...the price bites.

Gotta look at the performance specs before making that description. I dunno how they compare with the typical VHF/UHF ham rig.

> It used to be you bought a kit and saved money cuz
>you did the lion's share of the work.

That's because in those days a big part of the cost of a piece of electronic gear was the labor involved in building the dern things. Back in point-to-point wiring days, that meant a lot of hand labor. PC boards reduced that somewhat. Automated parts insertion and wave soldering reduced it still more. Surface mount technology reduced labor cost yet again. All at the price of serviceability at the component level.

Open up yer computer - each board and drive is essentially a component. Fixing a drive, card or even a motherboard is a rare thing - you toss a bad one and get another.

>Now you buy a kit and pay a premium for
>the "fun" you are going to have doing it!

Not really. You have to compare apples to apples. The K2's receiver and QSK performance are far above that of similarly-priced new HF rigs. Its power drain on receive, overall size and weight is a fraction of that of similar rigs. If those things are important to you, its price is not very high.

If you want a real test, download the parts list for a K2 and then add up the price to buy all of the components from the various distributors. Don't forget hardware, cabinet and PC board fabrication costs.
>
> I priced out the K2 with the options I'd ant and one (six meters)
>transverter kit and came in just over $1100. Like you said...NOT for the
>timid!

Which options?
>
> But I WANT one!

Isn't that the ultimate test? And ain't it great that we have so many choices?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1430. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 00:24:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522202439.25815.00000170@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67531

In article <3ECD0BE5.849C61EA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>> >From: k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB)
>> >Date: 5/22/2003 7:55 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <e79dbd9b.0305220455.34fe9569@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
>> >
>> >> This thing just keeps getting better and better!
>> >
>> >Looked at the literature for the new Icom 7800 when I was in Belgium
>> >yesterday. I'm seriously in love! With the strength of the Euro/Yen
>> >over the dollar, I might bring one home. Also, they will probably hit
>> >the shelves here before FCC blesses them.
>>
>> Howdy in Deutschland, Hans!
>>
>> I hear they are topping $8K for them, Hans? Makes the $1200 I am
>> considering dropping on the K2 and options paltry! But it is pretty!
>
>I have only one word for Hans: "Orion".

Let's see...

We have the seriously gold-plated IC-7800, at about that many dollars, the
wonderful Orion at somewhat less than half that price, the Elecraft kits
ranging from about $300 to $1500 depending on models and options. Plus lots of
other rigs in between, like the FT-897.

As W3RV points out, there's also no shortage of good clean high performance
used rigs like the FT-1000 and Omni 6.

Go back to the alleged "golden age of ham radio" (the '50s? '60s?), and a
top-of-the-line 100W HF station cost between $1000 and $2000. Which figures out
to about 8 or 10 times that much in today's money (if not more). And there
wasn't nearly as much selection back then.

Plus if somebody wants to run rigs from those days, they still can, in most
cases. An S-line or 4-line will still do a good job.

Why do I keep imagining Carly Simon singing "these are the good old days"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

(who still misses those album covers)

1431. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 00:24:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522202440.25815.00000171@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67529

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>> > ...
>> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
>> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
>> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
>> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
>>
>> Except it should be 1.5!
>
>If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.

Only if you want the audio to extend down to 0 Hz.

Let's do the math...

Suppose typical "SSB quality" audio covers 300-2700 Hz (bandwidth 2.4 kHz). The
'center' of that audio is 1500 Hz - 1200 Hz up from the lower limit of 300 Hz,
and 1200 down from the upper limit of 2700 Hz.

So if we have a USB signal with the above audio characteristics "centered" on,
say, 5200 kHz, the passband covers 5198.8 to 5201.2 kHz. And the suppressed
carrier frequency (which equals 0 Hz audio) is at 5198.5 kHz.
>
>Another candidate for "stereo-quality SSB?" :-)

HAW!
>
>If we can't even agree on this, that is an indication of the problem right
>there.
>
See above

73 de Jim, N2EY

1432. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 00:33:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67533
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
> >folks here...so what willit be?
>
> 1.5 puts a 3000 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> and a 200 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
>
> 1.4 puts a 2800 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> and a 0 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
>
> I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
> the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
> whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.
>
> What does the Bell standards say?

You're dating yourself...Bell standards have long since given way
to various telephone industry standards organization. Additionally,
today's tranmission for telephony is all digital other than the line from
your telephone to the central office ...and some of those are
digital too. Bottom line then for telephony is you get whatever you
can encode into a 64kb/sec bit stream.

> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
> filters?

You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
that answer.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1433. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 00:36:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305221636.55d94150@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67532

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ECD0BE5.849C61EA@earthlink.net>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >

> > I hear they are topping $8K for them, Hans? Makes the $1200 I am
> > considering dropping on the K2 and options paltry! But it is pretty!
>
> I have only one word for Hans: "Orion".

Yesssss!

How do ya like Baby so far?

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1434. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 01:27:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD78E4.6A466371@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67534

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3ECD0BE5.849C61EA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>

> >I have only one word for Hans: "Orion".
>
> Let's see...
>
> We have the seriously gold-plated IC-7800, at about that many dollars, the
> wonderful Orion at somewhat less than half that price, the Elecraft kits
> ranging from about $300 to $1500 depending on models and options. Plus lots of
> other rigs in between, like the FT-897.

But we have only the Orion with specs similar to the IC-7800 which,
according to those writing it up on the TT reflector sells for in the
neighborhood of *10 grand*. The Orion, at $3300 is only six hundred
dollars more than the Omni VI price when new.

> As W3RV points out, there's also no shortage of good clean high performance
> used rigs like the FT-1000 and Omni 6.

...and I'm betting that there'll be many more such rigs available at
really good prices in the near future.

> Go back to the alleged "golden age of ham radio" (the '50s? '60s?), and a
> top-of-the-line 100W HF station cost between $1000 and $2000. Which figures out
> to about 8 or 10 times that much in today's money (if not more). And there
> wasn't nearly as much selection back then.

The selection didn't worry me any back in the sixties. I just didn't
know how'd I'd ever come up with that kind of money for ham radio in a
whole lifetime of saving.
>
> Plus if somebody wants to run rigs from those days, they still can, in most
> cases. An S-line or 4-line will still do a good job.

Either can do much more than a good job. Receiver specs easily beat
most of the lower end offerings from Japan.

> Why do I keep imagining Carly Simon singing "these are the good old days"?

Give 'em twenty years and these WILL be someone's good old days.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> (who still misses those album covers)

You'd have to have gotten rid of all the vinyl to miss them. You didn't get rid of all the vinyl, did you?

Dave K8MN

1435. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 01:36:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD7B75.AF3322F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67535

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ECD0BE5.849C61EA@earthlink.net>...
> > Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> > >
>
> > > I hear they are topping $8K for them, Hans? Makes the $1200 I am
> > > considering dropping on the K2 and options paltry! But it is pretty!
> >
> > I have only one word for Hans: "Orion".
>
> Yesssss!
>
> How do ya like Baby so far?

You may have to revise your crystal filter comments. The receiver is
the best I've ever heard anywhere. Of course there are some crystal
filters in the thing. The stock roofing filters are four pole units but
the 500 Hz optional roofing filter is a six pole job. The DSP filter
skirts are razor sharp and there's no ringing down to 100 Hz.
There are FOUR band stacking registers per band making it easy to set
one up for CW, SSB, AM, RTTY or whatever your favorites happen to be.
DSP noise reduction (nine levels) is phenomenal.

I've downloaded firmware updates twice since owning the Orion and was
delighted when some of my suggestions were implemented in the last
update.

Dave K8MN

1436. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 02:20:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECD8591.8050000@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67536

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3ECD0BE5.849C61EA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>>>>From: k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB)
>>>>Date: 5/22/2003 7:55 AM Central Daylight Time
>>>>Message-id: <e79dbd9b.0305220455.34fe9569@posting.google.com>
>>>>
>>>>Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> This thing just keeps getting better and better!
>>>>
>>>>Looked at the literature for the new Icom 7800 when I was in Belgium
>>>>yesterday. I'm seriously in love! With the strength of the Euro/Yen
>>>>over the dollar, I might bring one home. Also, they will probably hit
>>>>the shelves here before FCC blesses them.
>>>
>>> Howdy in Deutschland, Hans!
>>>
>>> I hear they are topping $8K for them, Hans? Makes the $1200 I am
>>>considering dropping on the K2 and options paltry! But it is pretty!
>>
>>I have only one word for Hans: "Orion".
>
>
> Let's see...
>
> We have the seriously gold-plated IC-7800, at about that many dollars, the
> wonderful Orion at somewhat less than half that price, the Elecraft kits
> ranging from about $300 to $1500 depending on models and options. Plus lots of
> other rigs in between, like the FT-897.
>
> As W3RV points out, there's also no shortage of good clean high performance
> used rigs like the FT-1000 and Omni 6.
>
> Go back to the alleged "golden age of ham radio" (the '50s? '60s?), and a
> top-of-the-line 100W HF station cost between $1000 and $2000. Which figures out
> to about 8 or 10 times that much in today's money (if not more). And there
> wasn't nearly as much selection back then.

>
> Plus if somebody wants to run rigs from those days, they still can, in most
> cases. An S-line or 4-line will still do a good job.
>
> Why do I keep imagining Carly Simon singing "these are the good old days"?

Because they are.

Its too bad so many hams have such a bitter outlook. Because as you
point out, we've never been able to pick up so much rig for our money.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> (who still misses those album covers)

mmmmmmmmm Carly Simon.....

(who still looks pretty good last time I checked)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1437. This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 02:27:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67537

Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services. Oh, well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm? Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?

73 de Larry, K3LT

****

ZCZC AG37
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 37 ARLB037
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT May 22, 2003
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB037
ARLB037 FCC Proposes Additional 5-GHz Spectrum for Unlicensed Use

The FCC has proposed making another 255 MHz of 5-GHz spectrum available for unlicensed use at 5.470 to 5.725 GHz. Amateur Radio has a secondary allocation at 5.650 to 5.925 GHz, which it shares mostly with government and nongovernment radars.

In a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in ET Docket 03-122, approved May 15 but not yet released, the FCC suggested that the additional spectrum be made available for use by unlicensed National Information Infrastructure devices, including Radio Local Area Networks, operating under Part 15 of the FCC's rules.

The FCC's action comes in response to a petition for rule making from the Wi-Fi Alliance, formerly known as WECA. If implemented, Amateur Radio will be left with a 25-MHz segment--5.825 to 5.850 GHz--that's not already earmarked for unlicensed services. The FCC's proposal represents an 80% increase in the amount of 5-GHz spectrum that would become available to unlicensed devices.

The ARRL has opposed past WECA efforts to expand the 5 GHz franchise for unlicensed users. In comments to a 2002 petition, the League said WECA failed to establish any current need for additional spectrum and that the FCC may not be able to enforce rules against harmful interference to licensed users. The ARRL plans to comment on the latest NPRM once the full text has been released.
NNNN

73 de Larry, K3LT
ARRL OBS DE Section

/EX

1438. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 02:31:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECD8804.B92C8CA3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67538
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

>
>
> NTIA's version of "good neighbors" is 0 W ERP.
>

Well, at least we can avoid a "we told you so"
result.

1439. Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 02:36:00 UTC
From: bsd_mike@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67539

I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the code test back then too.

Now I would like to get a license again. Is it true that I get credit for the code test? Do I get credit for anything else that I passed?

I still have the paperwork from the original testing.

-Mike

1440. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 02:49:10 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <G_fza.689470$OV.643522@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 67540

"Bill" <hikezilla@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:662db5ea.0305220558.794cca14@posting.google.com...
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<LpVva.860928$S_4.877248@rwcrnsc53>...
>
> Hey Tom...I've been running QRP since 1998, all via a nice 1/2 wave
> 40m dipole cut just a little bit long, in my attic.
>
> I can tune it on 15, 20, 30, 40, and a small part of 80. In 98-99 I
> got WAS using this meager wire and a Norcal 40A at 1.2 watts. I am
> now running a 5W K1 to same and still having a ball. I'll never be on
> the top of DXCC but I'm up to around 52 confirmed DX contacts since I
> got back on the air in 1998.

Hello there Bill ....
I really was never a big DXer but I did have about 260 plus countries on CW.
I just threw out all my QSL cards from over the last 30 plus years as that
was history. I am now going to sell my other gear and get exclusively on
QRP from the new QTH not because I have to but because I am ready for a new
"experience" I will be looking for you on the air there Bill ..

73 God Bless KI3R Port Vue Pa

1441. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 02:49:10 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <G_fza.232959$pa5.229189@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 67541

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bad63l$f33$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote
>
> [I wrote: >>]
>
> > "Packet Radio may very well enhance the
> > > survivability of digital communications and the internet in the event
of
> > > catastrophe." Hurray, and "So what?" Should everybody be required to
be
> > able
> > > to set up a node? Hardly, no more than they should be required to
fiddle
> > > about with CW.
> >
> > Bob I cringe at the prospects of this happening on a national level
> ......
> > either we will shine as Americans and people in general or degenerate
> into
> > what is happening in other parts of the world ....I wish I knew the
> answer.
>
> Not sure which you're talking about - dropping CW>

Sorry should have been clearer there Bob ... I was refering to some sort of mass catastrophy where all the support systems of our society would fall apart. No dropping CW wouldn't fit into my concerns at this level. There would be far greater concerns at this level than CW.

> >
> > You can require CW until the end of time, but if nobody's
> > > interested,
> >
> > Glittering generality ..... nobody I guess all the thousands of stations
I
> > have worked over the years were either my imagination or non interested
> ops.
>
> You miss the point - what's happening _now_? How many people are
> upgrading their licenses? How many people are _learning_ CW?

Good point Bob ...wish I knew hard and fast... I could counter with some impressive stats but I can't. The only thing I could say is that there are

plenty of ops out there on CW and that those who don't operate this mode are missing out on a good "chunk" whatever that is of operating fun.

> > I had a chat with a fellow on 2 meters one day on this same point. He
> > repeatedly told me nobody operates CW with all the modern modes out there.
> > I had asked if he had tuned about for several nights with good propagation
> > on his HF rx in the CW bands. No reply ... I suggested that he try and
> see
> > for himself. Granted I feel that there are not the number of staions out
> > there that used to be on in general but you really can't tell that on a
> > contest weekend. BTW which I avoid.
>
> Which indicates that the ARS is, (excepting the Technician class) at
> best, stagnant, if not actually declining.

Boy Bob you got a point there ...most techs I know out there are on 2 meters and STUCK...not by the class but by their own motivational level. I am not saying that CW is the where with all but I see little in my ham experience to see that the Techs that I know are learning new aspects of the service ...wish I was wrong .....

> >
> > it's irrelevant how grand it is, or how reliable it is, or
> > > anything else. Heck, you'd probably get more licensees working this
> > question
> > > backwards. Let 'em get on HF and maybe _that'll_ give 'em the CW bug.
> > >
> >
> > With what Bob ?? ... SSB ...digital ...etc with out even the least bit
> of
> > ......gee I hate this word ....profeciency with CW.
>
> Why not? Without the least bit of knowledge of CW, I've operated HF
> teletype over 1KW, encrypted; cut tapes, caught the sked, did all the things
> necessary as supervisor of radio room, including working other modes over
> the whole spectrum - VLF to UHF on the boat and VHF to SHF on shore duty, AM
> and FM phone, FSK, PSK, encrypted voice and teletype, you name it. Whenever
> I went to learn anything about radio systems (operating anywhere in the
> spectrum) nobody ever asked me if I knew CW, or implied that knowing it was
> somehow beneficial to my ability to operate the equipment or run the shack,

> nor is it (or was) a prerequisite for any of the tech schools I went to.

Again how is this going to open the doors for CW ops if they don't know the basics ....it is true that you have operated all these modes according to your posts but have you operated CW in the ham bands ????

I give you my cudos on your accomplishments there Bob you are and have been involved in radio as a profession. There is absolutely no doubt that you could blow me out of the water in radio related matters. I however am in this service for a deversion from my profession. I hold a ticket ....big deal ...so do thousands of others. I wish you had a ham ticket as I am sure we would have a lot in commen to talk about.

Take care there Robert .... 73 God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Port Vue Pa.
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003
>
>

1442. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 02:58:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305221858.798e54d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67542
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bah2vo$f12$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hf7sh71.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Wed, 21 May 2003 01:41:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> >
> > >The bad designation, being in conflict with the
> > >common understanding by custom, will cause this interference problem -
> and that
> > >will be the FCC's fault for issuing a VAGUE ruling.
> >
> > What is vague about saying that the center of the occupied
> > band is 5xxx. If one cannot figure out where to put the
> > suppressed carrier to get the center of the occupied band at
> > 5xxx, one has no business operating that transmitter.
>
> The carrier offset depends on the actual signal bandwidth for
> the SSB signal produced by a specific rig. Just because 2.8 is
> pretty common, doesn't mean all rigs have a 2.8 bandwidth
> implemented.
>
> It seems to me the only way to assure that my carrier and yours
> are in sync is if we specifically agree to a 1.4KHz center frequency as
> an assumption. My signal may not actually be 2.8 wide and the
> center frequency of my signal might actually be only 1.3 or less
> up from my suppressed carrier freq.
>
> Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)

Mountains outta molehills again . . God bless RRAP . .

1. Get in the program and install a decent 2.1 Khz wide TX xtal filter
which is as as wide as is necessary for SSB and also conforms with the
reg requirement to occupy no more the maximum bandwidth needed to
carry out SSB voice comms.

2. Dial into the channel with the freq readout showing that yer ham
reddio is talking 1 Khz below the stated channel freq.

3. This would give you yer own personal 700 Hz wide "safety factor"
(+/- 350 Hz. guard bands, i.e., slop both up & down from indicated)

inside the alotted 2.8 Khz bandwidth to compensate for that one too
many 807s, crappy calibration, drift, whatever.

>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

w3rv

1443. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:13:09 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522231309.08597.00000149@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67543

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>Why do you insist on limiting the definition of contest to sports??

>A contest is simply people trying to
>be better than the other people in the contest. It is not and never has
>been limited to sports.

Thats not the point. My point was in Ham radio, a contest is limited to a specific contact chasing game. Other types of competitions are possible, but are not called contests in Ham radio.

Contesting is playing the contact chasing game, not any other competition.

The word contest has been defined to one specific activity, for Ham radio.

1444. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:15:12 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3ngza.233205$pa5.228965@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 67544

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bad52b$ek4$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote
>
> > Hello again Robert .... well I for one am not going to get involved in
> this
> > "proficiency" discussion.
>
> Hehehe...actually, this _isn't_ a proficiency discussion, although
> it's been neatly diverted in that direction.

No profeciency discussion Bob ...just the way I see it in this newsgripe.

> >BTW Robert I see no positives in bashing any class op
>
> Just to be clear, I'm not bashing CW, and I've seen very little of
> that (until somebody gets their back to the wall on the real issue). It's
> the _requirement_ that's at issue, as far as I'm concerned.

Hold tight Bob and it will go away according to what I have read and or
perceived over the last number of years. Will I bemoan the loss ...naw as
there are far greater "losses" in this world to bemoan that are really
significant. I will however look at this service with interest to see what
real positive changes come about. I am not being saricastic as I have a
....dare I say love for this service. It has directed me over the years to
a lot of interesting people and experiences whose absence would have
lessened my "story". You know Bob things would have been a LOT different if
my dad hadn't built that crystal set for me in 1956.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue PA
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003
>
>

1445. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:16:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522231605.08597.00000151@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67545

From: "Phil Kane"

>In many foreign countries, amateur radio contesting is referred
> to as "radiosport".

Contesting is not a sport, like hockey, etc.

>Vippy, it seems, communicates in a variety of English which is
> foreign to us American-speakers

Please, my name is not "Vippy".

1446. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:24:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522232402.08597.00000152@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67546

From Mike KB3EIA

>> The gathering I last went to was fun. It did not matter that most of them
>were
>> fat.
>
> That is correct, it doesn't matter. Why do you keep bringing that up?
>

I am sorry about that.

Its nice that various age groups can get together in this groups activity.

Most of the clubs seem to be interested in those activities which I am less interested in - contesting, CW, antennas, etc.I wish Ham radio had more activities like the one I went to a short while ago.

1447. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:28:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522232803.08597.00000153@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67547

From Mike KB3EIA

>Well, you've vipniated on contesting for us now. But what exactly would
>YOU call it?

Point chasing is one possiblity. A word that indicates what it is would be
suitable.

1448. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:32:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 67548

In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> >ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
>> >folks here...so what willit be?
>>
>> 1.5 puts a 3000 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
>> and a 200 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
>>
>> 1.4 puts a 2800 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
>> and a 0 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
>>
>> I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
>> the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
>> whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.
>>
>> What does the Bell standards say?
>
>You're dating yourself...Bell standards have long since given way
>to various telephone industry standards organization. Additionally,
>today's tranmission for telephony is all digital other than the line from
>your telephone to the central office ...and some of those are
>digital too. Bottom line then for telephony is you get whatever you
>can encode into a 64kb/sec bit stream.

Bill, what is the INPUT frequency bandwidth to the telco
A-to-D? That matters greatly to the conversion from analog
to digital. It also matters as greatly to the conversion from
digital to analog.

Please don't cop out by going off into digital land discussions.
Those don't apply to the brand-new 60m frequencies'
modulation.

>> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
>> filters?
>
>You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
>that answer.

You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a

dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.

That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.

1449. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:32:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030522233222.06400.00000159@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 67549

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>> > ...
>> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
>> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
>> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
>> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
>>
>> Except it should be 1.5!
>
>If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.
>
>Another candidate for "stereo-quality SSB?" :-)
>
>If we can't even agree on this, that is an indication of the problem right
>there.

FCC 03-105 is still quite precise as to staying within a 2.8 KHz
bandwidth centered on the frequency given.

If you can't agree on English meanings for an R&O, how can
anyone expect you to "agree" on the other regulations in
Part 97?

1450. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 03:56:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECD9BE1.B70BAC9F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67550

Mike wrote:

> I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
> code test back then too.
>
> Now I would like to get a license again. Is it true that I get credit
> for the code test? Do I get credit for anything else that I passed?
>

IIRC yes for the 5 wpm code test. However, no credit for having
passed a faster code test. Seems some FCC bureaucrat didn't
understand that having passed a 13 or 20 wpm code test would
supersede a 5 wpm test. "Okay, you did 13, but can you do 5?"

NO credit for anything else. So you have to retest. Might as well
take the general and extra writtens at the VE session, cost no more,
and maybe you'll pass 'em. BTW, these only need 5 WPM code
nowadays.

1451. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 04:11:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67602

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >> >ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
> >> >folks here...so what willit be?
> >>
> >> 1.5 puts a 3000 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> >> and a 200 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
> >>
> >> 1.4 puts a 2800 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> >> and a 0 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
> >>
> >> I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
> >> the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
> >> whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.
> >>
> >> What does the Bell standards say?
> >
> >You're dating yourself...Bell standards have long since given way
> >to various telephone industry standards organization. Additionally,
> >today's tranmission for telephony is all digital other than the line from
> >your telephone to the central office ...and some of those are
> >digital too. Bottom line then for telephony is you get whatever you
> >can encode into a 64kb/sec bit stream.
>
> Bill, what is the INPUT frequency bandwidth to the telco
> A-to-D?

The input is whatever is present onthe cable pair. The analog signal
is then limited by the A to D conversion as a function of the sample
rate (8000 samples/sec usually). That leaves 8 bits per sample
to indicate the signal level (128 discrete points). The A to D conversion
thus theoretically allows a 4KHz bandwidth.

> That matters greatly to the conversion from analog
> to digital. It also matters as greatly to the conversion from
> digital to analog.
>
> Please don't cop out by going off into digital land discussions.

> Those don't apply to the brand-new 60m frequencies'
> modulation.

Current or former telco standards don't apply to 60m either.
I was simply answering Phil's question.

> >> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
> >> filters?
> >
> >You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
> >that answer.
>
> You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
> counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a
> dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.
>
> That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.

Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1452. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 04:13:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523001307.08597.00000154@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67601

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
>coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
>spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services. Oh,
>well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
>it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
>Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

The ARRL has put in place an incentive program for microwave freqs. Seems noone
is taking them up.

Back when I was an EE, I went to one club's repeater site.

At their club meeting, I told of my interest in electronics. They seemed like
there could be some activities. I contacted some people. Somehow, never
materialized. Something always came up.

Yet, Hams will take a day off and show up on Friday for a Hamfest. It seems
like its really a matter of priorities.

Generally Hams are nice people, but when I asked about the repeater, the person
was snobby, and said they had someone for that and that they didn't need my
input.

I bet if I said I wanted to learn CW, they would enthustically help me do that.

Please realize that I was courteous, both at the meeting and at the repeater
site when I made my requests.

At my local club, there was an EE there. He usually does not attend the
meetings. Anyway I asked him if I could work with him on some project. His
response was snobby also.

It seems the problem is that most Hams aren't interested and those that do
handle these aspects are too snobby to include others. Ham radio is driving
away those that can contribute and have technical interests and capabilities-
in favor of other activites.

1453. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 04:24:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523002402.08597.00000155@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67603

>From: Robert Casey wa2ise

>IIRC yes for the 5 wpm code test. However, no credit for having
>passed a faster code test.

That does not seem fair to those that made the effort to learn code.

>Seems some FCC bureaucrat didn't
>understand that having passed a 13 or 20 wpm code test would
>supersede a 5 wpm test. "Okay, you did 13, but can you do 5?"

Just because you can do 13wpm does NOT necessarily mean you can do 5 wpm. There is a condition where one can encode at a higher speed, but not at a lower speed. I have had that condition, on occasion.

1454. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 04:25:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfbdvj0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67604
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 22 May 2003 20:33:16 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
>> the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
>> whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.
>>
>> What does the Bell standards say?
>
>You're dating yourself...Bell standards have long since given way
>to various telephone industry standards organization. Additionally,
>today's tranmission for telephony is all digital other than the line from
>your telephone to the central office ...and some of those are
>digital too. Bottom line then for telephony is you get whatever you
>can encode into a 64kb/sec bit stream.

That's why I asked about the Bell System standards.... <ggg>

The engineering firm for whom I am regulatory counsel has a
library of all the old standards and BSTJ's for historical
purposes.

PS - do you know Leslie Kleinberg, who started at Bell Labs
in the mid-60s?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1455. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 04:25:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfbe8r1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67605

On 23 May 2003 03:16:05 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>From: "Phil Kane"
>
>>In many foreign countries, amateur radio contesting is referred
>> to as "radiosport".
>
>Contesting is not a sport, like hockey, etc.

Let's try that one again:

In many foreign countries, amateur radio contesting is referred
to as "radiosport".

Yup - that still reads that way.

>
>>Vippy, it seems, communicates in a variety of English which is
>> foreign to us American-speakers
>
>Please, my name is not "Vippy".

Let's try that one again:

Mister Shah seems to use his own language and concepts which
have only a passing resemblance to those used by the rest of us.

Yup - that still reads that way.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1456. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 04:33:05 UTC
From: Arch Stanton <Nate4metalshop@att.net>
Message-ID: <3ecda4a1@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67606
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

This story may not seem as far-fetched at first read or thought!
For several years there was a hamfest-gypsy-bum who
would set up at just about every hamfest in the NJ/Pa/Del/Md. area
and one of his trademarks was he would always swipe a
roll of Charmin from out of the men's room early on.
I am not kidding folks. This unwashed, slovenly, smelly sorry
assed excuse for a ham radio op would often camp out
the night before with his xyl in their beat up old van or car to
ostensibly get the good spot in the dealer's tailgate section.
He would go into the men's room wearing a tattered old coat into which he
had sewn
2 large pockets inside early in the morning. When nobody was
looking, in his coat would go 2 or three rolls of toilet paper, bar soap
or whatever else was available. (almost every dealer knew he did this)
It did not stop there either. He also would "raid" the condiments stand
if there were foil packs of ketchup, relish, pepper and salt. He'd then
go back to his grossly-overloaded vehicle and quickly hand off his
"booty" to his XYL or himself place it under the drivers seat.
(..glub forbid he stayed in a motel! One dealer who stayed in the next
room caught him walking out of the room with 6 towels and washcloths!)

Things soon caught up with the scumbag. He was banned from 2 hamfests
that I know of, and from one club meetings for life, when at a meeting he
tried his "dirty longcoat trick" to swipe 2 rolls from the men's room at
break time, followed by two 64 oz bottles of Pepsi, was caught, and launched
into a tirade of foul comments before he left.

I am sure hams in the Northeastern USA will probably know exactly of
whom I am speaking. His "longstanding reputation" goes back 20 yrs,
his house is a junkyard, complete with 2 derelict cars on blocks and
old electronic junk in piles in sheds on the side. (I know this as a friend
works for the town he lives in ahs has been cited on numerous times
for "unkempt property" and "hazardous stacked piles of recyclables".

Thankfully, he does not go to any more area club meetings or hamfests,
as nobody wants to sit near him because he bathes once a week, and
has also screwed several hams out of $$$ from junk he's sold as
"working" which was not, or had to wait several weeks to get items
shipped only to have their late refund checks bounce.

The archetype "Hamfest Bum". Thank glub as the hamfests (sadly)
disappear more and more, these types of slovenly people are also
going the way of the dinosaur.

"Randy Thomas" <TP@pradirandco.org> wrote in message
news:bagtn2$s5j$0@pita.alt.net...
> Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
> at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
> mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
> hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
> the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
> cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the
> blanks. Hope you washed your hands after shaking hands
> with other hams.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Randy

(this guy was not at Dayton this year Randy, but from what I've seen
at some hamfests, he has lots of "company". tell the guys at the food
stand not to put too many condiment packages out, or better yet use
squeeze-bottles-on-a-rope so the cheap SOB Hams among us will
not pocket these also....)

1457. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 05:13:36 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bam278$1asn2$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67648

Yeah... in the ER there is alot more at your disposal. Caffiene IV's would definitely give a new twist to the local coffeehouses though. Why bother with the digestive track when it can go direct into the bloodstream eh? :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030522084411.01898.00000091@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
> >From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" kc8pmx@diamondcs.net
> >Date: 5/22/2003 3:36 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <baifnh$32vp$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
> >
> >I am waiting for those "caffiene" IV's! There are days where those would
> >come in handy.
>
> I got some other nifty stuff in our bag of tricks in the ER that would
be a
> LOT better! Not as satisfying to the palate, but if you want "good
taste",
> call Charlie the Tuna ! ! ! ! =)
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP
>

1458. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 05:24:30 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bam279$1asn2$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67649

Not to defend him, but one possible point he may be getting at that in a contest, use of some type of drug may give an opponent an unfair advantage. For example if someone who is on "speeders" or similar drug may be able to stay up considerably longer than someone who is not, therefore may have more opportunities to get more contacts. Whether this is a valid point or not, I am not going to take either side of it. Just a possible direction he may be going towards??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Why do you insist on limiting the definition of contest to sports?? Every
> state fair in the country has contests in things like quilts, jams and
> jellies, size of vegetables, quality of cattle raised, etc. There are
music
> contests throughout this country too. A contest is simply people trying
to
> be better than the other people in the contest. It is not and never has
> been limited to sports.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

1459. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 05:27:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bam27a$1asn2$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67650

Terms of CW and morse are NOT interchangeable.... In a different manner, an "engine" and "motor" are not the same. The main device under the hood of your car or truck is an engine, but the item that spins up the blower fan for your climate control devices is a motor, or the device that turns the clothes dryer barrel is a motor. Not intechangeable.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Yeah, well, while you're splitting hairs this time over using the
> term "CW" instead of "Morse", you _still_ haven't made the slightest
> attempt to address the question. Should I just assume you don't have an
> answer?

1460. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 05:32:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523013237.16581.00000196@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 67607

In article <20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
>coming true!

You "just saw" that FCC document now?!? Oh, my, don't get out on the Internet much, do you? :-)

>The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
>spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services.

TS. What do you mean "our spectrum," bubeh? Look again at who is primary and who is secondary before this little addition of 255 MHz for unlicensed RF devices.

Had you bothered to read the large print, FCC 03-105 gave US amateurs 2 whole MegaHertz as PRIMARY at the 2.4 GHz band. That's a spectrum chunk bigger than all of the 10m band.

>Oh,
>well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
>it?

Have you EVER been above 440 MHz? In any radio?

Why do you care? You aren't in that spectrum area.

You stay down on HF as a "real ham" and work your DX with CW.

>How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
>Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?

Use it or lose it.

Look out for those BIG black helicopters, Larrah. They are hauling black bulldozers to tear down your conspiracy hut.

Everyone has had a year to comment on both NPRMs and there was more commentary action on the 5 GHz unlicensed devices. If you didn't comment, then what gives you a gold star for being such a Late observer of the regulatory scene?

1461. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 05:32:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523013238.16581.00000197@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 67608

In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> >> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> >> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
>> >> filters?
>> >
>> >You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
>> >that answer.
>>
>> You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
>> counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a
>> dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.
>>
>> That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.
>
>Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.

TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?
If that is in violation of FCC regulations you are responsible.
No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
the licensee are responsible.

Now if you feel that you "don't have to" make such
measurements, don't. You don't have to operate on those
five 60m frequencies, either. US Hams didn't have them before
14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away from all of
you.

Why are there so many argumentative hams demanding things
in here? :-)

1462. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 10:01:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523060127.20217.00000192@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67609

In article <20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
>coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
>spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services. Oh,
>well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
>it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
>Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?

Larry,

Where have you been? Reallocation is a fact of life. Been that way since "200 meters and down" was news.

Once upon a time there wasn't much demand for microwaves, and the available technologies were expensive and the results limited. So we hams got enormous allocations up there. Times have changed and technology has changed.

Because the radio spectrum is finite and is considered to be public property, its allocation to anybody must be constantly justified.

Here's an analogy - not perfet, but it illustrates the point.

Suppose there was a piece of land set aside by the govt. as a park. But very few people used it, because it was hard to reach, lacked certain facilities and there were closer, "better" parks. Would the govt. be wrong to change the park into, say, an area for oil exploration? Particularly when there's a big need for new oil sources?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1463. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 12:09:36 UTC
From: Sadiq Akhbar <SadiqLTD@consulsadiq.org>
Message-ID: <bal31s$p9d$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message >

> What does the Bell standards say?
>
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

Bell standards!!??? You are dating yourself. Bell standards
went away years ago. Telephony transmission is now digital
and has been for years. Start with a search on "Telephone
Industry Standards Organization," if you are interested in
getting caught up with the times.

Akah S.
Sadiq Engineering Consults

1464. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 12:24:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523082425.15462.00000191@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67611

In article <20030523002402.08597.00000155@mb-m24.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise
>
>>IIRC yes for the 5 wpm code test. However, no credit for having
>>passed a faster code test.
>
>That does not seem fair to those that made the effort to learn code.

It isn't, but that's life.
>
>>Seems some FCC bureaucrat didn't
>>understand that having passed a 13 or 20 wpm code test would
>>supersede a 5 wpm test. "Okay, you did 13, but can you do 5?"
>
>Just because you can do 13wpm does NOT necessarily mean you can do 5
>wpm.

I remember the rules defining the tests as being sent "at a rate not less than X wpm", which means that faster still counts.

>There is a condition where one can encode at a higher speed, but not at a
lower
>speed.

With Morse code?

>I have had that condition, on occasion.

With Morse code?

Besides, the Morse code test is a test of basic DECODING skill, not ENCODING skill.

1465. Re: FCC takes trips to Vegas from Paying Customers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 12:33:33 UTC
From: RWS <none@anonnonex.net>
Message-ID: <bal4eq$s00$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67612

No real surprise. It has been going on for years and no matter
how much spin the FCC spin doctors put on it, it is illegal and
unethical. As one poster mentioned not too long ago,
today's FCC is a culture of greed and personal gain. The
"What's in it for me" mentality is what drives today's FCC.
Look for increasingly larger scandals to come out of the FCC.
Next FCC scandal to be exposed will be massive fraud involving
official government credit cards. You heard it her first!

RWS

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:8Gbza.11080$rO.957181@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> FCC Travel Routinely Funded by Industry
> Watchdog Group Documents Regulators' Trips on the Regulated's Nickel
> By Frank Ahrens
> Washington Post Staff Writer
> Thursday, May 22, 2003; Page E04
>
> Vegas. Rio. 'Frisco. Paris. The Big Easy. Over the past eight years,
Federal
> Communications Commission officials have taken 2,500 business trips to
> global tourist spots, most of which were paid for by the media and
> telecommunications companies the agency oversees, according to a study to
be
> released today.
>
> The report, released by the Center for Public Integrity in Washington,
comes
> as the FCC is poised to relax or eliminate key media ownership rules, a
step
> that has been criticized by some as putting too much power in the hands of
a
> few media giants.
>
> "I think travel is necessary and if it's necessary then the taxpayer
should
> pay for it," said Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for
Public
> Integrity in Washington. "When you're traveling on somebody's nickel and
> they're in your face while you're traveling, there might be a problem."
>
> FCC officials accepted $2.8 million in free trips, mainly to industry
> conventions, academic symposia and technical forums. The top
destination --

> Las Vegas, with 330 trips -- is the site of many media industry
conventions,
> such as annual gatherings put on by the National Association of
> Broadcasters. The second-most popular destination for FCC officials was
New
> Orleans, with 173 trips, followed by New York (102 trips) and London (98
> trips), the study said.
>
> The NAB paid the most, spending $191,472 on trips, the study said,
followed
> by the National Cable & Telecommunications Association ($172,636) and the
> Consumer Electronics Manufacturers Association ($149,285). Last November,
a
> group of technology firms paid $2,646 to fly FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q.
> Abernathy to a two-day conference in Montpellier, France.
>
> "All of the trips appear to have been legal under government guidelines,"
> the study reads. "Other agencies routinely accept similar travel and
> entertainment gifts."
>
> The Center for Public Integrity describes itself as a 40-person,
nonpartisan
> watchdog group. The FCC study was funded by a $300,000 grant from the Ford
> Foundation and $100,000 from the Open Society Institute, run by
millionaire
> philanthropist George Soros, Lewis said. The group has released such
travel
> studies in the past, which are based on FCC public filings.
>
> FCC officials defended the trips, saying the agency's limited travel
budget
> of about $2 million per year does not pay for sufficient travel outside of
> Washington to meet with foreign governments and local officials and
citizen
> groups within the United States. All travel invitations are vetted through
> the FCC's ethics office, a spokesman said, adding that about two-thirds of
> the trips were to technical and academic events and were not
> industry-related.
>
> "I'm not crazy about having the industry pick up the tab, but I think it
is
> the second-best option we have in tight fiscal times like now," the study
> quotes Robert Pepper, chief of the FCC's office of plans and policy, as
> saying. "The other option is for us to just stay home. That doesn't
benefit
> anyone."
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
> Death to 19th century horse and buggy technology in ham radio tests!

> Eliminate the Morse Code test in 2004!

1466. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 12:54:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305230454.5bef3919@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67613

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3ECD8591.8050000@adelphia.net>...
> > Go back to the alleged "golden age of ham radio" (the '50s? '60s?), and a
> > top-of-the-line 100W HF station cost between $1000 and $2000.

Back when a nice 3 bedroom house cost $20-25,000. And a nice new car
was under $2,000.

> > Which figures out
> > to about 8 or 10 times that much in today's money (if not more). And there
> > wasn't nearly as much selection back then.
> >
> > Plus if somebody wants to run rigs from those days, they still can, in most
> > cases. An S-line or 4-line will still do a good job.
> >
> > Why do I keep imagining Carly Simon singing "these are the good old days"?
>
> Because they are.

We have an embarrassment of riches..
>
> Its too bad so many hams have such a bitter outlook.

I don't know many who do. The great majority of hams I meet, on the
air or off, young or old, newcomers or oldtimers, aren't bitter at
all. They're too busy having fun.

> Because as you
> point out, we've never been able to pick up so much rig for our money.

Funny how things have reversed. 40-50 years ago, homes in a good
neighborhoods with unrestricted, large lots were common and not too
hard for the average worker to afford. A really nice rig, on the other
hand, was a lot of money, and the choices were relatively few. Today
the houses are expensive and the rigs aren't.
>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > (who still misses those album covers)

There's a reference to them in a WKRP episode. Johnny makes a remark
to Venus about "checking out some CS album covers".
>
> mmmmmmmmm Carly Simon.....

I remembered this article for 25 years, and just recently found it
again on the web:

http://members.aol.com/OhSueCQ/index.page6.html
>
> (who still looks pretty good last time I checked)
>
oh yes. She did a concert/video in Grand Central Station a few years
back that was excellent.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1467. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 13:45:08 UTC
From: Arch Stanton <Nate4metalshop@att.net>
Message-ID: <3ece2622$1@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67614
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com...
> Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
> coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
> spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services.

I say let the commercial interests have 5 GHz.

Really now, let's be honest. If there are a
grand total of 3 or 6 ham radio operators
in the whole of the USA who are
using 5 gHz once or twice for a
one minute QSO over the course of a Year
then we are very lucky. All we need
is 144, 220 and 440 MHz
FM voice and perhaps some
cw for the once-a-year contests.
Everything else is both esoteric
and likely beyond our present technological
needs and/or ability as hams.

Again, let us be straightforward here folks....y
You and I *both know* that today, in the world
of ham radio in the Year 2003, if you can't
buy the radio to get on the air, off the shelf,
made-in-Japan, and from Ham Radio
Outlet (for an outrageous price) the related
RF spectrum WILL NOT be used by Hams.
(except for perhaps the few or so in the whole
United States on a very erratic and itinerate basis)

Sorry but that is the truth, and our scant
usage of 5 GHz cannot justify our continued
spectrum allocation. It can, and will be better used
for consumer or commercial products/Industrial/Wireless
IP type applications.

1468. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 13:55:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523095515.13414.00000123@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67615

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/22/2003 10:16 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030522231605.08597.00000151@mb-m24.aol.com>

>Please, my name is not "Vippy"

It's better than what you've earned.

Steve, K4CAP

1469. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 13:56:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523095644.13414.00000124@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67616

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/22/2003 10:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030522231309.08597.00000149@mb-m24.aol.com>

>Thats not the point. My point was in Ham radio, a contest is limited to a
>specific contact chasing game. Other types of competitions are possible, but
>are not called contests in Ham radio.

Sure they are! Who told you they're not, Vippy...???

1470. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 13:58:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523095846.13414.00000125@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67617

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/22/2003 6:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ECD59B5.4060302@adelphia.net>

>> Thats almost Orwellian.
>
>
>While you seem Simpsonian.......

I was thinking more simiean.

Steve, K4CAP

1471. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 14:06:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523100634.13414.00000126@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67618

>Subject: Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/22/2003 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030523001307.08597.00000154@mb-m24.aol.com>

>The ARRL has put in place an incentive program for microwave freqs. Seems
>noone
> is taking them up.

"Incentive program"...?!?! What are you talking about?

>Back when I was an EE...(SNIP)

You never were an EE, Vipul.

>At my local club, there was an EE there. He usually does not attend the
>meetings. Anyway I asked him if I could work with him on some project. His
>response was snobby also.

So my own assumptions are correct...You are a social ner-do-well...That's
why you hate Amateur Radio so much.

>It seems the problem is that most Hams aren't interested and those that do
>handle these aspects are too snobby to include others. Ham radio is driving
>away those that can contribute and have technical interests and capabilities-
>in favor of other activites.

No...Amateurs (as would any other subset of society) just don't like
snot-nosed kids coming into ther circle, telling them they are all wrong, and
demanding to be treated differently than everyone else.

Like you and Lennie, for example...

Steve, K4CAP

1472. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 14:28:05 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93846A7FC1400AX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@65.100.3.61>
Source record: 67619

> The nationwide "Multistate Bar Exam" consists of two hundred
> multiple-choice questions, with about half of them coming from
> "The Green Book" of 600 questions and answers published by the
> givers of the test. These questions cover "black letter" law
> in six specific fields.

The Uniform CPA Examination is not published. IT is all M/C
with some OOF and essay questions. The essay questions appear
to be primarily for testing writing skills and not knowledge.
The OOF are tougher than one might think. So are the M/C. Typically,
You can take information from the paragraph and determine any one of
the choices to be correct. They all look correct under certain
circumstances or you just don't fully understand the concept. It
really is a tough examination.

The ARS is tough. I passed extra written examination. I know
someone that did and is not aware of take-off angles when I told
him to retain his vertical for transmitting. 5 wpm is not going
to prevent the memorizers from coming in. It is only stopping those
that are poor at code. I'm still plugging at it and I don't think
5 WPM is easy. It is not same 5 WPM that many had a long time ago.
I also think that they should require a sending test. The TPTB
should require you to zero beat a SSB signal and then zero beat a
CW signal as well.

bill

1473. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 14:46:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305230646.18d6c0a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67620

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
> coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
> spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services. Oh,
> well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
> it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
> Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?

There's nothing new about any of it Larry. As Jim points out the
general practice goes back to the days when hams got tossed into the
"useless space" above 200 meters for the convenience of the
commecials. The ham bands have always served as "spectrum preserves"
for commercial and government users. i.e., they're "easy pickin's"
when new technologies come along like the current need to find a home
for what is being billed as the huge incoming wave of wideband Part 15
devices.

It's obvious as hell that the public interest will be far better
served by using that 5Ghz space for Part 15 ops vs. "saving it" for
ham purposes. WHAT ham purposes?? A few guys with horns on camera
tripods shooting at each other from mountaintops? 'Snot even a
discussion.

And yeah, the rest of the ham centimeter and millimeter bands are
under the same gun and we're going to lose even more space as time
goes by. Down the road when we find we're really in a pinch for
playpen space we'll be forced to wise up and implement better
technolgies ourselves. The current 1960's era spectrum-eating repeater
crap is gonna go. As an example.

The League will wave the flag and put up the usual cerimonial good
fight as usual. Snoozer.

> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> ARRL OBS DE Section

w3rv

1474. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 15:08:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baldgn$dq1$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 67621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Thu, 22 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> > On Wed, 21 May 2003 19:00:14 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >Agree completely. In fact, both the center freq AND the suppressed carrier
> > >frequency could easily have been in the regs.
> >
> > Neither of us has any problem in calculating either. Those
> > who have problems have no business being on tha air with a
> > transmitter that has a "VFO" whether synthesized or not.
> >
> > My gut feeling is that those here who are doing the complaining
> > are perfectly capable of making that computation without any
> > "brain smoke".
>
> Perhaps, but we're also smart enough to recognize that no everyone is as
> intelligent and that there is a high possibility of someone screwing this up.

It's far more than possible. I'd say it's inevitable.

1475. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 15:13:14 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baldqa$dq5$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 67622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Thu, 22 May 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> > On Wed, 21 May 2003 19:00:14 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >Agree completely. In fact, both the center freq AND the suppressed carrier
> > >frequency could easily have been in the regs.
> >
> > Neither of us has any problem in calculating either. Those
> > who have problems have no business being on tha air with a
> > transmitter that has a "VFO" whether synthesized or not.
> >
> > My gut feeling is that those here who are doing the complaining
> > are perfectly capable of making that computation without any
> > "brain smoke".
>
> Perhaps, but we're also smart enough to recognize that no everyone is as
> intelligent and that there is a high possibility of someone screwing this up.

It's far more than possible. I'd say it's inevitable.

1476. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 15:13:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baldqe$dq5$1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 67623

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
> <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
>
> >On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> > ...
> >> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> >> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> >> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> >> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
> >>
> >> Except it should be 1.5!
> >
> >If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.
>
> Only if you want the audio to extend down to 0 Hz.
>
> Let's do the math...
>
> Suppose typical "SSB quality" audio covers 300-2700 Hz (bandwidth 2.4 kHz). The
> 'center' of that audio is 1500 Hz - 1200 Hz up from the lower limit of 300 Hz,
> and 1200 down from the upper limit of 2700 Hz.
>
> So if we have a USB signal with the above audio characteristics "centered" on,
> say, 5200 kHz, the passband covers 5198.8 to 5201.2 kHz. And the suppressed
> carrier frequency (which equals 0 Hz audio) is at 5198.5 kHz.

Well, there you have it. No one knows what the actual story is. Since no tolerance

was specified, everyone will be off frequency except those who accidently happen to

own a crystal filter that has attributes that happen to land in the right spot.
And of course no one cares!

As I've said- Do you KNOW what the characteristics of your crystal filter are?

It is more accurate to specify the carrier frequency, then everyone would be on
frequency
and know that they are.

1477. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 15:13:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baldqi$dq5$2@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 67624

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
> coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
> spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services. Oh,
> well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
> it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
> Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?

It's the natural progression of things, Larry. They only gave it to us
temporarily because no one else had any use for it. When that use is
developed, they withdraw it from ham use and award it to commercial use.
Been that way all along.

What happens when they get down to the much-used parts of our
allocations might get to be more interesting. Of course they'll encounter a
bit
more resistance at that point, but who knows the outcome?

1478. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 15:35:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305230735.591df4d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67625

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ECD78E4.6A466371@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >

> >
> > Plus if somebody wants to run rigs from those days, they still can, in most
> > cases. An S-line or 4-line will still do a good job.
>
> Either can do much more than a good job. Receiver specs easily beat
> most of the lower end offerings from Japan.

Nah. I have two little "low end" HF rice boxes, a TS-50 and an FT-847.
I've compared the test results of both with the published test results
of the long-since deified meatball 75S-3B. This might come as a jolt
but with reference to important characteristics like front-end
performance the two rice boxes compare very favorably with the 75S3-B.
To the point of being peers in this respect. All three rcvrs have 110
dB. BDRs. The 200 Hz filter in the 75S-3B is probably the worst filter
I've ever used. Tried to use. The meatball only tunes 200 Khz segemnts
and it goes downhill from there. Donkey rcvr to the core by today's
reckonings.

. . . has to do with the proclivity we all have for looking behind us
with the rose-colored glasses. Until the lab reports pee on the parade
and impose the reality checks.

> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > (who still misses those album covers)
>
> You'd have to have gotten rid of all the vinyl to miss them. You didn't
> get rid of all the vinyl, did you?

HooBoy! Yeah, Jim has "done" some "vinyl", MOUNTAINS of vinyl!

Tell 'em Jim.

Bwaaahaha!

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1479. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 15:38:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305230738.50d5f476@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67626

bsd_mike@hotmail.com (Mike) wrote in message
news:<b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com>...
> I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
> code test back then too.
>
> Now I would like to get a license again.

Welcome back, Mike!

> Is it true that I get credit for the code test?

YES.

> Do I get credit for anything else that I passed?

Unfortunately, no.
>
> I still have the paperwork from the original testing.

Do you have your old license? That's the most definitive paperwork you
need.

The test 'elements' are defined as:

Element 1 - 5 wpm Morse code
Element 2 - Technician written (35 multiple-choice questions)
Element 3 - General written (35 multiple-choice questions)
Element 4 - Extra written (50 multiple-choice questions)

Technician license requires Element 2
General license requires Elements 1, 2 and 3
Extra license requires Elements 1, 2, 3, and 4

Here are the applicable regulations about element credit(FCC Part 97):

"ï¿½97.505 Element credit.

(a) The administering VEs must give credit as specified below to an
examinee holding any of the following license grants or license
documents:

(1) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
FCC-granted Advanced Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and
3.

(2) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
FCC-granted General Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and
3.

(3) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal) FCC-granted Technician Plus Class operator (including a Technician Class operator license granted before February 14, 1991) license grant: Elements 1 and 2.

(4) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal) FCC-granted Technician Class operator license grant: Element 2.

(5) An unexpired (or expired) FCC-granted Novice Class operator license grant: Element 1.

(6) A CSCE: Each element the CSCE indicates the examinee passed within the previous 365 days.

(7) An unexpired (or expired less than 5 years) FCC-issued commercial radiotelegraph operator license or permit: Element 1.

(8) An expired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license document granted before March 21, 1987: Element 3.

(9) An expired or unexpired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license document granted before February 14, 1991: Element 1."

(9) applies directly to you, Mike. All you need to do is pass the written exams. The Q&A pools and practice exams are online at several sites.

Good luck!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1480. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 15:40:32 UTC
From: "Catch ME, Spank ME." <public@e.mail>
Message-ID: <vcsg7gammnfg63@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 67627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner

"Randy Thomas" <TP@pradirandco.org> wrote in news:bagtn2$s5j$0
@pita.alt.net:

> Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
> at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
> mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
> hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
> the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
> cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the
> blanks. Hope you washed your hands after shaking hands
> with other hams.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Randy

Could've been the FCC took the paper. I hear they're running short on paper
to print ham licenses.

Toilet Paper is plenty good ham licenses since restructuring took effect.

1481. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 16:28:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bali74pbk0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 67628

N2EY wrote:

> bsd_mike@hotmail.com (Mike) wrote in message
news:<b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com>...
> > I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
> > code test back then too.
> >
> > Now I would like to get a license again.
>
> Welcome back, Mike!
>
> > Is it true that I get credit for the code test?
>
> YES.

Did I miss something, or didn't FCC say that 5wpm code-credit-for-life was
accrued by former holders of the Novice class ONLY? There was some
chatter about this at the time, and if that FOX POX was ever corrected
I must have missed it. Seems that if one skipped the Novice and went straight to Tech Plus
he missed out.

1482. Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 16:41:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305230841.5e5ddaa3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67629

Folks,

Interesting article recently appeared in a local paper:

http://www.philly.com/mld/philly/business/columnists/jeff_gelles/5832172.htm

The part that's relevant to amateur radio policy is Gelles' description of the FCC rulemaking process, and how secret it is. Yes, FCC puts out an NPRM and there's an easily-accessed comment system. But the FCC is not required to make its Report and Order match the corresponding NPRM in any way, no matter how detailed the NPRM is on a given subject. (And there's no requirement that the NPRM be detailed).

Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC. The Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying something else after you place your order.

Thoughts, anyone?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1483. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 17:52:55 UTC
From: <>
Message-ID: <wuacnRgzzL1mwlOjXTWcqw@comcast.com>
Source record: 67630
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Sounds to me like all this clown needs is 11 meters....

In article <3ece2622$1@snipnews.snip.net>, "Arch Stanton"
<Nate4metalshop@att.net> wrote:
>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com...
>> Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
>> coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
>> spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services.
>
>I say let the commercial interests have 5 GHz.
>
>Really now, let's be honest. If there are a
>grand total of 3 or 6 ham radio operators
>in the whole of the USA who are
>using 5 gHz once or twice for a
>one minute QSO over the course of a Year
>then we are very lucky. All we need
>is 144, 220 and 440 MHz
>FM voice and perhaps some
>cw for the once-a-year contests.
>Everything else is both esoteric
>and likely beyond our present technological
>needs and/or ability as hams.
>
>Again, let us be straightforward here folks....y
>You and I *both know* that today, in the world
>of ham radio in the Year 2003, if you can't
>buy the radio to get on the air, off the shelf,
>made-in-Japan, and from Ham Radio
>Outlet (for an outrageous price) the related
>RF spectrum WILL NOT be used by Hams.
>(except for perhaps the few or so in the whole
>United States on a very erratic and itinerate basis)
>
>Sorry but that is the truth, and our scant
>usage of 5 GHz cannot justify our continued
>spectrum allocation. It can, and will be better used
>for consumer or commercial products/Industrial/Wireless
>IP type applications.
>
>

1484. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 18:10:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECE642A.4030604@psu.edu>
Source record: 67631

Vshah101 wrote:
> From Mike KB3EIA
>
>
>> Well, you've vipniated on contesting for us now. But what exactly
>> would YOU call it?
>
>
> Point chasing is one possiblity. A word that indicates what it is
> would be suitable.

Arrow points? pen points? Pointy heads? Seems like your idea is pretty vague.

Contesting fits the definition of a contest, unless you are using it in the context of disagreeing with something.

One of these days we'll have to make up a new dictionary for you my man!

- mike KB3EIA -

1485. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 18:13:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECE64E1.4020402@psu.edu>
Source record: 67632

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>
>>Why do you insist on limiting the definition of contest to sports??
>
>
>>A contest is simply people trying to
>>be better than the other people in the contest. It is not and never has
>>been limited to sports.
>
>
> Thats not the point. My point was in Ham radio, a contest is limited to a
> specific contact chasing game. Other types of competitions are possible, but
> are not called contests in Ham radio.
>
> Contesting is playing the contact chasing game, not any other competition.
>
> The word contest has been defined to one specific activity, for Ham radio.

Zounds! could you back up and try this one again? I have no idea what
you are saying.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1486. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 18:21:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECE66AD.30506@psu.edu>
Source record: 67634

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: "Phil Kane"
>
>
>>In many foreign countries, amateur radio contesting is referred
>> to as "radiosport".
>
>
> Contesting is not a sport, like hockey, etc.

No, it isn't. No sport is like another. But as a person who plays both hockey and participates in field day, I can tell you that I am more physically whipped after field day than after a game of hockey.

Let us compare contesting to say, driving a race car. The driver is just sitting there, and it doesn't take much strength to race. Endurance is another matter. While not necessarily taking the same amount of endurance as auto racing, there is a certain stamina required in a long contest.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1487. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 18:22:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ECE6700.1000607@psu.edu>
Source record: 67633

Vshah101 wrote:
> From Mike KB3EIA
>
>
>>>The gathering I last went to was fun. It did not matter that most of them
>>
>>were
>>
>>>fat.
>>
>> That is correct, it doesn't matter. Why do you keep bringing that up?
>>
>
>
> I am sorry about that.
>
> Its nice that various age groups can get together in this groups activity.
>
> Most of the clubs seem to be interested in those activities which I am less
> interested in - contesting, CW, antennas, etc.I wish Ham radio had more
> activities like the one I went to a short while ago.

Keep going to those activities, my man. If there is enough interest,
you'll be part of a group.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1488. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 18:33:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523143338.07664.00000158@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 67635

>Subject: Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/22/2003 11:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030523002402.08597.00000155@mb-m24.aol.com>

>>Seems some FCC bureaucrat didn't
>>understand that having passed a 13 or 20 wpm code test would
>>supersede a 5 wpm test. "Okay, you did 13, but can you do 5?"
>
>Just because you can do 13wpm does NOT necessarily mean you can do 5 wpm.

Sheeeesh...here we go again...

Yes, Vippy, you CAN copy Morse Code at 5 WPM if you can copy 13. It may bore the dickens out of you, but you can do it.

>There
>is a condition where one can encode at a higher speed, but not at a lower
>speed. I have had that condition, on occasion.

Then come to a VE session I participate in. I promise you that if you show me you can successfully copy 13 WPM, we will sign you off for the present Element 1.

(I won't hold my breath...)

We even have "preety fems" at OUR hamfests, Vippy.

Steve, K4CAP

1489. Yet Another Rant Sinks.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 18:57:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523145746.13414.00000131@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67637

For those who insist that Amateur Radio does not "play well" with the egghead types, here's yet another example of just how wrong they are.

Too bad Vippy and Lennie won't be able to participate...

Unless, of course, Lennie breaks down and does that "Extra Lite" thing he promised...?!?!

Once again truth and reality undo the assinine.....

QUOTE FROM ARRL WEBPAGE:

NARTE registers ham radio net: In association with ARRL, the National Association of Radio Telecommunications Engineers (NARTE) headquartered in Medway, Massachusetts, has registered an HF Amateur Radio Net--The NARTE Net. The NARTE Net will provide a forum for the common interests of ARRL members and NARTE-certified professionals, NARTE said in announcing the net. The NARTE Net meets Saturdays, 1700 UTC, and Sundays, 2100 UTC, on 18.140 MHz. "The NARTE Net is launched to further the mutual support of ARRL and NARTE in fostering technical awareness, educating and providing credentials to practitioners in amateur and commercial telecommunications," NARTE said. A worldwide, non-profit, professional organization, NARTE certifies professional engineers and technicians in the fields of telecommunications and unlicensed wireless systems installation. The ARRL and NARTE maintain a memorandum of understanding to support areas of mutual interest.

UNQUOTE

73

Steve, K4CAP

1490. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:01:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfcikn9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67639
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 23 May 2003 08:09:36 -0400, Sadiq Akhbar wrote:

> Bell standards!!??? You are dating yourself. Bell standards
>went away years ago. Telephony transmission is now digital
>and has been for years. Start with a search on "Telephone
>Industry Standards Organization," if you are interested in
>getting caught up with the times.
>
>Akah S.
>Sadiq Engineering Consults

Mister Sadiq - I am a senior engineering specialist and regulatory counsel for a major engineering consulting firm in the field, whose VP of engineering is a member of several TISO committees, so I DO have knowledge of and access to modern standards. We also maintain a library of Bell System standards and BSTJs - one of the remaining few on the West Coast - as well as of current standards.

I asked about Bell Standards for a particular reason: Bill is a seasoned Bell Labs person and we can pull each other's chain (in jest, of course) over them.

In truth, the analog standards on voice characteristics (an analog process) haven't changed much over the last 30 years even though digital transmission has been common.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1491. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:01:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjfpa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67640

On 23 May 2003 09:41:14 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC.

Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
drives them.

>Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely
>different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks
>might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying
>something else after you place your order.

Not in the least, and thank goodness that the Commish'
occasionally realizes that what the petitioner proposed was bad
policy and should be changed. We have had a bunch of those in
the ARS over the years.

Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
the action causes personal harm. There have been several station
licensing cases (one that I am intimately familiar with) that have
kicked around between the FCC and the courts for over 30 years.

>Thoughts, anyone?

As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
it's over and even then it may not be over.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1492. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:01:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfck46c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67641

On 23 May 2003 05:54:23 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>Back when a nice 3 bedroom house cost $20-25,000. And a nice new car
>was under $2,000.

And an engineer several years out of school working for an
allegedly high-paying defense contractor got paid $5000 a year.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1493. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:01:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjmfb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67642

On 23 May 2003 12:24:25 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Besides, the Morse code test is a test of basic DECODING skill,
>not ENCODING skill.

I can arrange a test of encoding skill if that's what you
crave..... <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1494. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:02:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305231202.823bf92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3ECBAE02.E4585ACB@ix.netcom.com>...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > >
> > > I'm sorry that your rig does not have a panel or automatic
> > > switch to change the displayed readout frequency from "suppressed
> > > carrier" to "center of occupied bandwidth" if you can't make
> > > the computation in your head.
> > >
> > > Get a copy of Part 2 of the FCC Rules and READ the definition
> > > of "assigned frequency" in Section 2.1 of the Rules. This
> > > applies to the Amateur Radio Service as well as other FCC Radio
> > > Services. This is the standard method of specifying discrete
> > > channels for regulatory purposes.
> > >
>
> QST, when they publish the fact that we will be getting this
> allocation, should mention how the FCC specifies the frequencies,
> and point out that most ham rigs traditionally display the suppressed
> carrier freq, and that we need to dial up the rig so the display
> reads 1.5KHz lower than the FCC numbers. And, as there are only
> 5 freqs, just list the numbers translated into "ham" from "FCC/NATO".

See:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/05/23/3/?nc=1

Plain and simple explanation of the issues.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1495. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:10:28 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305231210.2145948e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67644

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ECD7B75.AF3322F6@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > > I have only one word for Hans: "Orion".
> > >
> > > Yesssss!
> > >
> > > How do ya like Baby so far?
> >
> You may have to revise your crystal filter comments. The receiver is
> the best I've ever heard anywhere. Of course there are some crystal
> filters in the thing. The stock roofing filters are four pole units but
> the 500 Hz optional roofing filter is a six pole job.

I noticed that in the specs. It's a hybrid which makes huge sense.
That takes it out of the "all DSP" category in a big way. I'm very
leery of the all-DSP rigs so far because I've had some not-so-hot
experiences with DSP but there is no doubt that the promise is there.
It hasn't been fulfilled in the particular radios I've used, not even
close so I'm in a "show me" frame of mind. I've attributed lousy DSP
to processing speeds which simply ain't high enough yet to compete
with, for instance, the shape factors of really good xtal filters like
those INRAD supplies. But once higher-speed chips become available . .
? We're in the 8086 days of ham DSP. Maybe even Z-80 days.

> The DSP filter
> skirts are razor sharp and there's no ringing down to 100 Hz.

. . So far so good . .

> There are FOUR band stacking registers per band making it easy to set
> one up for CW, SSB, AM, RTTY or whatever your favorites happen to be.

Boy that should save a lotta hassles for mode-hoppers. Me. I have a
terminal dose of menuitis, drives me nuts.

> DSP noise reduction (nine levels) is phenomenal.

There's a hot topic. There are apparently major differences in the
various rigs when it comes to the effectiveness of DSP noise blankers.
Been a lotta comments about DSP noise abatement implementations
ranging from superb to useless in the high-end rigs. Beats me.

> I've downloaded firmware updates twice since owning the Orion and was
> delighted when some of my suggestions were implemented in the last
> update.

That's truly slick. None of the JA radio builders offer any such capability. I don't think they will either unless it comes via CAT control software some of which is already available. But ya gotta be hooked to the 'puter to use 'em. Firmware updates are the right way to go. Small nimble U.S. outfits like TT and Elecraft can play this game very successfully but I don't see the JAs getting into it since they're remote, slow-moving corporate monoliths with much different priorities and mindsets.

OK now 'fess up David: What *warts* does the Orion have? Don't be silly and tell me it doesn't have any, all xcvrs have notable warts. There's lists of MP warts and their fixes out there and some of 'em can't be fixed.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1496. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:34:18 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@xrayzuluanon.com>
Message-ID: <bam0kb$qk6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67645

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjfpa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 23 May 2003 09:41:14 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC.
>
> Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
> matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
> all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
> think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
> drives them.
>
> >Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely
> >different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks
> >might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying
> >something else after you place your order.
>
> Not in the least, and thank goodness that the Commish'
> occasionally realizes that what the petitioner proposed was bad
> policy and should be changed. We have had a bunch of those in
> the ARS over the years.
>
> Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
> pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
> the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
> and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
> the action causes personal harm. There have been several station
> licensing cases (one that I am intimately familiar with) that have
> kicked around between the FCC and the courts for over 30 years.
>
> >Thoughts, anyone?
>
> As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
> it's over and even then it may not be over.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>

Come on now, quit denying it. You ARE an apologist for
the FCC! Right?

You liberal big government types just don't get it , do you?

"Liberals are at their funniest when they are out of power"
----Rush Limbaugh

anon

1497. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:35:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bam0krvdv1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67646

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0305230841.5e5ddaa3@posting.google.com...
> Folks,
>
> Interesting article recently appeared in a local paper:
>
>
http://www.philly.com/mld/philly/business/columnists/jeff_gelles/5832172.htm
>
> The part that's relevant to amateur radio policy is Gelles'
> description of the FCC rulemaking process, and how secret it is. Yes,
> FCC puts out an NPRM and there's an easily-accessed comment system.
> But the FCC is not required to make its Report and Order match the
> corresponding NPRM in any way, no matter how detailed the NPRM is on a
> given subject. (And there's no requirement that the NPRM be detailed).
>
> Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC. The
> Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely
> different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks
> might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying
> something else after you place your order.
>
> Thoughts, anyone?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Just what happened back in 1968 when the FCC, in cahoots with the ARRL
shoved Incentive Licensing down our throats.

Dan/W4NTI

1498. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 20:40:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bam0u3$8uq$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67647
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3ECE98E9.9B5E9876@crosslink.net...
> Arch Stanton wrote:
> >
> > Really now, let's be honest. If there are a
> > grand total of 3 or 6 ham radio operators
> > in the whole of the USA who are
> > using 5 gHz once or twice for a
> > one minute QSO over the course of a Year
> > then we are very lucky. All we need
> > is 144, 220 and 440 MHz. ...
> >
> > Again, let us be straightforward here folks....y
> > You and I *both know* that today, in the world
> > of ham radio in the Year 2003, if you can't
> > buy the radio to get on the air, off the shelf,
> > made-in-Japan, and from Ham Radio Outlet the related
> > RF spectrum WILL NOT be used by Hams....
>
> True- for now. But the same was once true for 20 meters, not to mention
> 144, 220 and 440 MHz. FCC gave 11 meters to CB because no hi-power
> devices were available to draw ham interest at the time. I remember
> needing expensive "lighthouse" tubes to get 100 watts on 440. Now HRO
> will sell you a whole 100W amp for $339 and the band is so busy you
> might have to wait to get a repeater coordinated on it. The same will
> happen to the GHz bands sooner than you think.
>
> 73, K3DWW

Yep...and remember when Wayne Green of 73 magazine wanted to give away the top 2 megs of 2 meters (146-148) because hams didn't use it? (circa 1963 or so).

Then came FM and repeaters.

Dan/W4NTI

1499. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:26:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Wlwza.2899$4G.1150643@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67651

"Mike" <bsd_mike@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com...
> I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
> code test back then too.
>
> Now I would like to get a license again. Is it true that I get credit
> for the code test? Do I get credit for anything else that I passed?
>
> I still have the paperwork from the original testing.
>
> -Mike

Double check the following with your local volunteer examiner team or call the ARRL. If your license expired, code is the only thing you can get credit for I believe. You would have to take the written exams again. However these days, the Technician class license only requires one written test as there are no new Novice licenses being tested for or issued.

While you are at it, study up and take your General since only the 5wpm code test is required for any class of license.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1500. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:30:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Zpwza.2908$4G.1151404@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67652

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030522231309.08597.00000149@mb-m24.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >Why do you insist on limiting the definition of contest to sports??
>
> >A contest is simply people trying to
> >be better than the other people in the contest. It is not and never has
> >been limited to sports.
>
> Thats not the point. My point was in Ham radio, a contest is limited to a
> specific contact chasing game. Other types of competitions are possible,
but
> are not called contests in Ham radio.
>
> Contesting is playing the contact chasing game, not any other competition.
>
> The word contest has been defined to one specific activity, for Ham radio.

There is nothing that prohibits anyone from setting up other types of
competitions. Get a sponsor and do it. That's all it takes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1501. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:41:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Wzwza.2970$4G.1153433@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67653

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bali74pbk0@208.206.142.69...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > bsd_mike@hotmail.com (Mike) wrote in message
news:<b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com>...
> > > I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
> > > code test back then too.
> > >
> > > Now I would like to get a license again.
> >
> > Welcome back, Mike!
> >
> > > Is it true that I get credit for the code test?
> >
> > YES.
>
> Did I miss something, or didn't FCC say that 5wpm code-credit-for-life
was
> accrued by former holders of the Novice class ONLY? There was some
> chatter about this at the time, and if that FOX POX was ever corrected
> I must have missed it. Seems that if one skipped the Novice and went
straight to Tech Plus he missed out.
>

Tech Plus is included for the 5wpm code-credit-for-life. You just have to
be sure to have the documentation. But it must have actually been a Tech
Plus not the Tech with code credit of today. Some one who has received code
credit on the current Tech licenses can operate the attendant HF privileges
so long as their license doesn't lapse but for purposes of upgrading, the
credit only lasts one year.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1502. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:44:38 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <tf5tcvojgvhqhk2dbkhe5ufe2hpfs3kqt1@4ax.com>
Source record: 67654
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner

They stole all the toilet seats as well. The convention authorities are looking to find out who did it, but right now they've got nothing to go on.

{;-)

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1503. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:45:41 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@xrayzuluanon.com>
Message-ID: <bam4qa$94e$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfcikn9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Fri, 23 May 2003 08:09:36 -0400, Sadiq Akhbar wrote:
>
> > Bell standards!!??? You are dating yourself. Bell standards
> >went away years ago. Telephony transmission is now digital
> >and has been for years. Start with a search on "Telephone
> >Industry Standards Organization," if you are interested in
> >getting caught up with the times.
> >
> >Akah S.
> >Sadiq Engineering Consults
>
> Mister Sadiq - I am a senior engineering specialist and
> regulatory counsel for a major engineering consulting firm in
> the field, whose VP of engineering is a member of several TISO
> committees, so I DO have knowledge of and access to modern
> standards. We also maintain a library of Bell System standards
> and BSTJs - one of the remaining few on the West Coast - as
> well as of current standards.
>
> I asked about Bell Standards for a particular reason: Bill is
> a seasoned Bell Labs person and we can pull each other's chain
> (in jest, of course) over them.
>
> In truth, the analog standards on voice characteristics (an
> analog process) haven't changed much over the last 30 years
> even though digital transmission has been common.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>

Wow! You have more degrees than a thermometer and more
titles than the King of England! Which.....begs the question. Just
why DO you slum here with us low lifes? Do you enjoy the petty
bickering? Perhaps you would relate better to fellow elitists
in a professional forum? BTW, you date yourself again when
you use phrases like, "Pull your chain, pulling each others chain."
Phrases like that went out with the 50s, maybe early 60s.

anon

1504. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:45:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bam508$7g$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67656

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030523013238.16581.00000197@mb-m17.aol.com...
> In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >> In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >> >> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> >
> >> >> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
> >> >> filters?
> >> >
> >> >You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
> >> >that answer.
> >>
> >> You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
> >> counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a
> >> dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.
> >>
> >> That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.
> >
> >Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.
>
> TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
> of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?

What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
to make any specific measurements. The rules require
a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
spec I don't have to measure anything.

> If that is in violation of FCC regulations you are responsible.

> No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
> the licensee are responsible.

Agreed. That does not, however, require any periodic or
speciifc measurements to be made by me.

> Now if you feel that you "don't have to" make such
> measurements, don't.

I don't, nor do most hams with no ill effect.

> You don't have to operate on those
> five 60m frequencies, either.

Why should I not?

> US Hams didn't have them before
> 14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away from all of
> you.

If there's a point you're making on that statement,
it eludes me.

> Why are there so many argumentative hams demanding things
> in here? :-)

Who's demanding anything. Some of us believe that rules and regulations
can be written with a level of clarity and in such a way as to avoid
confusion. That is something any documentation writer should strive
for.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1505. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:48:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JGwza.3006$4G.1154742@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67657

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3ECE9EC3.E469D5BB@crosslink.net...
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > Did I miss something, or didn't FCC say that 5wpm code-credit-for-life
was
> > accrued by former holders of the Novice class ONLY? There was some
> > chatter about this at the time, and if that FOX POX was ever corrected
> > I must have missed it. Seems that if one skipped the Novice and went
straight to > Tech Plus he missed out.
>
> I thot all "Tech Plus's" had to be Novices first, if only briefly. I got
> my Novice by passing 5WPM then a written test, both administrated by a
> General at a local club; then my Tech by passing the General written
> exam at an FCC office a week or so later (ie, there was no "Tech" exam
> per se). IIRC, I became a "Tech Plus" when FCC invented a seperate Tech
> exam.
>
> 73, K3DWW

I originally licensed in 1992. At one session, I passed the Novice written, Tech written, and 5 wpm. I was issued a Tech Plus license as a result. I never held a Novice license. The FCC was so slow that while I waited for my license (it took 3 months), I passed my General requirements. So my first on-air contact, I was a "Temporary AG."

In other words, a Tech Plus had to pass the Novice elements but did not have to have held a Novice license.

It's rather confusing to keep all the different licensing programs straight.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1506. 3865 kHz Nightly Drunk-A-Thon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:51:03 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@xrayzuluanon.com>
Message-ID: <bam54a$a7i$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hey, I'm glad I read about 3865 kHz on k1tp's web page.
The frequency is a riot!!!!! There's a mean drunk on there
every night using profanity & obscenity. He's so drunk he
can't string together two coherent words. Claims to have the
goods on everyone and hates Masons. Last night he passed
out, finally, about 11:30 pm. Then all kinds of people got on
the freq. talked about him and had a good time. Man, this
guy needs to be admitted to detox, the sooner the better!

anon
3865 Lurker

1507. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:55:53 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECE98E9.9B5E9876@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67636
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Arch Stanton wrote:
>
> Really now, let's be honest. If there are a
> grand total of 3 or 6 ham radio operators
> in the whole of the USA who are
> using 5 gHz once or twice for a
> one minute QSO over the course of a Year
> then we are very lucky. All we need
> is 144, 220 and 440 MHz. ...
>
> Again, let us be straightforward here folks....y
> You and I *both know* that today, in the world
> of ham radio in the Year 2003, if you can't
> buy the radio to get on the air, off the shelf,
> made-in-Japan, and from Ham Radio Outlet the related
> RF spectrum WILL NOT be used by Hams....

True- for now. But the same was once true for 20 meters, not to mention 144, 220 and 440 MHz. FCC gave 11 meters to CB because no hi-power devices were available to draw ham interest at the time. I remember needing expensive "lighthouse" tubes to get 100 watts on 440. Now HRO will sell you a whole 100W amp for $339 and the band is so busy you might have to wait to get a repeater coordinated on it. The same will happen to the GHz bands sooner than you think.

73, K3DWW

1508. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 21:56:48 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305232150270.3124@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67659

On Fri, 23 May 2003, N2EY wrote:
> In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
> <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
> >On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> > ...
> >> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> >> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> >> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> >> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
> >>
> >> Except it should be 1.5!
> >
> >If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.
>
> Only if you want the audio to extend down to 0 Hz.

OK, maybe not that far, but some people do have some resonant component of
their voice below 300 Hz.... Those people sometimes sound like "Mickey Mouse"
on answering machines and such, but not in person - because the bandwidth of
that device cuts off part of their vocalization. I assume NOTHING about the
signal because that really depends on its source of modulation.

A 2.8kHz bandwidth implies to me => 200Hz - 3kHz which is more reasonable.
That means moving 1.6kHz down from the center the FCC specified. Guess what -
ANOTHER adjustment factor! Bad regulation. Bad, bad FCC.

> Let's do the math...
>
> Suppose typical "SSB quality" audio covers 300-2700 Hz (bandwidth 2.4 kHz). The
> 'center' of that audio is 1500 Hz - 1200 Hz up from the lower limit of 300 Hz,
> and 1200 down from the upper limit of 2700 Hz.
>
> So if we have a USB signal with the above audio characteristics "centered" on,
> say, 5200 kHz, the passband covers 5198.8 to 5201.2 kHz. And the suppressed
> carrier frequency (which equals 0 Hz audio) is at 5198.5 kHz.
> >
> >Another candidate for "stereo-quality SSB?" :-)
>
> HAW!
> >
> >If we can't even agree on this, that is an indication of the problem right
> >there.
> >
> See above

1509. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 22:02:07 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305232158530.3124@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 22 May 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > >ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
> > >folks here...so what willit be?
> >
> > 1.5 puts a 3000 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> > and a 200 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.

Actually, no it doesn't. The center of that range is 1600Hz, so one needs to
be 1.6kHz down to make that centered.

Adjusting by 1.5Khz means that 3kHz will be 1.5kHz above, but 200Hz will only
be 1.3kHz below. That's not symmetrical and therefore not centered.

> > 1.4 puts a 2800 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> > and a 0 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.

That one is at least centered.

1510. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 22:17:04 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305232209400.3124@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67661

On Fri, 23 May 2003, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
> > <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
> >
> > >On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> > >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> > >> > ...
> > >> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> > >> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> > >> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> > >> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
> > >>
> > >> Except it should be 1.5!
> > >
> > >If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.
> >
> > Only if you want the audio to extend down to 0 Hz.
> >
> > Let's do the math...
> >
> > Suppose typical "SSB quality" audio covers 300-2700 Hz (bandwidth 2.4 kHz). The
> > 'center' of that audio is 1500 Hz - 1200 Hz up from the lower limit of 300 Hz,
> > and 1200 down from the upper limit of 2700 Hz.
> >
> > So if we have a USB signal with the above audio characteristics "centered" on,
> > say, 5200 kHz, the passband covers 5198.8 to 5201.2 kHz. And the suppressed
> > carrier frequency (which equals 0 Hz audio) is at 5198.5 kHz.
>
>
>
> Well, there you have it. No one knows what the actual story is. Since no tolerance
>
> was specified, everyone will be off frequency except those who accidently happen to
>
> own a crystal filter that has attributes that happen to land in the right spot.
> And of course no one cares!
>
> As I've said- Do you KNOW what the characteristics of your crystal filter are?
>
> It is more accurate to specify the carrier frequency, then everyone would be on
> frequency
> and know that they are.

...Especially when someone else comes up and uses the entire 2.8kHz range. Their signal (let's say it passes 200Hz-3kHz) will have its center as 1600Hz. Your signal with your 2.4kHz bandpass filter wants a center of 1500Hz. Assuming both radios were perfect in their transmission characteristics, there's going to be a 100Hz shift between the transmitted and received audio due to just the different interpretation of the rule (not doppler or any other phenonomon) before bandpass clipping.

...So Donald Duck may end up sounding like Mickey Mouse.

If the rule were written with the suppressed carrier frequency in mind, we wouldn't have this issue.

Although the shift in question isn't going to be that significant, just the fact that it happens shows the bad authorship of the rule.

1511. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 22:20:51 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECE9EC3.E469D5BB@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67638

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Did I miss something, or didn't FCC say that 5wpm code-credit-for-life was
> accrued by former holders of the Novice class ONLY? There was some
> chatter about this at the time, and if that FOX POX was ever corrected
> I must have missed it. Seems that if one skipped the Novice and went straight to > Tech Plus he missed out.

I thot all "Tech Plus's" had to be Novices first, if only briefly. I got my Novice by passing 5WPM then a written test, both administrated by a General at a local club; then my Tech by passing the General written exam at an FCC office a week or so later (ie, there was no "Tech" exam per se). IIRC, I became a "Tech Plus" when FCC invented a seperate Tech exam.

73, K3DWW

1512. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 22:24:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523182431.29002.00000144@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67662

In article <bali74pbk0@208.206.142.69>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> bsd_mike@hotmail.com (Mike) wrote in message
>news:<b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com>...
>> > I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
>> > code test back then too.
>> >
>> > Now I would like to get a license again.
>>
>> Welcome back, Mike!
>>
>> > Is it true that I get credit for the code test?
>>
>> YES.
>
> Did I miss something, or didn't FCC say that 5wpm code-credit-for-life was
>accrued by former holders of the Novice class ONLY? There was some
>chatter about this at the time, and if that FOX POX was ever corrected
>I must have missed it. Seems that if one skipped the Novice and went straight
>to Tech Plus he missed out.

They changed that mess some time back. See a current copy of Part 97. ARRL has
it online.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1513. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 22:24:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523182431.29002.00000143@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67663

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjmfb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 23 May 2003 12:24:25 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Besides, the Morse code test is a test of basic DECODING skill,
>>not ENCODING skill.
>
> I can arrange a test of encoding skill if that's what you
> crave..... <ggg>
>
Had one last night with K2BE....

Can I bring my four Vibroplexes and my J-37?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1514. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 22:32:40 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305232227500.3124@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67664

On Fri, 23 May 2003, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
> > bsd_mike@hotmail.com (Mike) wrote in message
news:<b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com>...
> > > I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
> > > code test back then too.
> > >
> > > Now I would like to get a license again.
> >
> > Welcome back, Mike!
> >
> > > Is it true that I get credit for the code test?
> >
> > YES.
>
> Did I miss something, or didn't FCC say that 5wpm code-credit-for-life was
> accrued by former holders of the Novice class ONLY? There was some
> chatter about this at the time, and if that FOX POX was ever corrected
> I must have missed it. Seems that if one skipped the Novice and went straight to Tech
Plus he missed out.

No, you didn't miss.

Note that only elements 1 and 3 can be granted from former, expired licenses
NOT within the grace period, but as for which licenses, not all classes
qualify.

Element 1: Only a Novice or Pre-1991 Technician license counts.
Element 3: Only a pre-March 21, 1987 Technician license counts.

Other licenses, if they remained valid or were in the grace period, can carry
these elements. However, element credit not being given for licenses beyond
the grace period is more of a punishment.

Moral: Don't let your license expire. Renew it even if you aren't active.

1515. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 23:03:13 UTC
From: helmsman <helmsman@DELETEmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <g5atcv8t1ok6gukg69r31qtjv6psr5kfq9@4ax.com>
Source record: 67665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner

On Fri, 23 May 2003 14:44:38 -0700, Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote:

>They stole all the toilet seats as well. The convention authorities are looking
>to find out who did it, but right now they've got nothing to go on.
>
>{;-)
>
>Jim
>Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
>A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

Surely they will FLUSH them out..

.
Boycott anything made in france and vacation somewhere else.

1516. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 23:16:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECEABD7.2010507@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67666

Bill Sohl wrote:

>What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
>to make any specific measurements. The rules require
>a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
>spec I don't have to measure anything.
>
>
But how do you know if your rig is in spec without doing some measurements?

1517. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 23:34:04 UTC
From: me <me@none.com>
Message-ID: <Ldyza.43852$eJ2.21800@fed1read07>
Source record: 67667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner

"helmsman" <helmsman@DELETEmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:g5atcv8t1ok6gukg69r31qtjv6psr5kfq9@4ax.com...
>
> Surely they will FLUSH them out..
>
> .
> Boycott anything made in france and vacation somewhere else.

I bet toilet boy John Mackey is the thief.

-me
--
You have the right to remain stupid.
Everything you say can and will be ignored.

1518. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-23 23:40:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bambmh$lb8$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67668

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3ECEABD7.2010507@ix.netcom.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
> >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
> >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
> >spec I don't have to measure anything.
> >
> But how do you know if your rig is in
> spec without doing some measurements?

I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
does what the manufacturer states in the
documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
I accept the responsibility.

Do you really think any significant percentage
of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
made periodic measurements of their commercial
equipment's signal? For many, an "on-the-air"
QSO with another ham will give sufficient
indication via the other ham's assessment of what
s/he hears as to the quality of the signal.

The above has been the norm for decades within amateur radio
with no ill effects or otherwise wholesale indication that
individual rigs are not performing within part 97
rules.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1519. Re: Yet Another Rant Sinks.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:10:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfcyscd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67669

On 23 May 2003 18:57:46 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>The NARTE Net will provide a forum for the common interests of
>ARRL members and NARTE-certified professionals, NARTE said in
>announcing the net. The NARTE Net meets Saturdays, 1700 UTC, and
>Sundays, 2100 UTC, on 18.140 MHz.

Goody - another net that I'm qualified to join if I ever get a
HF rig......(I'm a lifetime member of NARTE.)

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1520. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202432.15427.00000231@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67673

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfck46c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 23 May 2003 05:54:23 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Back when a nice 3 bedroom house cost $20-25,000. And a nice new car
>>was under $2,000.
>
> And an engineer several years out of school working for an
> allegedly high-paying defense contractor got paid $5000 a year.

Yup.

Today that house costs $250-350,000 or more. How much does the engineer make?

I recall that when I started work in the design office of Undisclosed Corporation, (1977), my design group leader told me that when he had started there (about 1962?) one of his goals was to make $10,000 per year before taxes. He figured that $10K was "Easy Street" - and it was, back then.

Seems to me that one of the big changes in economic life today is that the prices of many of the essentials (housing, cars, insurance, education) have risen faster than wages, while many "luxuries" have risen slower than inflation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1521. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202432.15427.00000232@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67674

In article <20030520223539.15462.00000158@mb-m06.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Reminds me of a line from a Harry Chapin song: "...And she walked away
>in silence; It's strange but you'd never know; We'd both gotten what we'd
>asked for, Such a long, long time ago." Unfortunately, for us hams, as it
>was
>for Harry and Sue, "getting what we'd asked for" didn't bring a happy ending.

It didn't? You mean you never heard the second song?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1522. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202433.15427.00000233@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67670

In article <bahgaprpj1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Neither novice nor advanced will disappear in the next 10 years as many have
>actually been renewed and 100s more are renewed every month giving those
>renewals another 10 years of existence

DOH!

Of course!

>...unless they all suddenly upgrade.
>
Or the rules change.

ARRL was trying to avoid all this by proposing instant upgrades/grandfathering
of existing Tech Pluses and Novices to General. Problem was, such a plan would
have opened a neat loophole because there has to be some time between an R&O
and its implementation - in the case of 98-143, it was almost 4 months.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1523. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202434.15427.00000235@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67676

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305232227500.3124@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>Note that only elements 1 and 3 can be granted from former, expired licenses
>NOT within the grace period, but as for which licenses, not all classes
>qualify.
>
>Element 1: Only a Novice or Pre-1991 Technician license counts.
>Element 3: Only a pre-March 21, 1987 Technician license counts.
>
>Other licenses, if they remained valid or were in the grace period, can carry
>these elements. However, element credit not being given for licenses beyond
>the grace period is more of a punishment.

Yup. Which means that somebody with a long-expired Technician (as far back as
1951) can get a General without any testing. But someone who bypassed Novice
and Tech, and went straight to General, Advanced or Extra, gets no credit at
all if the license is beyond the grace period.
>
>Moral: Don't let your license expire. Renew it even if you aren't active.

Good advice! With 10 year license terms and a 90 day renewal window, it's easy
to miss the boat, though. OTOH, you can renew online or download and print out
the necessary form and instructions with no fuss.

I remember times when you could renew any time the license was also modified -
say, for an address change. Not so anymore! The only way to get a renewal
outside the 90 day window is to go for a vanity call.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1524. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202434.15427.00000234@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67677

In article <d22b54c3.0305230646.18d6c0a1@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
>> coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
>> spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services. Oh,
>> well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
>> it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
>> Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?
>
>There's nothing new about any of it Larry. As Jim points out the
>general practice goes back to the days when hams got tossed into the
>"useless space" above 200 meters for the convenience of the
>commercials. The ham bands have always served as "spectrum preserves"
>for commercial and government users. i.e., they're "easy pickin's"
>when new technologies come along like the current need to find a home
>for what is being billed as the huge incoming wave of wideband Part 15
>devices.

'zactly. btw, most of our microwave allocations date from 1946, with various modifications over the years. Those bands aren't exactly new - there were 10 gig radar systems in WW2.

>It's obvious as hell that the public interest will be far better
>served by using that 5Ghz space for Part 15 ops vs. "saving it" for
>ham purposes. WHAT ham purposes?? A few guys with horns on camera
>tripods shooting at each other from mountaintops? 'Snot even a
>discussion.

There ARE ham uses for the microwaves, like control links, satellites and even EME. But IMHO, we'd be better off with a few MHz of exclusive amateur spectrum than many MHz of shared space.

>And yeah, the rest of the ham centimeter and millimeter bands are
>under the same gun and we're going to lose even more space as time
>goes by. Down the road when we find we're really in a pinch for
>playpen space we'll be forced to wise up and implement better
>technolgies ourselves. The current 1960's era spectrum-eating repeater
>crap is gonna go. As an example.

Which brings up another point: The proliferation of bands has its downside - dilution of the user base. There are only so many hams interested in any one band, and the more bands there are, the more fragmented things become.

>
>The League will wave the flag and put up the usual cerimonial good
>fight as usual. Snoozer.

Maybe not. If the end result is some exclusive-amateur spectrum rather than massive sharing with other users.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1525. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202435.15427.00000236@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67671

In article <bam0krvdv1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Just what happened back in 1968 when the FCC, in cahoots with the ARRL
>shoved Incentive Licensing down our throats.
>
I don't see how the ARRL was in cahoots with FCC, Dan. The League and others actually got the FCC to tone down some of the harsher aspects of IL, like demoting all Advanceds to Generals, as was proposed by FCC. And the original ARRL proposal (1963) was very simple.

And the story really begins about 1949, when FCC started talking about restructuring the old ABC system. That resulted in a system where hams who did not have an Advanced by the end of 1952 would have needed an Extra to operate 'phone on the HF ham bands below 25 MHz. (160 is MF, not HF).

But then FCC did a complete about-face and opened up all privileges to all hams except Techs and Novices.

So the whole IL mess of the '60s was actually a rethinking of that last-minute end-of-1952 decision. btw, the whole subband-by-license-class thing did not come from either FCC or ARRL.

Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes - just like before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1526. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202436.15427.00000238@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67672

In article <bam27a$1asn2$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>In a different manner, an
>"engine" and "motor" are not the same. The main device under the hood of
>your car or truck is an engine, but the item that spins up the blower fan
>for your climate control devices is a motor, or the device that turns the
>clothes dryer barrel is a motor. Not intechangeable.

A distinction that is blurring in common use, just like "kleenex" as a general
reference to tissues, "xerox" to photostatic copying and "cokes" as a general
reference to carbonated soft drinks.

Bit of railroad trivia....

For quite some years the Pennsylvania Railroad referred to steam and
diesel-electric locomotives as "engines" and referred to electric locomotives
(third-rail or overhead wire) as "motors".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1527. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:24:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523202436.15427.00000237@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 67675

In article <d22b54c3.0305230735.591df4d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> You'd have to have gotten rid of all the vinyl to miss them. You didn't
>> get rid of all the vinyl, did you?

Yes, I did. Don't even have a turntable anymore. CDs and casettes only.
>
>HooBoy! Yeah, Jim has "done" some "vinyl", MOUNTAINS of vinyl!

They weren't mine, but I had to deal with them.
>
>Tell 'em Jim.
>
They would not believe me. Heck, I sometimes don't even believe it, and I was there.

>Bwaaahaha!
>
Did anybody check out that CS link I posted?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1528. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 00:50:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bamfk9$57e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67678

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030523202435.15427.00000236@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <bam0krvdv1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Just what happened back in 1968 when the FCC, in cahoots with the ARRL
> >shoved Incentive Licensing down our throats.
> >
> I don't see how the ARRL was in cahoots with FCC, Dan. The League and
others
> actually got the FCC to tone down some of the harsher aspects of IL, like
> demoting all Advanceds to Generals, as was proposed by FCC. And the
original
> ARRL proposal (1963) was very simple.
>
> And the story really begins about 1949, when FCC started talking about
> restructuring the old ABC system. That resulted in a system where hams who
did
> not have an Advanced by the end of 1952 would have needed an Extra to
operate
> 'phone on the HF ham bands below 25 MHz. (160 is MF, not HF).
>
> But then FCC did a complete about-face and opened up all privileges to all
hams
> except Techs and Novices.
>
> So the whole IL mess of the '60s was actually a rethinking of that
last-minute
> end-of-1952 decision. btw, the whole subband-by-license-class thing did
not
> come from either FCC or ARRL.
>
> Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes - just
like
> before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

In 1961 I passed the General. At that time it gave me ALL HF PRIVLIDGES.
In 1968 I was told I had to upgrade to "EXTRA" to get the same privlidges.
That was not right and as far as I'm concerned is the main problems with
Amateur Radio today. A class system has been imposed.

Dan/W4NTI

1529. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:02:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305231702.3f6e5968@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner

Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:<tf5tcvojgvhqhk2dbkhe5ufe2hpfs3kqt1@4ax.com>...
> They stole all the toilet seats as well. The convention authorities are looking
> to find out who did it, but right now they've got nothing to go on.
>
> {;-)

Go QSO an outer marker WILLYA?!

>
> Jim
> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

w3rv

1530. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:04:38 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523210438.23152.00000203@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67680

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>as a person who plays both
>hockey and participates in field day, I can tell you that I am more
>physically whipped after field day than after a game of hockey.

You must not have put much effort into your hockey game. I was on a hockey team in school. I can tell you that a hockey game is more tiring than field day weekend. Burns more calories too.

>While not necessarily taking the same amount of
>endurance as auto racing, there is a certain stamina required in a long
>contest.

Yes, staying awake. Also, turning knobs, searching for contacts, keying CW for long time (gets tiring).

1531. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:15:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd1ixj.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67681

On 23 May 2003 22:24:31 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>> I can arrange a test of encoding skill if that's what you
>> crave..... <ggg>
>>
>Can I bring my four Vibroplexes and my J-37?

Sure - but my "J-37" says "J-38" <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1532. Re: 3865 kHz Nightly Drunk-A-Thon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:32:18 UTC
From: "Rev. Froot-Loop" <snotnosekids@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ececc67@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Anon" <Anon@xrayzuluanon.com> wrote in message
news:bam54a$a7i$0@pita.alt.net...
> Hey, I'm glad I read about 3865 kHz on k1tp's web page.

What is the URL for K1TP's page?
I have heard it mentoned several times
but cannot find it.

> The frequency is a riot!!!!! There's a mean drunk on there
> every night using profanity & obscenity. He's so drunk he
> can't string together two coherent words. Claims to have the
> goods on everyone and hates Masons. Last night he passed
> out, finally, about 11:30 pm. Then all kinds of people got on
> the freq. talked about him and had a good time. Man, this
> guy needs to be admitted to detox, the sooner the better!
>
> anon
> 3865 Lurker

Sounds like the new 14.313 !!!!! Gotta listen in here tonight

1533. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:39:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd2i6l.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67684

On 24 May 2003 00:24:35 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes - just like
>before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.

"What goes around comes around"......

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1534. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:39:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd2s5m.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67683

On 24 May 2003 00:24:36 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Bit of railroad trivia....
>
>For quite some years the Pennsylvania Railroad referred to steam
>and diesel-electric locomotives as "engines" and referred to
>electric locomotives (third-rail or overhead wire) as "motors".

IIRC the NEC DS-es still refer to them as "motors".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
PNW MP 754 - Tillamook Dist.

1535. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:50:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bamj5n$it4$0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 67685

Vito wrote:

> I thot all "Tech Plus's" had to be Novices first, if only briefly.

No, by taking the General written (later the Tech written when it was split from the General) along with the
5wpm code test one could to straigt to Tech (or Tech Plus after it was created). In this case the applicant
nevver was issued a Novice license although of course he qualified for one. If I racall the correctly the order
said that anyone who had eer held a NOice license could claim lifetime code credit, but strangely no other class
had that privilege. Maybe they came to their senses and corrected that error.

Dick

1536. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 01:55:19 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <biAza.259$bW2.33@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67686

Jim,

I pretty much agree with you, but the simple fact is that big buck$ will win the war. Fewer and fewer corporations own more and more broadcast stations. Oh well ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030523060127.20217.00000192@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
> >coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
> >spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services. Oh,
> >well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
> >it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
> >Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?
>
> Larry,
>
> Where have you been? Reallocation is a fact of life. Been that way since "200
> meters and down" was news.
>
> Once upon a time there wasn't much demand for microwaves, and the available
> technologies were expensive and the results limited. So we hams got enormous
> allocations up there. Times have changed and technology has changed.
>
> Because the radio spectrum is finite and is considered to be public property,
> its allocation to anybody must be constantly justified.
>
> Here's an analogy - not perfet, but it illustrates the point.
>
> Suppose there was a piece of land set aside by the govt. as a park. But very
> few people used it, because it was hard to reach, lacked certain facilities and
> there were closer, "better" parks. Would the govt. be wrong to change the

park
> into, say, an area for oil exploration? Particularly when there's a big
need
> for new oil sources?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1537. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 02:00:01 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <BmAza.272$cR2.40@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67687

Dang, who cares? I dropped my tickets around 1982. Had my extra, 1st phone, and 2nd telegraph. Decided to get back into it in 1993. Just took the tests. All of 'em. No study. You can do the same. Difference is that the max code test is now 5 WPM. Not so in 1993 (although multiple guess made it easy :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike" <bsd_mike@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:b2809f59.0305221836.4b14cfeb@posting.google.com...
> I took and passed the code technician license in 1988. I passed the
> code test back then too.
>
> Now I would like to get a license again. Is it true that I get credit
> for the code test? Do I get credit for anything else that I passed?
>
> I still have the paperwork from the original testing.
>
> -Mike

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1538. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 02:23:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baml2h$o4m$0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 67688

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3ECEABD7.2010507@ix.netcom.com...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
> > >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
> > >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
> > >spec I don't have to measure anything.
> > >
> > But how do you know if your rig is in
> > spec without doing some measurements?
>
> I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
> does what the manufacturer states in the
> documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
> I accept the responsibility.
>
> Do you really think any significant percentage
> of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
> made periodic measurements of their commercial
> equipment's signal? For many, an "on-the-air"
> QSO with another ham will give sufficient
> indication via the other ham's assessment of what
> s/he hears as to the quality of the signal.
>
> The above has been the norm for decades within amateur radio
> with no ill effects or otherwise wholesale indication that
> individual rigs are not performing within part 97
> rules.

And that, Bill is the reason I've been protesting the channelization of the new 60 meter allocation. It sidesteps a hundred years of amateur practice and substitutes commercial criteria.

1539. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 02:24:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030523222438.04554.00000134@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67689

In article <bamfk9$57e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>In 1961 I passed the General. At that time it gave me ALL HF PRIVLIDGES.

In 1968 I passed the Advanced. At that time it gave me all privileges, too.

>In 1968 I was told I had to upgrade to "EXTRA" to get the same privlidges.

Same here. After just a few weeks with all privs, I lost 'em. And I had to wait
almost two years to even try the Extra test.

>That was not right and as far as I'm concerned is the main problems with
>Amateur Radio today. A class system has been imposed.

There's always been some sort of class system. Between 1953 and 1968, it was
Novices, Techs, and everybody else.
>
But your point is well taken. IL was FCC's idea, and they were bent on imposing
it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1540. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 02:36:59 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bamlsbrah0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 67690

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> In 1961 I passed the General. At that time it gave me ALL HF PRIVLIDGES.
> In 1968 I was told I had to upgrade to "EXTRA" to get the same privlidges.
> That was not right and as far as I'm concerned is the main problems with
> Amateur Radio today. A class system has been imposed.

My General/Conditional went back to '57. So when I went in to get back the spectrum we lost due to incentive licensing, I had to take every test except the Novice since Conditional licenses carried no credit for advancement. I saw no problem with it other than the 260-miles-each-way drive to the FCC office that made an overnight stay necessary.

But it gives you something to gripe about! :-)

1541. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 02:48:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ECEDDAF.3010208@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67691

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>as a person who plays both
>>hockey and participates in field day, I can tell you that I am more
>>physically whipped after field day than after a game of hockey.

at which point you decided to hurl a major insult at me......

> You must not have put much effort into your hockey game. I was on a hockey team
> in school. I can tell you that a hockey game is more tiring than field day
> weekend. Burns more calories too.

I sweat off ten pounds of water in a typical game. So don't go telling me that I don't put much effort into my hockey. As the captain of my team, I can have guests play on occasion. Since you have hockey experience, I'm inviting you to stop in and play a game with us. Then you can decide if you think I'm dogging it. What position d'ya like?

On field day weekend, I participate in raising two large tents, three portable towers, a couple masts, some 80 meter dipoles, then move and set up tables and rigs. Then I catch a couple hours sleep, and work the next day with the GOTA station. Then after the newbies head home, I man an overnight station. Around 7 a.m. or so, I catch two more hours sleep, and then do GOTA again until the end of FD. After that, I help tear down all the above mentioned stuff, and put them back into storage. Work hard, play hard.

The caloric output is immense.

- Mike -

1542. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 02:49:14 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bammja$u1s$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 67692

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 24 May 2003 00:24:35 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes - just like
> >before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.
>
> "What goes around comes around"......
>
>

Can we then assume that by April 2016 (1951-1968 = 16 years)
that FCC will have by then realized the error of their predecessors' ways, and
have by then reinstated all six licenses classes, with a 20wpm code test for
Extra? :-)

1543. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 03:02:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bamnh1$v67$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67693

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:baml2h$o4m$0@208.206.142.104...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3ECEABD7.2010507@ix.netcom.com...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
> > > >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
> > > >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
> > > >spec I don't have to measure anything.
> > > >
> > > But how do you know if your rig is in
> > > spec without doing some measurements?
> >
> > I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
> > does what the manufacturer states in the
> > documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
> > I accept the responsibility.
> >
> > Do you really think any significant percentage
> > of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
> > made periodic measurements of their commercial
> > equipment's signal? For many, an "on-the-air"
> > QSO with another ham will give sufficient
> > indication via the other ham's assessment of what
> > s/he hears as to the quality of the signal.
> >
> > The above has been the norm for decades within amateur radio
> > with no ill effects or otherwise wholesale indication that
> > individual rigs are not performing within part 97
> > rules.
>
> And that, Bill is the reason I've been protesting the channelization of
> the new 60 meter allocation. It sidesteps a hundred years of amateur
> practice and substitutes commercial criteria.

I have no problem with channelized frequency assignments for
this 60m "special purpose" set of amateur assignments. In fact,
if done properly to avoid the obvious uncertainty as to what one's
sup. carrier setting should be, the channelized 60m makes much
```

sense over a "band" where internal agreements would then be needed as to what channel/frequency should be used for any specific emergency.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1544. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 03:13:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bamo5ufsi1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67694

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030523202433.15427.00000233@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <bahgaprpj1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Neither novice nor advanced will disappear in the next 10 years as many
have
> >actually been renewed and 100s more are renewed every month giving those
> >renewals another 10 years of existence
>
> DOH!
>
> Of course!
>
> >...unless they all suddenly upgrade.
> >
> Or the rules change.

The thing I still don't understand is why the vast amount of Advanced hams
didn't
take the opportunity to pass the old Extra written and then just wait for
the
April implementation date of the R&O. The pre-implementation Extra
test was, on the whole, pretty lame. To move up today, the Advanced
needs to "study" the entire scope of material found on the old Advanced
and Extra.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1545. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 03:48:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd8lyp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67695

On 24 May 2003 02:49:14 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>Can we then assume that by April 2016 (1951-1968 = 16 years)
>that FCC will have by then realized the error of their
>predecessors' ways, and have by then reinstated all six licenses
>classes, with a 20wpm code test for Extra? :-)

You are assuming two things: (1) that there will be an amateur
radio service still in existence, and (2) that the government
will not have privatized the whole shebang to RCA which will
have risen from the ashes like the foo-bird.

I know better than to predict what the FCC will do tomorrow,
let alone 16 years from now.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1546. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 03:48:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd8fso.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67696

On 24 May 2003 02:36:59 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> My General/Conditional went back to '57. So when I went in to
> get back the spectrum we lost due to incentive licensing, I had
> to take every test except the Novice since Conditional licenses
> carried no credit for advancement. I saw no problem with it other
> than the 260-miles-each-way drive to the FCC office that made an
> overnight stay necessary.

It reinforced the concept that you had to go to the government,
on its oewn terms, not to some ham club, to get permission to
put a radio transmitter on the air.

> But it gives you something to gripe about! :-)

That too... <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1547. Re: 3865 kHz Nightly Drunk-A-Thon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 03:50:06 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@xrayzuluanon.com>
Message-ID: <bamq5o$73a$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67697
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rev. Froot-Loop" <snotnosekids@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ececc67@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Anon" <Anon@xrayzuluanon.com> wrote in message
> news:bam54a$a7i$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Hey, I'm glad I read about 3865 kHz on k1tp's web page.
>
> What is the URL for K1TP's page?
> I have heard it mentoned several times
> but cannot find it.
>
>

http://members.aol.com/jcunham

1548. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 05:05:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bamuiigsr0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 67698

```
Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:baml2h$o4m$0@208.206.142.104...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3ECEABD7.2010507@ix.netcom.com...
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
> > > > >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
> > > > >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
> > > > >spec I don't have to measure anything.
> > > > >
> > > > But how do you know if your rig is in
> > > > spec without doing some measurements?
> > >
> > > I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
> > > does what the manufacturer states in the
> > > documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
> > > I accept the responsibility.
> > >
> > > Do you really think any significant percentage
> > > of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
> > > made periodic measurements of their commercial
> > > equipment's signal? For many, an "on-the-air"
> > > QSO with another ham will give sufficient
> > > indication via the other ham's assessment of what
> > > s/he hears as to the quality of the signal.
> > >
> > > The above has been the norm for decades within amateur radio
> > > with no ill effects or otherwise wholesale indication that
> > > individual rigs are not performing within part 97
> > > rules.
> >
> > And that, Bill is the reason I've been protesting the channelization of
> > the new 60 meter allocation. It sidesteps a hundred years of amateur
> > practice and substitutes commercial criteria.
>
> I have no problem with channelized frequency assignments for
> this 60m "special purpose" set of amateur assignments. In fact,
```

> if done properly to avoid the obvious uncertainty as to what one's
> sup. carrier setting should be, the channelized 60m makes much
> sense over a "band" where internal agreements would then be
> needed as to what channel/frequency should be used for any
> specific emergency.

I agree, for emergency communications it is well suited. And the 5 discrete frequencies are not all that useful for much more than that. We got the bare minimum requested-a 5mhz allocation to use for emergency comms when propagation is unusable on 3 and 7 mhz. But the "center frequency" spec and USB only are a bit out of range for ham radio, tho it's understandable since the Feds insist on full control .

Seems likely that all this concern with holding onto all possible spectum for homeland security use will fade with time as needs become clear
.
So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have been raving about? The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum bulletproof and interference immune?

1549. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 05:44:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <hFDza.1095$ng.11@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67699

Dang! I hope you aren't going to drive on the left side of the road since
the government (the states) decided you should drive on the right! :)

If so, I hope you meet an 18-wheeler.
:D)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA - think about it

"Anon" <Anon@xrayzuluanon.com> wrote in message
news:bam0kb$qk6$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjfpa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On 23 May 2003 09:41:14 -0700, N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC.
> >
> > Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
> > matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
> > all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
> > think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
> > drives them.
> >
> > >Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely
> > >different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks
> > >might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying
> > >something else after you place your order.
> >
> > Not in the least, and thank goodness that the Commish'
> > occasionally realizes that what the petitioner proposed was bad
> > policy and should be changed. We have had a bunch of those in
> > the ARS over the years.
> >
> > Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
> > pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
> > the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
> > and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
> > the action causes personal harm. There have been several station
> > licensing cases (one that I am intimately familiar with) that have
> > kicked around between the FCC and the courts for over 30 years.
> >
> > >Thoughts, anyone?
> >
> > As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until

> > it's over and even then it may not be over.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> >
>
> Come on now, quit denying it. You ARE an apologist for
> the FCC! Right?
>
> You liberal big government types just don't get it , do you?
>
> "Liberals are at their funniest when they are out of power"
> ----Rush Limbaugh
>
> anon
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1550. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 05:46:56 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <kHDza.651$MT3.64@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67700

Geeze, Dan ... are you older than I am? I got my novice in 1962 and passed
the extra in 1966. Good grief!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bamfk9$57e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030523202435.15427.00000236@mb-m18.aol.com...
> > In article <bam0krvdv1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >Just what happened back in 1968 when the FCC, in cahoots with the ARRL
> > >shoved Incentive Licensing down our throats.
> > >
> > I don't see how the ARRL was in cahoots with FCC, Dan. The League and
> others
> > actually got the FCC to tone down some of the harsher aspects of IL,
like
> > demoting all Advanceds to Generals, as was proposed by FCC. And the
> original
> > ARRL proposal (1963) was very simple.
> >
> > And the story really begins about 1949, when FCC started talking about
> > restructuring the old ABC system. That resulted in a system where hams
who
> did
> > not have an Advanced by the end of 1952 would have needed an Extra to
> operate
> > 'phone on the HF ham bands below 25 MHz. (160 is MF, not HF).
> >
> > But then FCC did a complete about-face and opened up all privileges to
all
> hams
> > except Techs and Novices.
> >
> > So the whole IL mess of the '60s was actually a rethinking of that
> last-minute
> > end-of-1952 decision. btw, the whole subband-by-license-class thing did
> not
> > come from either FCC or ARRL.
> >
> > Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes - just

> like
> > before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
>
> In 1961 I passed the General. At that time it gave me ALL HF PRIVLIDGES.
> In 1968 I was told I had to upgrade to "EXTRA" to get the same privlidges.
> That was not right and as far as I'm concerned is the main problems with
> Amateur Radio today. A class system has been imposed.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1551. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 05:52:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305232152.5c6d98ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ba0fb2dul1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>...
> This is from ARRL bulletin just received. (ARLB035)
>
> Dan/W4NTI

And here's the follow-on info in the ARRL Letter

- - - - - - - - -

The NTIA says that hams planning to operate on 60 meters "must assure that their signal is transmitted on the channel center frequency." In general, the NTIA has advised, users should set their carrier frequency 1.5 kHz lower than the channel center frequency. According to the NTIA:

Channel Center Amateur Tuning Frequency
5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
5405 kHz (common US/UK) 5403.5 kHz

ARRL Technical Relations Manager Paul Rinaldo, W4RI, says the assignment of these channels implies that amateurs now must adhere to certain frequency tolerances for their use. While the international Radio Regulations don't list these for the Amateur Service, he notes, they do stipulate tolerances on the order of 20 to 50 Hz for other services.

"We haven't been told anything specific about frequency tolerances for these channels but would probably annoy federal regulators if we strayed any more than 50 Hz from the assigned carrier frequencies," Rinaldo cautioned.

Keeping one's audio within the 2.8-kHz wide channel to comply with the 2K8J3E emission specification is another important issue. ARRL Laboratory Manager Ed Hare, W1RFI, believes prudence calls for not having baseband audio below 200 Hz nor greater than 2800 Hz--for a total bandwidth of 2.6 kHz. "That will probably keep us out of trouble," he said. Noting that the high-frequency response "can vary a lot from radio to radio," however, Hare recommended that amateurs play it conservatively.

Additionally, the FCC has restricted operation to USB only, with a maximum effective radiated power (ERP) of 50 W. The USB-only requirement stemmed from NTIA interoperability concerns. The NTIA wanted to make sure that federal users could copy and, if necessary, identify any amateur station using one of the 60-meter channels. As a result, the 60-meter frequencies

will become the only ones available to the general amateur community that do not permit CW operation.

For the sake of this particular grant, the FCC said it would consider a half-wave dipole to have a gain of 0 dBd. In its letter to the FCC, the NTIA stipulated that radiated power should not exceed "the equivalent of 50 W PEP transmitter output power into an antenna with a gain of 0 dBd."

"Although this is less spectrum than the American Radio Relay League petition requested, this is the best we can do pending a definition of Homeland Security HF requirements," concluded Fredrick R. Wentland in the NTIA's letter to the FCC's OET.

Sumner has predicted that, over time, amateurs can and will "develop a record of disciplined, responsible use of the five channels in the public interest that will justify another look at these rather severe initial restrictions."

Just when amateurs will get their first crack at 60 meters is not yet clear. The changes to Part 97 go into effect 30 days after publication of the Report and Order (R&O) in The Federal Register, which has not yet happened. Publication could take anywhere from a few weeks to a few months. ARRL will announce a specific date as soon as it's known.

The FCC Report and Order in ET Docket 02-98 is available on the FCC's Web site <http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-105A1.doc>.

- - - - - - -

w3rv

1552. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 05:59:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524015925.15886.00000345@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67802

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 5/23/2003 7:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030523202432.15427.00000231@mb-m18.aol.com>

>I recall that when I started work in the design office of Undisclosed
>Corporation, (1977)...(SNIP)

I can see a near-stroke-ridden old man in SoCal stomping hs feet,
demanding to know WHO it is!

Keep it up, Jim!

Steve, K4CAP

1553. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 06:04:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524020459.15886.00000346@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67803

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 5/23/2003 6:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bambmh$lb8$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>

>I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
>does what the manufacturer states in the
>documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
>I accept the responsibility.

This is like having unprotected sex with a casual partner, Bill. Maybe
you WON'T have a problem...but then again...

>Do you really think any significant percentage
>of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
>made periodic measurements of their commercial
>equipment's signal?

I do. So there's your percentage of 1/670,000 ! ! !

73

Steve, K4CAP

1554. Re: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 06:09:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524020918.15886.00000347@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67804

Subject: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003
From: radionews@aol.com (Radionews)
Date: 5/24/2003 12:14 AM Central Daylight Time
Message-id: <20030524011447.06840.00000201@mb-m19.aol.com>

>Subject: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003
>From: radionews@aol.com (Radionews)
>Date: 5/24/2003 12:15 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524011524.06840.00000202@mb-m19.aol.com>

No doubt Bill posted this twice just to get Dieter's goat!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1555. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 08:30:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305240030.6c1729b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67805

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030523202434.15427.00000234@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0305230646.18d6c0a1@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

>> >Oh,
> >> well -- it's not like us hams are actually USING this spectrum anyway, is
> >> it? How long will it be before they're looking at our 1.2 GHz specturm?
> >> Or 902 MHz? Or 440 MHz? Anyone feel the walls closing in?
> > >
> > >There's nothing new about any of it Larry. As Jim points out the
> > >general practice goes back to the days when hams got tossed into the
> > >"useless space" above 200 meters for the convenience of the
> > >commercials. The ham bands have always served as "spectrum preserves"
> > >for commercial and government users. i.e., they're "easy pickin's"
> > >when new technologies come along like the current need to find a home
> > >for what is being billed as the huge incoming wave of wideband Part 15
> > >devices.
> >
> > 'zactly. btw, most of our microwave allocations date from 1946, with various
> > modifications over the years. Those bands aren't exactly new - there were 10
> > gig radar systems in WW2.

But there weren't any hams during WW2. Heh.

I think it's fair to state that given a lack of commercial interest
above some arbitrary high freq limit the freqs above that limit
historically got designated "ham and experimental" simply to fill in
the high end of the allocation charts. Bureuacrats can't deal with
open-ended charts.

> > >It's obvious as hell that the public interest will be far better
> > >served by using that 5Ghz space for Part 15 ops vs. "saving it" for
> > >ham purposes. WHAT ham purposes?? A few guys with horns on camera
> > >tripods shooting at each other from mountaintops? 'Snot even a
> > >discussion.
> >
> > There ARE ham uses for the microwaves, like control links, satellites and even
> > EME. But IMHO, we'd be better off with a few MHz of exclusive amateur spectrum
> > than many MHz of shared space.

Right now we have 59 Mhz available from 222 thru 928 Mhz alone and
another 60 Mhz available just above in the 1240-1300 band. 89 frigging
Mhz! Three times as much space as DC to 30Mhz. Izzat enough "elbow
room" for ham ops??

Most of it is shared however but mostly with government stations which apparently are not much of a problem in either direction. But there probably would be a big problem if Part 15 widgets landed in those spaces so you know the gummint will be loathe to share their nav and space comms freqs with the wireless modem mobs. In this sense our sharing status in those bands protects us from the commercials. Thankew Big Brother.

So I dunno if we'd wind up better off trading what we now have for less but 100% exclusive space or not.

> >And yeah, the rest of the ham centimeter and millimeter bands are
> >under the same gun and we're going to lose even more space as time
> >goes by. Down the road when we find we're really in a pinch for
> >playpen space we'll be forced to wise up and implement better
> >technolgies ourselves. The current 1960's era spectrum-eating repeater
> >crap is gonna go. As an example.
>
> Which brings up another point: The proliferation of bands has its downside -
> dilution of the user base. There are only so many hams interested in any one
> band, and the more bands there are, the more fragmented things become.

Nobody much cares about 222-225 except for some utility ops like repeater links. The few repeaters around here in the band are normally dead 99.999% of the time even in this obscenly high population density area.

440 cooks (everything being relative) around here but not to the extent that a good case could be made to justify the need for the 30 Mhz worth of space we have in this band.

I don't know anynody or know of anybody around here who actually operate on 902-928 or 1240-1300. I'm utterly clueless about any ham activity in the rest of the microwave ham bands beyond what I read here and there, mostly in QST.

I haven't seen any "proliferation" effect so far and the equipment and allocations have been available for eons. I suspect that the only reason the equipment is available is because it is used in Japan in enough volume to justify production.

In general we been clumping on two for a half century and I for one don't see any new forces in play which would disperse us into the higher bands.

> >The League will wave the flag and put up the usual cerimonial good
> >fight as usual. Snoozer.
>
> Maybe not. If the end result is some exclusive-amateur spectrum rather than
> massive sharing with other users.

That might make some sense but I can't imagine the League telling the FCC "Look, if you give us exclusive use of (whatever lesser space) we'll cheerfully give up our claims to (whatever the League proposes

the tradeoffs should be). It ain't in the ARRL culture, it just ain't, they couldn't say it, they'd choke on it. They don't act, the FCC acts then the League coils up in a defensive position and throws Imlay at the FCC.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1556. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 11:52:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF5D94.1F826D7F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67806

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >Why do you insist on limiting the definition of contest to sports??
>
> >A contest is simply people trying to
> >be better than the other people in the contest. It is not and never has
> >been limited to sports.
>
> Thats not the point. My point was in Ham radio, a contest is limited to a
> specific contact chasing game. Other types of competitions are possible, but
> are not called contests in Ham radio.
>
> Contesting is playing the contact chasing game, not any other competition.
>
> The word contest has been defined to one specific activity, for Ham radio.

...and we know from experience that you have difficulty with quite a
number of existing definitions.

Dave K8MN

1557. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 11:55:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF5E24.973771C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67807

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Phil Kane"
>
> >In many foreign countries, amateur radio contesting is referred
> > to as "radiosport".
>
> Contesting is not a sport, like hockey, etc.

No, it is a sport like with transceivers and antennas.

> >Vippy, it seems, communicates in a variety of English which is
> > foreign to us American-speakers
>
> Please, my name is not "Vippy".

We'd have never known what you name is if Steve hadn't outted you.
You certainly never volunteered it.

Dave K8MN

1558. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 11:56:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF5E87.93137668@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67808

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From Mike KB3EIA
>
> >Well, you've vipniated on contesting for us now. But what exactly would
> >YOU call it?
>
> Point chasing is one possiblity. A word that indicates what it is would be
> suitable.

Why does the situation keep cropping up where you feel that amateur
radio worldwide should changes thedefinitions of terms to suit you?
Wouldn't it be simpler for you to learn a few definitions?

Dave K8MN

1559. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 12:07:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <GfJza.3094$4G.1277451@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67811
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305232158530.3124@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Thu, 22 May 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > >ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
> > > >folks here...so what willit be?
> > >
> > > 1.5 puts a 3000 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> > > and a 200 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
>
> Actually, no it doesn't. The center of that range is 1600Hz, so one needs
to
> be 1.6kHz down to make that centered.
>
> Adjusting by 1.5Khz means that 3kHz will be 1.5kHz above, but 200Hz will
only
> be 1.3kHz below. That's not symmetrical and therefore not centered.
>
> > > 1.4 puts a 2800 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> > > and a 0 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
>
> That one is at least centered.

The ARRL has now posted the recommended settings on their web site.

www.arrl.org

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1560. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 12:07:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF6114.90862208@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67812

Vshah101 wrote:

> Back when I was an EE, I went to one club's repeater site.
>
> At their club meeting, I told of my interest in electronics. They seemed like
> there could be some activities. I contacted some people. Somehow, never
> materialized. Something always came up.

Maybe someone thought your record was stuck and decided that you made
watching paint dry seem exciting.

> Yet, Hams will take a day off and show up on Friday for a Hamfest. It seems
> like its really a matter of priorities.

Let's see....On one hand, an evening of circuit designing with Vipul.
On the other--a hamfest. Yep, priorities work for me.

> Generally Hams are nice people, but when I asked about the repeater, the person
> was snobby, and said they had someone for that and that they didn't need my
> input.

...or the club could have a repeater committee which handles such things
and the person you asked was simply being honest with you.

> I bet if I said I wanted to learn CW, they would enthustically help me do that.

Maybe it isn't too late to take them up on it.

> Please realize that I was courteous, both at the meeting and at the repeater
> site when I made my requests.

Maybe you believed you were being courteous. Maybe some folks there
thought you were being pushy.

> --------
>
> At my local club, there was an EE there. He usually does not attend the
> meetings. Anyway I asked him if I could work with him on some project. His
> response was snobby also.

It had to be rough, being rejected by radio amateurs AND EE's.

> --------
>
> It seems the problem is that most Hams aren't interested and those that do
> handle these aspects are too snobby to include others.

Aren't interested in what? They aren't interested in what YOU want them
to be interested in? The self-centered bastards!

> Ham radio is driving
> away those that can contribute and have technical interests and > capabilities in favor
of other activites.

Maybe you have something to offer, Vipul, though God knows I haven't
seen it here. If I couldn't drive you away, I'd be happy to pay for
your ticket.

Dave K8MN

1561. Re: Credit for test elements from expired license?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 12:10:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF61B3.BCF79E6F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67809

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >From: Robert Casey wa2ise
>
> >IIRC yes for the 5 wpm code test. However, no credit for having
> >passed a faster code test.
>
> That does not seem fair to those that made the effort to learn code.
>
> >Seems some FCC bureaucrat didn't
> >understand that having passed a 13 or 20 wpm code test would
> >supersede a 5 wpm test. "Okay, you did 13, but can you do 5?"
>
> Just because you can do 13wpm does NOT necessarily mean you can do 5 wpm. There
> is a condition where one can encode at a higher speed, but not at a lower
> speed. I have had that condition, on occasion.

You were already pasted on this one in a previous incarnation. If
you've had the condition, you learned morse code on the sly and didn't
bother to tell us. You'll be the first to have this particular
"condition" where you can copy 13 wpm and not 5 wpm.

Maybe you need to work on new trolling materials.

Dave K8MN

1562. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 12:16:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF6277.423443F5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67810

Len Over 21 wrote:

> You stay down on HF as a "real ham" and work your DX with CW.

...while you operate on...hmmm, uhhhh....Almost forgot. You aren't
involved at all.

Let me bounce your quote of you:
"Why do you care? You aren't in that spectrum area."

Dave K8MN

1563. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 12:19:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF634C.1CC00C74@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67813

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

> >Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.
>
> TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
> of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?
> If that is in violation of FCC regulations you are responsible.
> No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
> the licensee are responsible.

If you get a license, you can be responsible too.

> Now if you feel that you "don't have to" make such
> measurements, don't. You don't have to operate on those
> five 60m frequencies, either. US Hams didn't have them before
> 14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away from all of
> you.

Tell us again--how'd you get involved?

> Why are there so many argumentative hams demanding things
> in here? :-)

Why are there non-hams trying to play traffic cop?

Dave K8MN

1564. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 12:25:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524082518.20212.00000176@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67814

In article <20030524015925.15886.00000345@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 24 May 2003 05:59:25 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 5/23/2003 7:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030523202432.15427.00000231@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>>I recall that when I started work in the design office of Undisclosed
>>Corporation, (1977)...(SNIP)
>
> I can see a near-stroke-ridden old man in SoCal stomping hs feet,
>demanding to know WHO it is!
>
Not My Problem, Steve.

The point of this whole economic discussion comes down to things like this:

Is a family with, say, a $50,000 annual income today better off financially than one with a $5,000 annual income 40-50 years ago?

If not, how much is needed to reach parity with the past?

How many and what type of jobs are needed to reach that level?

Ham rigs are inexpensive but the houses to put them in aren't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1565. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 12:30:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ECF65C4.ADAF92F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67815

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ECD78E4.6A466371@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
>
> > >
> > > Plus if somebody wants to run rigs from those days, they still can, in most
> > > cases. An S-line or 4-line will still do a good job.
> >
> > Either can do much more than a good job. Receiver specs easily beat
> > most of the lower end offerings from Japan.
>
> Nah. I have two little "low end" HF rice boxes, a TS-50 and an FT-847.
> I've compared the test results of both with the published test results
> of the long-since deified meatball 75S-3B. This might come as a jolt
> but with reference to important characteristics like front-end
> performance the two rice boxes compare very favorably with the 75S3-B.
> To the point of being peers in this respect. All three rcvrs have 110
> dB. BDRs.

Ah yes, but what of the third order intercept points? What about the
noise floor? What happens if you activate the noise blanker? Arno
OH7XM (see below) brought his TS-50 to Botswana. You should have seen
the thing fold up when hooked to a 2 element 40m beam. It sounded
pretty good when a dipole was connected.

The 200 Hz filter in the 75S-3B is probably the worst filter
> I've ever used. Tried to use. The meatball only tunes 200 Khz segemnts
> and it goes downhill from there. Donkey rcvr to the core by today's
> reckonings.
>
> . . . has to do with the proclivity we all have for looking behind us
> with the rose-colored glasses. Until the lab reports pee on the parade
> and impose the reality checks.

OH7XM is a fellow who does factory repair of Icom, Yaesu and Kenwood
equipment in Finland. In '97 he came to my place with a calibrated test
oscillator to run some comparative measurements on my Omni VI and his
TS-870 along with OH2MM's FT-1000MP. The Omni VI held its own but did
show some filter leakage. For grins, Arno hooked the oscillator to my
KWM-2A. It blew the other rigs away. Yes, you had to tune it up. Yes,
it had those 200 KHz segments and yes, it had a tighter receiver.

Of course when you mention the C-Line, I assume that the words "Sherwood modified" preceed it. That stuff is *still* competitive.

Dave K8MN

1566. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 13:15:37 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524091537.06770.00000184@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67816

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> At their club meeting, I told of my interest in electronics. They seemed
>like
>> there could be some activities. I contacted some people. Somehow, never
>> materialized. Something always came up.
>
>Maybe someone thought your record was stuck and decided that you made
>watching paint dry seem exciting.

No, thats not what happened. The person gave me his email. I was courteous and
didn't hear back from him. Yet somehow certain things get done. I guess you
must be in the Ham "click" to be involved in these things. Also, another person
said he will contact me if something else interesting comes up. I have not
heard from him again. That was a while ago.

>> Yet, Hams will take a day off and show up on Friday for a Hamfest. It seems
>> like its really a matter of priorities.
>
>Let's see....On one hand, an evening of circuit designing with Vipul.
>On the other--a hamfest. Yep, priorities work for me.

For one thing, I never asked anyone to take a day off from work.

Take a day off for a Hamfest to go and buy stuff, when that stuff is available
on Saturday also? Thats sounds intelligent. Oh, and Hamfests are really fun
too.

>> Generally Hams are nice people, but when I asked about the repeater, the
>person
>> was snobby, and said they had someone for that and that they didn't need my
>> input.
>
>...or the club could have a repeater committee which handles such things
>and the person you asked was simply being honest with you.

Actually, that could be the club's activities instead. So what if someone is
already handling it? I believed, with thier different facilities, this club
would be different. But, it was not.

>Maybe you believed you were being courteous. Maybe some folks there
>thought you were being pushy.

No, thats not what happened.

>It had to be rough, being rejected by radio amateurs AND EE's.

At least that EE was smart enough not to attend the meetings, unlike myself (now former EE). He probably didn't know I was an EE and assumed I was a typical Ham like everyone else at the meeting. In that case, he was making an assumption that Hams are generally non technical. In that case, he was right to be snobby.

Also, I was offered a project from one Prof of the classes I took, so I think it has more to do with Ham radio than EEs. Obviously, I didn't take that offer, or I could still be considered an EE.

>> It seems the problem is that most Hams aren't interested and those that do
>> handle these aspects are too snobby to include others.
>
>Aren't interested in what? They aren't interested in what YOU want them
>to be interested in? The self-centered bastards!

Yes, its frustrating. Ham radio is a culture. Hams like to only do certain aspects of the hobby.

Also, at the gathering I joined a few weeks ago, I wanted to take a break, but the host urged me to operate radios and make contacts.

1567. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 13:29:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524092928.06770.00000185@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67817

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>We'd have never known what you name is if Steve hadn't outted you.
>You certainly never volunteered it.

I never volunteered my callsign. But then, when I asked an antenna lab person what his callsign was and he wouldn't give it to me.

(He said its not "right". I didn't know what he was talking about. It was an ungraded lab tour.)

And I didn't keep my name hidden.

>.and we know from experience that you have difficulty with quite a
>number of existing definitions.

Like how many? The word contest, "Ham" radio vs amateur radio, (and Title Engineer) are the only definitions I challenged(contested).

1568. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 15:05:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bao1m4fqb1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> The ARRL has now posted the recommended settings on their web site.
>
> www.arrl.org
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Good....now we can discuss something else besides dial setting and
incompetent operators.

Dan/W4NTI

1569. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 15:18:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bao2ev$i4j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67819

Well Jim I dont know if Im older, I'll be 57 in July.
As stated got my Novice in summer of 61, upgraded to General 3 months
later.

By the time I got back from the military in 1968 the whole ham radio world
had changed. I didn't bother upgrading till the mid 70s because I was back
in the military and the General was all I needed to operate in Germany.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:kHDza.651$MT3.64@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> Geeze, Dan ... are you older than I am? I got my novice in 1962 and
passed
> the extra in 1966. Good grief!
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bamfk9$57e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030523202435.15427.00000236@mb-m18.aol.com...
> > > In article <bam0krvdv1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >Just what happened back in 1968 when the FCC, in cahoots with the
ARRL
> > > >shoved Incentive Licensing down our throats.
> > >
> > > I don't see how the ARRL was in cahoots with FCC, Dan. The League and
> > others
> > > actually got the FCC to tone down some of the harsher aspects of IL,
> like
> > > demoting all Advanceds to Generals, as was proposed by FCC. And the
> > original
> > > ARRL proposal (1963) was very simple.
> > >
> > > And the story really begins about 1949, when FCC started talking about
> > > restructuring the old ABC system. That resulted in a system where hams
> who
> > did
> > > not have an Advanced by the end of 1952 would have needed an Extra to

> > operate
> > > 'phone on the HF ham bands below 25 MHz. (160 is MF, not HF).
> > >
> > > But then FCC did a complete about-face and opened up all privileges to
> all
> > hams
> > > except Techs and Novices.
> > >
> > > So the whole IL mess of the '60s was actually a rethinking of that
> > last-minute
> > > end-of-1952 decision. btw, the whole subband-by-license-class thing
did
> > not
> > > come from either FCC or ARRL.
> > >
> > > Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes - just
> > like
> > > before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >
> >
> > In 1961 I passed the General. At that time it gave me ALL HF
PRIVLIDGES.
> > In 1968 I was told I had to upgrade to "EXTRA" to get the same
privlidges.
> > That was not right and as far as I'm concerned is the main problems with
> > Amateur Radio today. A class system has been imposed.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03
>
>

1570. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 15:40:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524114023.03937.00000211@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 67820

Go to

www.mostannoyingwebpage.com

When they ask you about a subject to talk about (if you are not annoyed too much and got that far), chose Ham radio.

1571. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 16:24:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524122427.23745.00000184@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67821

In article <bao1m4fqb1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>> The ARRL has now posted the recommended settings on their web site.
>>
>> www.arrl.org
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>Good....now we can discuss something else besides dial setting and
>incompetent operators.
>
WELL SAID, Dan!!

(I still think it's a plot to wipe out LSB)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1572. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 18:15:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524141521.15462.00000208@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67822

In article <bam508$7g$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030523013238.16581.00000197@mb-m17.aol.com...
>> In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> >> In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>> >> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> >> >> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>> >> >> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
>> >> >> filters?
>> >> >
>> >> >You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
>> >> >that answer.
>> >>
>> >> You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
>> >> counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a
>> >> dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.
>> >>
>> >> That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.
>> >
>> >Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.
>>
>> TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
>> of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?
>
>What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
>to make any specific measurements. The rules require
>a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
>spec I don't have to measure anything.

The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"

Laying-on of hands is not sufficient.

If someone in a QSO says "your signal is good" that isn't
a qualifier on frequency or filter bandpass or much of
anything else. A "599" signal report is commonly heard
but it isn't really that good everywhere all the time, is it? :-)

In Subpart D of Part 97 (all paragraphs of 97.3nn) there is
nothing about "measurement" but there are a whole heap
of "shalls" on signal emission. Each one of those "shall"
statements applies to the individual licensee. The FCC
gives all licensees considerable latitude on HOW they do
their "shall" thing but the bottom line is that each licensee
SHALL be within technical standards.

>> No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
>> the licensee are responsible.
>
>Agreed. That does not, however, require any periodic or
>speciifc measurements to be made by me.

So...you have NO way of knowing if you are operating
responsibly as to technical characteristics of your RF
emissions?

Not acceptible in a technical activity, Bill. The law is the
law and Phil just recently reminded everyone that "ignorance
is not an excuse."

Note: I left out a word in quoting Phil deliberately. If you have
no referencible data on your RF emissions, then you are
ignorant of the technical characteristics of your RF emissions.
That can be argued in a court as being synonymous with
"ignorance of the law." In the amateur radio situation, part of
the law applying to licensees IS technical.

>> Now if you feel that you "don't have to" make such
>> measurements, don't.
>
>I don't, nor do most hams with no ill effect.

Rhetorical statement, Bill. "Most hams" would refer to at least
320 thousand (give or take). I don't think you or anyone else
in here "know" that many people. :-)

FCC 03-105 give US amateurs five micro-bands, each with less
than 3 KHz bandwidth. That is tight with a capital T. In order to
operate there legally, it would take some measurements of
several parts of an amateur transmitter to insure compliance
with the law.

>> You don't have to operate on those
>> five 60m frequencies, either.
>
>Why should I not?

That's up to you. If you violate the law concerning 60m
operation for any reason, you can't claim any "ignorance"
as an excuse.

>> US Hams didn't have them before
>> 14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away from all of
>> you.
>
>If there's a point you're making on that statement,
>it eludes me.

Really? :-)

US radio amateurs had 9 bands below 30 MHz on 13 May 2003
with a total bandwidth of 2.75 MHz. FCC 03-105 added 14 KHz
to that total bandwidth, an increase of 0.5%.

Seems like there's a whole heap of bitching, moaning, whining,
ranting, shouting about that half-percent increase. :-)

>> Why are there so many argumentative hams demanding things
>> in here? :-)
>
>Who's demanding anything. Some of us believe that rules and regulations
>can be written with a level of clarity and in such a way as to avoid
>confusion. That is something any documentation writer should strive
>for.

Well then, just address your complaints to the FCC. You have
their address. Come to think of it, you were there at least once.
:-)

1573. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 18:47:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305241047.38a0221b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67823

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ECF65C4.ADAF92F6@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ECD78E4.6A466371@earthlink.net>...
> > > N2EY wrote:

> > of the long-since deified meatball 75S-3B. This might come as a jolt
> > but with reference to important characteristics like front-end
> > performance the two rice boxes compare very favorably with the 75S3-B.
> > To the point of being peers in this respect. All three rcvrs have 110
> > dB. BDRs.
>
> Ah yes, but what of the third order intercept points?

I'd have to go back out and find the numbers and they're not easy to
find for the Collins gear at this late date. If I have it right at 20
Khz spacing the Collins had an ~8-10 dB advantage over the rice boxes,
less than 10%.

> What about the
> noise floor?

No idea.

> What happens if you activate the noise blanker?

Noise gets clobbered by the TS-50 NB, it's a mobile rig. I don't have
enough mileage on the FT-847 yet to test it's NB but the reviews give
it a passing grade.

I'm not claiming that the TS50 at $550 and the FT-847 at $1200 are any
kinda "super radios", They're not, they're low-end
acceptable-performing rigs for casual, backup & portable ops. Which I
why I bought 'em. What I do claim however, which is my point is that
if I had the TS-50 in the '60s instead of the Drake & Collins gear I
had then I don't think I would have missed many if any contacts which
I made then as a result of TS-50 strong signal handling problems. The
jury is still out on the FT-847 but I'm not expecting miracles.

> Arno
> OH7XM (see below) brought his TS-50 to Botswana. You should have seen
> the thing fold up when hooked to a 2 element 40m beam. It sounded
> pretty good when a dipole was connected.

No surprise at all, the TS-50 seems to be particularly sensitive and
it's BDRs are only in the 110 dB range. I can jam the TS-50 front end

on 40 with a twist of a wrist. I almost always run it on the low bands
with the attenuator cranked in.

> The 200 Hz filter in the 75S-3B is probably the worst filter
> > I've ever used. Tried to use. The meatball only tunes 200 Khz segemnts
> > and it goes downhill from there. Donkey rcvr to the core by today's
> > reckonings.
> >
> > . . . has to do with the proclivity we all have for looking behind us
> > with the rose-colored glasses. Until the lab reports pee on the parade
> > and impose the reality checks.
>
> OH7XM is a fellow who does factory repair of Icom, Yaesu and Kenwood
> equipment in Finland. In '97 he came to my place with a calibrated test
> oscillator to run some comparative measurements on my Omni VI and his
> TS-870 along with OH2MM's FT-1000MP. The Omni VI held its own but did
> show some filter leakage. For grins, Arno hooked the oscillator to my
> KWM-2A. It blew the other rigs away.
> Yes, you had to tune it up. Yes,
> it had those 200 KHz segments and yes, it had a tighter receiver.

Whufff . . I wouldn't expect that, it's atypical. I hope ya still have
it.

>
> Of course when you mention the C-Line, I assume that the words "Sherwood
> modified" preceed it. That stuff is *still* competitive.

Depends on which of the progression of mods are incorporated. In the
extreme version there isn't a tube left in the signal-handling path.
Yeah, they're the ultimate 160/80/40 rcvrs but I can't get that
serious about a rcvr these days.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1574. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 18:53:39 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0305241053.4c915f82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67824

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjfpa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 23 May 2003 09:41:14 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC.
>
> Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
> matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
> all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
> think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
> drives them.

That's a mighty big blanket statement, Phil. Do you really believe
this applies to ALL who disagree with the FCC's way of "gettin' it
dun?"

> >Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely
> >different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks
> >might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying
> >something else after you place your order.
>
> Not in the least, and thank goodness that the Commish'
> occasionally realizes that what the petitioner proposed was bad
> policy and should be changed. We have had a bunch of those in
> the ARS over the years.

Agreed.

> Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
> pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
> the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
> and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
> the action causes personal harm.

This would be a good thing if the "commish's" legislative process were
more...well, more...American. (Checks & balances?)

> There have been several station
> licensing cases (one that I am intimately familiar with) that have
> kicked around between the FCC and the courts for over 30 years.

Is this something to be proud of?

> >Thoughts, anyone?
>
> As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
> it's over and even then it may not be over.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1575. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 18:58:12 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <baof7btuf1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67788

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote

> ...most techs I know out there are on 2 meters
> and STUCK...not by the class but by their own motivational level. I am
not
> saying that CW is the where with all but I see little in my ham experience
> to see that the Techs that I know are learning new aspects of the service
> ...wish I was wrong .....

Well, at least some non-zero percentage aren't upgrading because
they have zero interest in CW.

> > >
> > > it's irrelevant how grand it is, or how reliable it is, or
> > > > anything else. Heck, you'd probably get more licensees working this
> > > question
> > > > backwards. Let 'em get on HF and maybe _that'll_ give 'em the CW
bug.
> > > >
> > >
> > > With what Bob ?? ... SSB ...digital ...etc with out even the least
bit
> > of
> > > ......gee I hate this word ....profeciency with CW.
> >
> > Why not? Without the least bit of knowledge of CW, I've operated
> HF
> > teletype over 1KW, encrypted; cut tapes, caught the sked, did all the
> things
> > necessary as supervisor of radio room, including working other modes
over
> > the whole spectrum - VLF to UHF on the boat and VHF to SHF on shore
duty,
> AM
> > and FM phone, FSK, PSK, encrypted voice and teletype, you name it.
> Whenever
> > I went to learn anything about radio systems (operating anywhere in the
> > spectrum) nobody ever asked me if I knew CW, or implied that knowing it
> was
> > somehow beneficial to my ability to operate the equipment or run the
> shack,
> > nor is it (or was) a prerequisite for any of the tech schools I went to.
>
> Again how is this going to open the doors for CW ops if they don't know
the

> basics ....it is true that you have operated all these modes according to
> your posts but have you operated CW in the ham bands ????

I've never operated CW _anywhere_, I have no interest in it, no
desire to learn it, couldn't possibly care less about it. That's just me,
though.

> I give you my cudos on your accomplishments there Bob you are and have
been
> involved in radio as a profession. There is absolutely no doubt that you
> could blow me out of the water in radio related matters.

Oh, not necessarily! ;) My highest proficiency is (well, _was_)
probably in operating under adverse field conditions, more than
tech/engineering. Not to mention what I've forgotten over the
years...anyway, I'm more of an operational guy, myself. I looked at all the
electronic whiz-bang gadgets as tools to accomplish a task more than
anything else. (But the government gives ya a lovely set of toys, err,
tools, I'll give 'em that.)

> I however am in
> this service for a deversion from my profession. I hold a ticket ....big
> deal ...so do thousands of others. I wish you had a ham ticket as I am
> sure we would have a lot in commen to talk about.

My station identification is KG4ZXM, actually. The main reason I
decided to dabble more seriously, recently, is to do some sort of community
service - there's no ARES or RACES in my county, so I just might have start
it up myself. Of course, you won't find me operating any lower than 6
meters.....;)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/2003

1576. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 19:14:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524151452.02076.00000221@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67825

In article <bamo5ufsi1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >Neither novice nor advanced will disappear in the next 10 years as many
>> >have actually been renewed and 100s more are renewed every month
>> >giving those renewals another 10 years of existence
>>
>> DOH!
>>
>> Of course!
>>
>> >...unless they all suddenly upgrade.
>> >
>> Or the rules change.
>
>The thing I still don't understand is why the vast amount of Advanced hams
>didn't take the opportunity to pass the old Extra written and then just wait
for
>the April implementation date of the R&O.

Let's see - something like 15% of Advanceds have either let the license expire
or upgraded to Extra since May of 2000. Maybe 20% if we use AH0A data for
end-of-March 2000 as the reference point. Amazing.

>The pre-implementation Extra
>test was, on the whole, pretty lame.

I don't think it was that lame at all. YMMV

>To move up today, the Advanced
>needs to "study" the entire scope of material found on the old Advanced
>and Extra.

Not gonna go there, Bill!

But your observation still has lots to think about. If someone thought the old
Extra was easier, then the thing to do was take it before April 15, 2000, and
use the CSCE after that date. If someone the old Extra was harder, the thing to
do was take the new test soon after April 15 2000.

But it's been over three years.....

Some possibilities:

1) Lots of Advanceds don't care about getting an Extra
2) Lots of Advanceds are inactive (SK being the extreme case)
3) Lots of Advanceds haven't gotten the word yet.

Thoughts?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1577. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 19:39:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECFCA70.90206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67826

>
>
>>The pre-implementation Extra
>>test was, on the whole, pretty lame.
>>
>>
>
>I don't think it was that lame at all. YMMV
>
Back in Jan 2000, I took the old advanced and old extra elements.
IIRC I missed a total of 3 questions. Having a BSEE degree
helps some, also like any other reasonably competent student
I studied for these tests with the on line resources (question
pools). Then cashed in the CSCE's along with my pre '87
tech plus that April 15th and got my "extra lite" :-)
Did it partly to "lock in" my code credit, and getting HF
privs was nice too. Nowadays most of my operating is
on HF.

>
>
>
>>To move up today, the Advanced
>>needs to "study" the entire scope of material found on the old Advanced
>>and Extra.
>>
>>
>
>Not gonna go there, Bill!
>
>But your observation still has lots to think about. If someone thought the old
>Extra was easier, then the thing to do was take it before April 15, 2000, and
>use the CSCE after that date. If someone the old Extra was harder, the thing to
>do was take the new test soon after April 15 2000.
>
Nothing says you couldn't try the old extra test, and if you didn't pass
take
the newer test. Other than wasting a VE fee......

>
>But it's been over three years.....
>
>Some possibilities:
>
>1) Lots of Advanceds don't care about getting an Extra

>
okay

>2) Lots of Advanceds are inactive (SK being the extreme case)
>
likely

>3) Lots of Advanceds haven't gotten the word yet.
>
I doubt that unless they are completely inactive.....

1578. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 19:50:14 UTC
From: Spectrum <Spread@Spreadspectrumnuts.net>
Message-ID: <baoie7$dq0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67827

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0305241053.4c915f82@posting.google.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjfpa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 23 May 2003 09:41:14 -0700, N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC.
> >
> > Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
> > matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
> > all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
> > think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
> > drives them.
>
> That's a mighty big blanket statement, Phil. Do you really believe
> this applies to ALL who disagree with the FCC's way of "gettin' it
> dun?"
>
> > >Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely
> > >different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks
> > >might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying
> > >something else after you place your order.
> >
> > Not in the least, and thank goodness that the Commish'
> > occasionally realizes that what the petitioner proposed was bad
> > policy and should be changed. We have had a bunch of those in
> > the ARS over the years.
>
> Agreed.
>
> > Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
> > pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
> > the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
> > and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
> > the action causes personal harm.
>
> This would be a good thing if the "commish's" legislative process were
> more...well, more...American. (Checks & balances?)
>
> > There have been several station
> > licensing cases (one that I am intimately familiar with) that have
> > kicked around between the FCC and the courts for over 30 years.
>
> Is this something to be proud of?

>
> > >Thoughts, anyone?
> >
> > As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
> > it's over and even then it may not be over.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Phil was a federal bureaucrat for many years, so it is not surprising that he is an apologist for the FCC. And even less surprising that his politics gravitate to a very liberal big government view of things. Lets put it this way, I bet a dollar that Phil is no fan of Rush Limbaugh.

Spectrum

1579. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 19:51:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ECFCD46.7030402@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67828
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
>
>Keeping one's audio within the 2.8-kHz wide channel to comply with the
>2K8J3E emission specification is another important issue. ARRL Laboratory
>Manager Ed Hare, W1RFI, believes prudence calls for not having baseband
>audio below 200 Hz nor greater than 2800 Hz--for a total bandwidth of 2.6
>kHz. "That will probably keep us out of trouble," he said. Noting that the
>high-frequency response "can vary a lot from radio to radio," however,
>Hare recommended that amateurs play it conservatively.
>
>
>
Possible crude test (to identify gross trouble only): Find a ham friend
nearby who has
one of those modern rigs with the spectrum display. Both of you tune in
to say an
empty freq on 80 or 40m, and do a test transmission. Make "white noise" by
blowing at your mic. Have him take a look at the width of your signal.
Also do
a test in AM mode (so your carrier shows up on his display) so he knows
where
your suppressed carrier really is. If the 10dB down skirts of your
signal don't
exceed say 2.8KHz you should be acceptable. And 2.6KHz 3 dB down.
From 200 to 2800Hz.

If his rig can capture and store the spectral pattern, have him do that
so you can see
what he saw.

1580. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 20:20:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <baokbrtap1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67829

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bamuii$gsr$0@208.207.71.160...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:baml2h$o4m$0@208.206.142.104...
> > >
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:3ECEABD7.2010507@ix.netcom.com...
> > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
> > > > > >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
> > > > > >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
> > > > > >spec I don't have to measure anything.
> > > > > >
> > > > > But how do you know if your rig is in
> > > > > spec without doing some measurements?
> > > > >
> > > > I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
> > > > does what the manufacturer states in the
> > > > documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
> > > > I accept the responsibility.
> > > >
> > > > Do you really think any significant percentage
> > > > of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
> > > > made periodic measurements of their commercial
> > > > equipment's signal? For many, an "on-the-air"
> > > > QSO with another ham will give sufficient
> > > > indication via the other ham's assessment of what
> > > > s/he hears as to the quality of the signal.
> > > >
> > > > The above has been the norm for decades within amateur radio
> > > > with no ill effects or otherwise wholesale indication that
> > > > individual rigs are not performing within part 97
> > > > rules.
> > >
> > > And that, Bill is the reason I've been protesting the channelization
of
```

> > > the new 60 meter allocation. It sidesteps a hundred years of amateur
> > > practice and substitutes commercial criteria.
> >
> > I have no problem with channelized frequency assignments for
> > this 60m "special purpose" set of amateur assignments. In fact,
> > if done properly to avoid the obvious uncertainty as to what one's
> > sup. carrier setting should be, the channelized 60m makes much
> > sense over a "band" where internal agreements would then be
> > needed as to what channel/frequency should be used for any
> > specific emergency.
>
> I agree, for emergency communications it is well suited. And the 5
discrete
> frequencies are not all that useful for much more than that. We got the
bare
> minimum requested-a 5mhz allocation to use for emergency comms when
> propagation is unusable on 3 and 7 mhz. But the "center frequency" spec
> and USB only are a bit out of range for ham radio, tho it's understandable
> since the Feds insist on full control .

The USB only makes sense because ham rigs all pretty much
have that capability. The center frequency I agree is poor
verbige for the reg itself given the purpose and the specific
service (i.e. Amateur Service).

> Seems likely that all this concern with holding onto all possible spectum
for
> homeland security use will fade with time as needs become clear

Time will tell.

> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have
been
> raving about? The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum
> bulletproof and interference immune?

Who is "you guys?"

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1581. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 20:24:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <baokjr$3bm$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67830

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030524020459.15886.00000346@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 5/23/2003 6:40 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bambmh$lb8$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
> >does what the manufacturer states in the
> >documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
> >I accept the responsibility.
>
> This is like having unprotected sex with a casual partner, Bill.
Maybe
> you WON'T have a problem...but then again...

Bad anaology. The "odds" of having a problem for the unprotected
sex act are far higher than any odds that my Kenwood rig is suddently
going to put out a bad signal and even less likly that if the
Kenwood started doing so, that another ham at the other end of the
QSO wouldn't notice it and tell me.

> >Do you really think any significant percentage
> >of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
> >made periodic measurements of their commercial
> >equipment's signal?
>
> I do. So there's your percentage of 1/670,000 ! ! !
> Steve, K4CAP

Whatever floats your boat. If that's something
you wish to do, you are certainly free to do so.
Is that something I am mandated to do by any specific Part 97
rule? Not at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1582. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 20:49:54 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524164954.20909.00000292@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67831

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/22/03 6:16 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ECD4C02.962C2F15@earthlink.net>
>

>As Leonard has lectured on numerous occasions, his only
>interest here is in civil debate on the removal of morse code
>testing.

Really?

When's he going to start?

>He is, as you are no doubt aware, a self-appointed
>advocate for the removal of morse
>testing and the elimination of licensing for children.

Why?
>
>Those items aside, Len will launch random insults as the
>opportunity presents itself.

Looks like he doesn't wait for opportunities.
>
>Leonard doesn't play well with others.
>
Obviously.
>
>
>

1583. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 20:56:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <baomev$m6q$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67832

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030524141521.15462.00000208@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <bam508$7g$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030523013238.16581.00000197@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >> In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >> >> >> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >> >> >> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
> >> >> >> filters?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
> >> >> >that answer.
> >> >>
> >> >> You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
> >> >> counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a
> >> >> dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.
> >> >>
> >> >> That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.
> >> >
> >> >Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.
> >>
> >> TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
> >> of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?
> >
> >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
> >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
> >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
> >spec I don't have to measure anything.
>
> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"

Because the manufacturer built it to those specs and, there
has not been any long term empirical evidence that suggests
I should be concerned. Do you have your auto speedometer
calibrated or do you believe it will stay pretty
accurate for the life of the vehicle.

> Laying-on of hands is not sufficient.

It is for me and there's NO FCC rule requiring otherwise.

> If someone in a QSO says "your signal is good" that isn't
> a qualifier on frequency or filter bandpass or much of
> anything else. A "599" signal report is commonly heard
> but it isn't really that good everywhere all the time, is it? :-)

If my frequency is not where I should be I think the
other ham would know that. As to my filter bandpass,
I think if I was spitting out a 6KHz SSB signal that someone would likly
notice. The reality is that commercial ham rigs have an excellent
track record of doing what they are supposed to with zero maintenace.

The same ZERO maintenance is today widespread throughout
the telecommunications industry. Why? Because we have found that
today's equipment is rock stable and that doing "periodic" maintence
measurements causes more problems than it finds. The same
is true for the vast array of consumer products.

> In Subpart D of Part 97 (all paragraphs of 97.3nn) there is
> nothing about "measurement" but there are a whole heap
> of "shalls" on signal emission. Each one of those "shall"
> statements applies to the individual licensee. The FCC
> gives all licensees considerable latitude on HOW they do
> their "shall" thing but the bottom line is that each licensee
> SHALL be within technical standards.

Your point? The fact is, that there is NO rule that mandates
I measure anything. I am responsible for my signal and I accept that.
What's the worst thing that could happen? I get a note from
the FCC telling me that my signal was out of band, that I had too
broad a signal, etc? In the old tube days with simple VFO's
that happened far more than with today's digitally programed
rigs. 30 years ago what happen could afford a frequency
counter? Accuracy today is incredible when compared to
the 50s/60s.

> >> No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
> >> the licensee are responsible.
> >
> >Agreed. That does not, however, require any periodic or
> >speciifc measurements to be made by me.
>
> So...you have NO way of knowing if you are operating
> responsibly as to technical characteristics of your RF
> emissions?

Nor does over 90% of licensed hams.

> Not acceptible in a technical activity, Bill. The law is the
> law and Phil just recently reminded everyone that "ignorance
> is not an excuse."

The law sez I am responsible for my signal. The law does
not proscribe any specific measurments, calibration or
testing I must do to be a ham. Again, I accept the
responsibility for my signal and operate as I see fit.

> Note: I left out a word in quoting Phil deliberately. If you have
> no referencible data on your RF emissions, then you are
> ignorant of the technical characteristics of your RF emissions.

I do NOT need to measure my actual signal to be confident that
my signal meets specs. Do you measure your microwave
to be sure it isn't eminating RF beyond the specs permitted
for such devices (be the specs mandated by FCC, OSHA or whatever)?

> That can be argued in a court as being synonymous with
> "ignorance of the law." In the amateur radio situation, part of
> the law applying to licensees IS technical.

I have consistently stated and accept responsibility
for my signal. What don't you understand about that.

> >> Now if you feel that you "don't have to" make such
> >> measurements, don't.
> >
> >I don't, nor do most hams with no ill effect.
>
> Rhetorical statement, Bill. "Most hams" would refer to at least
> 320 thousand (give or take). I don't think you or anyone else
> in here "know" that many people. :-)

I know enough about the cross section of amateur demographics
to believe that few hams have the test equipment you would expect
to use to verify compliance.

> FCC 03-105 give US amateurs five micro-bands, each with less
> than 3 KHz bandwidth. That is tight with a capital T. In order to
> operate there legally, it would take some measurements of
> several parts of an amateur transmitter to insure compliance
> with the law.

Bull. I'm certain the FCC fully expects the vast array of commercial
ham gear to be no problem as that equipment operates with similar
specs today. As before, if in operation on 60m, the FCC were to
cite me for improper operation, I'd then take whatever response was
necessary. Until then, however, I have every confidence that my
Kenwood operates just fine per the specs.

> >> You don't have to operate on those
> >> five 60m frequencies, either.

> >
> >Why should I not?
>
> That's up to you. If you violate the law concerning 60m
> operation for any reason, you can't claim any "ignorance"
> as an excuse.

I HAVE NEVER TAKEN ANY STANCE OTHER
THAN FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR MY SIGNAL.

> >> US Hams didn't have them before
> >> 14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away from all of
> >> you.
> >
> >If there's a point you're making on that statement,
> >it eludes me.
>
> Really? :-)
>
> US radio amateurs had 9 bands below 30 MHz on 13 May 2003
> with a total bandwidth of 2.75 MHz. FCC 03-105 added 14 KHz
> to that total bandwidth, an increase of 0.5%.
>
> Seems like there's a whole heap of bitching, moaning, whining,
> ranting, shouting about that half-percent increase. :-)

I'm not complaining. I think it's great.

> >> Why are there so many argumentative hams demanding things
> >> in here? :-)
> >
> >Who's demanding anything. Some of us believe that rules and regulations
> >can be written with a level of clarity and in such a way as to avoid
> >confusion. That is something any documentation writer should strive
> >for.
>
> Well then, just address your complaints to the FCC. You have
> their address. Come to think of it, you were there at least once.
> :-)

It's not catastrophic and I'm sure the clarity will be found via the
pages of CQ and QST magazine.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1584. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 21:03:11 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524170311.20909.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 67833

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/24/03 2:15 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524141521.15462.00000208@mb-m06.aol.com>

wrote:

(long lecture removed for sanity's sake)
>
> US radio amateurs had 9 bands below 30 MHz on 13 May 2003
> with a total bandwidth of 2.75 MHz. FCC 03-105 added 14 KHz
> to that total bandwidth, an increase of 0.5%.

2.75 MHz?

1.800 to 2.000 MHz = 0.2 MHz
3.500 to 4.000 MHz = 0.5 MHz
7.000 to 7.300 MHz = 0.3 MHz
10.100 to 10.150 MHz = 0.05 MHz
14.000 to 14.350 MHz = 0.35 MHz
18.068 to 18.168 MHz = 0.1 MHz
21.000 to 21.450 MHz = 0.45 MHz
24.890 to 24.990 MHz = 0.1 MHz
28.000 to 29.700 MHz = 1.7 MHz

0.2 + 0.5 + 0.3 + 0.05 + 0.35 + 0.1 + 0.45 + 0.1 + 1.7 = 3.75

3.75 MHz of bandwidth below 30 MHz, not 2.75 MHz.

Can anyone explain why radio amateurs should take
technical "advice" about measurements from someone
who doesn't even check their math?

1585. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 21:06:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <baon1ahbm1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67834

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030524151452.02076.00000221@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <bamo5ufsi1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >Neither novice nor advanced will disappear in the next 10 years as
many
> >> >have actually been renewed and 100s more are renewed every month
> >> >giving those renewals another 10 years of existence
> >>
> >> DOH!
> >>
> >> Of course!
> >>
> >> >...unless they all suddenly upgrade.
> >> >
> >> Or the rules change.
> >
> >The thing I still don't understand is why the vast amount of Advanced
hams
> >didn't take the opportunity to pass the old Extra written and then just
wait
> for
> >the April implementation date of the R&O.
>
> Let's see - something like 15% of Advanceds have either let the license
expire
> or upgraded to Extra since May of 2000. Maybe 20% if we use AH0A data for
> end-of-March 2000 as the reference point. Amazing.
>
> >The pre-implementation Extra
> >test was, on the whole, pretty lame.
>
> I don't think it was that lame at all. YMMV
>
> >To move up today, the Advanced
> >needs to "study" the entire scope of material found on the old Advanced
> >and Extra.
>
> Not gonna go there, Bill!

:-) :-)

> But your observation still has lots to think about. If someone thought the
old

> Extra was easier, then the thing to do was take it before April 15, 2000,
and
> use the CSCE after that date.

Exactly what I and many others did.

> If someone the old Extra was harder, the thing to
> do was take the new test soon after April 15 2000.
>
> But it's been over three years.....
>
> Some possibilities:
>
> 1) Lots of Advanceds don't care about getting an Extra

I think that's true.

> 2) Lots of Advanceds are inactive (SK being the extreme case)

Yet the rate of reduction for total Advanced is not indicative
of that. Many (most?) Advanced hams do renew.

> 3) Lots of Advanceds haven't gotten the word yet.

For those that are inactve, maybe. Otherwise, I'd
find that hard to believe for the active ones.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1586. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 22:24:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524182432.04554.00000145@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67836

In article <baon1ahbm1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >The thing I still don't understand is why the vast amount of Advanced
>> >hams didn't take the opportunity to pass the old Extra written and then
just
>> >wait for the April implementation date of the R&O.
>>
>> Let's see - something like 15% of Advanceds have either let the license
>> expire or upgraded to Extra since May of 2000. Maybe 20% if we use AH0A
>> data for end-of-March 2000 as the reference point. Amazing.

>> But your observation still has lots to think about. If someone thought the
>> old Extra was easier, then the thing to do was take it before April 15,
2000,
>> and use the CSCE after that date.
>
>Exactly what I and many others did.

Not that many Advanceds, though. Otherwise their numbers would be lower.
>
>> If someone the old Extra was harder, the thing to
>> do was take the new test soon after April 15 2000.
>>
>> But it's been over three years.....
>>
>> Some possibilities:
>>
>> 1) Lots of Advanceds don't care about getting an Extra
>
>I think that's true.
>
>> 2) Lots of Advanceds are inactive (SK being the extreme case)
>
>Yet the rate of reduction for total Advanced is not indicative
>of that. Many (most?) Advanced hams do renew.

Good point.
>
>> 3) Lots of Advanceds haven't gotten the word yet.
>
>For those that are inacitve, maybe. Otherwise, I'd
>find that hard to believe for the active ones.
>
Back during the comment period, I was amazed at how many active hams had

little idea of what was being proposed. And despite the ECFS system and lots of explanations about how to comment, there were less than 2500 total comments and reply comments to 98-143. Back in the '60s, when everything was by mail and there were only 250K US hams, FCC got over 6000 comments about incentive licensing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1587. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 22:24:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <baore6bnk1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67835

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030524122427.23745.00000184@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <bao1m4fqb1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> The ARRL has now posted the recommended settings on their web site.
> >>
> >> www.arrl.org
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >
> >Good....now we can discuss something else besides dial setting and
> >incompetent operators.
> >
> WELL SAID, Dan!!
>
> (I still think it's a plot to wipe out LSB)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

And a plot to elliminate CW. grin

Dan/W4NTI

1588. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 23:30:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524193015.23114.00000248@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67837

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/24/2003 8:29 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524092928.06770.00000185@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>>We'd have never known what you name is if Steve hadn't outted you.
>>You certainly never volunteered it.
>
>I never volunteered my callsign. But then, when I asked an antenna lab person
>what his callsign was and he wouldn't give it to me.

I am of the opinion that if I knew you in person I probably wouldn't want
to tell YOU anything about me either.

>(He said its not "right". I didn't know what he was talking about. It was an
>ungraded lab tour.)

So who cares. That lab has nothing to do with this forum.

>And I didn't keep my name hidden.

Yes, you did. Until then you NEVER posted with your name, and to my best
knowledge, have YET to sign a post "Vipul" or "KB1HMW". I may be wrong and
offer an "I stand corrected" in advance if I am, but until shown differently,
it's a moot point. A link to a verifyable post will suffice as evidence to the
contrary.

>>.and we know from experience that you have difficulty with quite a
>>number of existing definitions.
>
>Like how many? The word contest, "Ham" radio vs amateur radio, (and Title
>Engineer) are the only definitions I challenged(contested).

ENGLISH, Vipul...ENGLISH!

Steve, K4CAP

1589. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 23:32:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524193225.23114.00000249@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67838

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/24/2003 10:40 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524114023.03937.00000211@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>Go to
>
>www.mostannoyingwebpage.com
>
>When they ask you about a subject to talk about (if you are not annoyed too
>much and got that far), chose Ham radio.

If this is where you are getting your "information", it's no wonder you're
on the verge of being a blithering idiot.

Steve, K4CAP

1590. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 23:34:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524193418.23114.00000250@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67839

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/24/2003 7:19 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ECF634C.1CC00C74@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>> >Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.
>>
>> TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
>> of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?
>> If that is in violation of FCC regulations you are responsible.
>> No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
>> the licensee are responsible.
>
>If you get a license, you can be responsible too.
>
>> Now if you feel that you "don't have to" make such
>> measurements, don't. You don't have to operate on those
>> five 60m frequencies, either. US Hams didn't have them before
>> 14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away from all of
>> you.
>
>Tell us again--how'd you get involved?

And WHAT class of license you will be using to get ON these allocations?

>> Why are there so many argumentative hams demanding things
>> in here? :-)
>
>Why are there non-hams trying to play traffic cop?

So much time on their hands since they can't get on the REAL air, Dave!

Steve, K4CAP

1591. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 23:38:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524193811.23114.00000251@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67840

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>Date: 5/24/2003 4:03 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524170311.20909.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>

>Can anyone explain why radio amateurs should take
>technical "advice" about measurements from someone
>who doesn't even check their math?

But he's a PROFESSIONAL, dang it! We MUST honor, cherish and admire him
in all things technical, right or wrong!~

EVERYONE knows that Lennie did it first, longer better, more accurately, or
had it published in a defunct magazine before any of us!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1592. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 23:44:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524194406.23114.00000252@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67841

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 5/24/2003 3:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <baokjr$3bm$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>

>> This is like having unprotected sex with a casual partner, Bill.
>Maybe
>> you WON'T have a problem...but then again...
>
>Bad anaology.

Why?

>The "odds" of having a problem for the unprotected
>sex act are far higher than any odds that my Kenwood rig is suddently
>going to put out a bad signal and even less likly that if the
>Kenwood started doing so, that another ham at the other end of the
>QSO wouldn't notice it and tell me

Just like the unsafe sex analogy, Bill, it only takes one error to cause a problem or solicit an FCC QSL card.

>> >Do you really think any significant percentage
>> >of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
>> >made periodic measurements of their commercial
>> >equipment's signal?
>>
>> I do. So there's your percentage of 1/670,000 ! ! !
>> Steve, K4CAP
>
>Whatever floats your boat. If that's something
>you wish to do, you are certainly free to do so.
>Is that something I am mandated to do by any specific Part 97
>rule? Not at all.

Better re-read the rules, Bill. Does it SPECIFY certain steps or time intervals to do this? Certainly not. Do the rules require you keep your station "legal"? You betcha.

You can argue the semantics of you doing it yourself or sending it off to "whiomever" to get it done, but it needs to be done. If you want to wait until you are told there's a problem, then you've waited too long.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1593. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-24 23:52:57 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <sBTza.703$p93.536@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67842

Doesn't get any better. You beat me by a year :) Just had number 56 on the
21st and had to call the fire department when we lit the candles :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bao2ev$i4j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> Well Jim I dont know if Im older, I'll be 57 in July.
> As stated got my Novice in summer of 61, upgraded to General 3 months
> later.
>
> By the time I got back from the military in 1968 the whole ham radio world
> had changed. I didn't bother upgrading till the mid 70s because I was
back
> in the military and the General was all I needed to operate in Germany.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:kHDza.651$MT3.64@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> > Geeze, Dan ... are you older than I am? I got my novice in 1962 and
> passed
> > the extra in 1966. Good grief!
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:bamfk9$57e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030523202435.15427.00000236@mb-m18.aol.com...
> > > > In article <bam0krvdv1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >Just what happened back in 1968 when the FCC, in cahoots with the
> ARRL
> > > > >shoved Incentive Licensing down our throats.
> > > > >
> > > > I don't see how the ARRL was in cahoots with FCC, Dan. The League
and
> > > others
> > > > actually got the FCC to tone down some of the harsher aspects of

IL,
> > like
> > > > demoting all Advanceds to Generals, as was proposed by FCC. And the
> > > original
> > > > ARRL proposal (1963) was very simple.
> > > >
> > > > And the story really begins about 1949, when FCC started talking
about
> > > > restructuring the old ABC system. That resulted in a system where
hams
> > who
> > > did
> > > > not have an Advanced by the end of 1952 would have needed an Extra
to
> > > operate
> > > > 'phone on the HF ham bands below 25 MHz. (160 is MF, not HF).
> > > >
> > > > But then FCC did a complete about-face and opened up all privileges
to
> > all
> > > hams
> > > > except Techs and Novices.
> > > >
> > > > So the whole IL mess of the '60s was actually a rethinking of that
> > > last-minute
> > > > end-of-1952 decision. btw, the whole subband-by-license-class thing
> did
> > > not
> > > > come from either FCC or ARRL.
> > > >
> > > > Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes -
just
> > > like
> > > > before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > In 1961 I passed the General. At that time it gave me ALL HF
> PRIVLIDGES.
> > > In 1968 I was told I had to upgrade to "EXTRA" to get the same
> privlidges.
> > > That was not right and as far as I'm concerned is the main problems
with
> > > Amateur Radio today. A class system has been imposed.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >

> >
> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03
> >
> >
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1594. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 00:02:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524200253.23114.00000253@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67843

>Subject: Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/24/2003 8:15 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524091537.06770.00000184@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>>> At their club meeting, I told of my interest in electronics. They seemed
>>like
>>> there could be some activities. I contacted some people. Somehow, never
>>> materialized. Something always came up.
>>
>>Maybe someone thought your record was stuck and decided that you made
>>watching paint dry seem exciting.
>
>No, thats not what happened. The person gave me his email. I was courteous
>and
>didn't hear back from him. Yet somehow certain things get done. I guess you
>must be in the Ham "click" to be involved in these things. Also, another
>person
>said he will contact me if something else interesting comes up. I have not
>heard from him again. That was a while ago

Are you waiting for somone to spoon feed it to you, Vippy? That's sure
what it seems like here!

>>> Yet, Hams will take a day off and show up on Friday for a Hamfest. It
>seems
>>> like its really a matter of priorities.
>>
>>Let's see....On one hand, an evening of circuit designing with Vipul.
>>On the other--a hamfest. Yep, priorities work for me.
>
>For one thing, I never asked anyone to take a day off from work.

For one thing YOU are the one who brought up taking a day off, Vippy!

(Kid can't even keep his own rants an assertions straight ! ! ! ! !)

>Take a day off for a Hamfest to go and buy stuff, when that stuff is
>available
>on Saturday also? Thats sounds intelligent. Oh, and Hamfests are really fun
>too.

Yes...Taking a day off, ESPECIALLY on a Friday and ESPECIALLY to go to a
Ham Radio related event makes sense to me...Of course I accrew PTO (paid time

off), so what do I care...?!?!

>>Maybe you believed you were being courteous. Maybe some folks there
>>thought you were being pushy.
>
>No, thats not what happened.

I bet. Uh huh...

>>It had to be rough, being rejected by radio amateurs AND EE's.
>
>At least that EE was smart enough not to attend the meetings, unlike myself
>(now former EE).

To be a "former EE" you must have at one time BEEN an EE.

>In that case, he was right to be snobby.

No person, in any situation, has the "right" tob e snobby. I think you
were acting like a fool and he didn't want anything to do with you.

Remember how you "refused" to ID yourself as an Amateur in the "EE class
you were allegedly taking? Well, Mr. EE didn't want to be in a group of Hams
and be identified with YOU. THAT says something.

>Also, I was offered a project from one Prof of the classes I took, so I think
>it has more to do with Ham radio than EEs. Obviously, I didn't take that
>offer,
>or I could still be considered an EE.

You can be an EE without being in the middle of a project to justify being
called one, Vippy. I am sitting at home making fun of your idiotic
rants...Does it mean that since I am not in the middle of doing CPR or wading
through somone's body fluids that I am not a Nurse?

>>Aren't interested in what? They aren't interested in what YOU want them
>>to be interested in? The self-centered bastards!
>
>Yes, its frustrating.

Maybe if you weren't such a putz and tried to follow what was going on,
rather than striding in demanding to have things go YOUR way, Vippy?

>Ham radio is a culture.

Ham (Amateur) Radio is a radio service regulated by the Federal
Communications Commission.

>Hams like to only do certain aspects of the hobby.

A narrow-minded assessment not validated by facts.

>Also, at the gathering I joined a few weeks ago, I wanted to take a break,
>but
>the host urged me to operate radios and make contacts.

Did he tie your ankles to a leash and wrap it to the table? Did his Doberman Pincers sit attentitively at the table and begin to growl if you appeared to NOT operate the radios?

How DARE he encourae you to operate the radios! The PIG!

BBBWWWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !
! ! !

Steve, K4CAP

1595. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 00:05:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524200519.23114.00000254@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67844

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/24/2003 1:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524141521.15462.00000208@mb-m06.aol.com>

>As long as my rig is within
>>spec I don't have to measure anything.
>
> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"
>
> Laying-on of hands is not sufficient.

Maybe for YOU it's not sufficient...! ! ! !

Steve, K4CAP

1596. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 00:16:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524201628.23114.00000255@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67845

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 5/24/2003 3:56 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <baomev$m6q$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>

>> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"
>
>Because the manufacturer built it to those specs and, there
>has not been any long term empirical evidence that suggests
>I should be concerned. Do you have your auto speedometer
>calibrated or do you believe it will stay pretty
>accurate for the life of the vehicle.

The radio is an electro/mechanical device, subject to the vagrities of manufacturing errors, enviromental factors, and out-and-out Acts of God. It may have been God's Gift to the Technically Inept when it left the front door, but everything after that is a crap shoot.

>The same ZERO maintenance is today widespread throughout
>the telecommunications industry. Why? Because we have found that
>today's equipment is rock stable and that doing "periodic" maintence
>measurements causes more problems than it finds. The same
>is true for the vast array of consumer products.

"ZERO maintenance"...?!?! Where are you getting THAT, Bill? Yes, decreasing maintenence IS an engineering goal, and many devices (including cellphones) are essentially throw-away items when they fail. But not so bigger assets.

>Your point? The fact is, that there is NO rule that mandates
>I measure anything. I am responsible for my signal and I accept that.
>What's the worst thing that could happen? I get a note from
>the FCC telling me that my signal was out of band, that I had too
>broad a signal, etc?

How about your signal; was dropping a harmonic on an EMS or Public Safety repeater and traffic was interrupted until you were found?

How about a VOR was interfered with and an aircraft on an ILS approach breaks out of minimums to find itself 2 miles from the REILS and 300 feet from KRUD's 700ft tower?

>The law sez I am responsible for my signal. The law does
>not proscribe any specific measurments, calibration or
>testing I must do to be a ham. Again, I accept the
>responsibility for my signal and operate as I see fit.

Bill...is that REALLY you in there?

>I have consistently stated and accept responsibility
>for my signal. What don't you understand about that.

I don't understand how you can "accept" it, but then run head-long into ignorance about avoiding a problem.

>I HAVE NEVER TAKEN ANY STANCE OTHER
>THAN FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR MY SIGNAL.

But how can you take "repsonsibility" for something you can't quantify or qualifiy?

73

Steve, K4CAP

1597. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 01:28:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524212829.02076.00000229@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67847

In article <bamuiigsr0@208.207.71.160>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> news:baml2h$o4m$0@208.206.142.104...
>> >
>> > Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >
>> > > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:3ECEABD7.2010507@ix.netcom.com...
>> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
>> > > > >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
>> > > > >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
>> > > > >spec I don't have to measure anything.
>> > > > >
>> > > > But how do you know if your rig is in
>> > > > spec without doing some measurements?
>> > > >
>> > > I have a reasonable expectation that my rig
>> > > does what the manufacturer states in the
>> > > documentation. If it turns out otherwise, then
>> > > I accept the responsibility.
>> > >
>> > > Do you really think any significant percentage
>> > > of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
>> > > made periodic measurements of their commercial
>> > > equipment's signal? For many, an "on-the-air"
>> > > QSO with another ham will give sufficient
>> > > indication via the other ham's assessment of what
>> > > s/he hears as to the quality of the signal.
>> > >
>> > > The above has been the norm for decades within amateur radio
>> > > with no ill effects or otherwise wholesale indication that
>> > > individual rigs are not performing within part 97
>> > > rules.
>> >
>> > And that, Bill is the reason I've been protesting the channelization of
>> > the new 60 meter allocation. It sidesteps a hundred years of amateur
>> > practice and substitutes commercial criteria.
>>

>> I have no problem with channelized frequency assignments for
>> this 60m "special purpose" set of amateur assignments. In fact,
>> if done properly to avoid the obvious uncertainty as to what one's
>> sup. carrier setting should be, the channelized 60m makes much
>> sense over a "band" where internal agreements would then be
>> needed as to what channel/frequency should be used for any
>> specific emergency.
>
>I agree, for emergency communications it is well suited. And the 5 discrete
>frequencies are not all that useful for much more than that. We got the bare
>minimum requested-a 5mhz allocation to use for emergency comms when
>propagation is unusable on 3 and 7 mhz. But the "center frequency" spec
>and USB only are a bit out of range for ham radio, tho it's understandable
>since the Feds insist on full control .

The "Feds" have had "full control" on US amateur radio since 1934.

I realize that may come as a rude awakening to those who
thought ARRL ran the whole thing... :-)

> Seems likely that all this concern with holding onto all possible spectum for
>homeland security use will fade with time as needs become clear

Tsk, tsk, tsk...some examination of Part 2's very big allocation
chart and many notes thereto will show a lot of federal users on
HF in that 60m area before 9-11-01...and unchanged after that
infamous date. Try researching some public sources other than
the ARRL website.

> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have been
>raving about?

It's still there and was there before "Homeland Security" was an
administration secretarial agency.

Read up on ALE or Automatic Link Establishment on HF. SHARES
uses that. Can you recognize an ALE signal if you hear one? You
can find out via the Internet with one site having sound samples.
Hint: It doesn't sound like OOK CW or FSK RTTY.

>The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum
>bulletproof and interference immune?

ALE doesn't need spread spectrum techniques yet can find an
open frequency automatically and send data at high rates
regardless of claims by olde-tymers that "phase shifting on HF
makes it no good." :-)

Sorry, Dickie, but OOK CW went the way of the dinosaurs faced
with a gigantic meteor for radio messaging. This is the new
millenium, not the days of the 1930s.

Enjoy your Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society activity as the last
living radio museum of morsemanship.

1598. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 01:28:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524212830.02076.00000230@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67846

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd8lyp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 24 May 2003 02:49:14 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>>Can we then assume that by April 2016 (1951-1968 = 16 years)
>>that FCC will have by then realized the error of their
>>predecessors' ways, and have by then reinstated all six licenses
>>classes, with a 20wpm code test for Extra? :-)
>
> You are assuming two things: (1) that there will be an amateur
> radio service still in existence, and (2) that the government
> will not have privatized the whole shebang to RCA which will
> have risen from the ashes like the foo-bird.

Hmmm...I'm still working on "1951-1968 = 16 years" (when it
should be -17 years). :-)

Radio Club of America (RCA) was formed in 1909, five years
before three New Englanders formed the ARRL to hack the
commercial telegram service. RCA is still around... :-)

> I know better than to predict what the FCC will do tomorrow,
> let alone 16 years from now.

Don't worry, Phil, amateurism will still exist...everywhere.

The National Traffic System can be depended on as an
indespensible backbone of national communications using
tried and trusty on-off keying telegraphy. An NTS message
originated today could reach its destination by 2016.

US amateur radio state of the art will have reached the peak
of perfection in 2016 using the very newest refinements in
manual telegraphy and be written up in glorious prose and
art work in the QEX yet to come. This will be praised to high
heaven as the olde-tymers give each other shaky high-fives
congratulating each other on the "most basic communications
skills" ever attained by mankind.

A few intrepid genius olde-tymers may have the last controls
on their outboard DSP filters understood by 2016.

The future is ripe with promise! Stay tuned...

"Today is the tomorrow you worried about yesterday." - tag line

1599. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 01:43:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524214341.27219.00000244@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67848

>Subject: Re: Bait and Switch?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/24/2003 8:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030524212830.02076.00000230@mb-m14.aol.com>

> Hmmm...I'm still working on "1951-1968 = 16 years" (when it
> should be -17 years)

"we're still working on finding that "Extra Lite" right out of the
box...shudda been three yeas ago. Ain't happened yet.

>The future is ripe with promise! Stay tuned

And it is highly unlikely you will be there to see it.

Bummer, huh?

Steve, K4CAP

1600. Re: FCC takes trips to Vegas from Paying Customers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 02:08:37 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <FAVza.711$754.268@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67849

I've news for you; it's bigger than the FCC. The whole US government stinks
of the culture you speak of.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"RWS" <none@anonnonex.net> wrote in message
news:bal4eq$s00$0@pita.alt.net...
> No real surprise. It has been going on for years and no matter
> how much spin the FCC spin doctors put on it, it is illegal and
> unethical. As one poster mentioned not too long ago,
> today's FCC is a culture of greed and personal gain. The
> "What's in it for me" mentality is what drives today's FCC.
> Look for increasingly larger scandals to come out of the FCC.
> Next FCC scandal to be exposed will be massive fraud involving
> official government credit cards. You heard it her first!
>
> RWS
>
> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:8Gbza.11080$rO.957181@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > FCC Travel Routinely Funded by Industry
> > Watchdog Group Documents Regulators' Trips on the Regulated's Nickel
> > By Frank Ahrens
> > Washington Post Staff Writer
> > Thursday, May 22, 2003; Page E04
> >
> > Vegas. Rio. 'Frisco. Paris. The Big Easy. Over the past eight years,
> Federal
> > Communications Commission officials have taken 2,500 business trips to
> > global tourist spots, most of which were paid for by the media and
> > telecommunications companies the agency oversees, according to a study
to
> be
> > released today.
> >
> > The report, released by the Center for Public Integrity in Washington,
> comes
> > as the FCC is poised to relax or eliminate key media ownership rules, a
> step
> > that has been criticized by some as putting too much power in the hands
of
> a
> > few media giants.
> >

> > "I think travel is necessary and if it's necessary then the taxpayer
> should
> > pay for it," said Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for
> Public
> > Integrity in Washington. "When you're traveling on somebody's nickel and
> > they're in your face while you're traveling, there might be a problem."
> >
> > FCC officials accepted $2.8 million in free trips, mainly to industry
> > conventions, academic symposia and technical forums. The top
> destination --
> > Las Vegas, with 330 trips -- is the site of many media industry
> conventions,
> > such as annual gatherings put on by the National Association of
> > Broadcasters. The second-most popular destination for FCC officials was
> New
> > Orleans, with 173 trips, followed by New York (102 trips) and London (98
> > trips), the study said.
> >
> > The NAB paid the most, spending $191,472 on trips, the study said,
> followed
> > by the National Cable & Telecommunications Association ($172,636) and
the
> > Consumer Electronics Manufacturers Association ($149,285). Last
November,
> a
> > group of technology firms paid $2,646 to fly FCC Commissioner Kathleen
Q.
> > Abernathy to a two-day conference in Montpellier, France.
> >
> > "All of the trips appear to have been legal under government
guidelines,"
> > the study reads. "Other agencies routinely accept similar travel and
> > entertainment gifts."
> >
> > The Center for Public Integrity describes itself as a 40-person,
> nonpartisan
> > watchdog group. The FCC study was funded by a $300,000 grant from the
Ford
> > Foundation and $100,000 from the Open Society Institute, run by
> millionaire
> > philanthropist George Soros, Lewis said. The group has released such
> travel
> > studies in the past, which are based on FCC public filings.
> >
> > FCC officials defended the trips, saying the agency's limited travel
> budget
> > of about $2 million per year does not pay for sufficient travel outside
of
> > Washington to meet with foreign governments and local officials and
> citizen

> > groups within the United States. All travel invitations are vetted
through
> > the FCC's ethics office, a spokesman said, adding that about two-thirds
of
> > the trips were to technical and academic events and were not
> > industry-related.
> >
> > "I'm not crazy about having the industry pick up the tab, but I think it
> is
> > the second-best option we have in tight fiscal times like now," the
study
> > quotes Robert Pepper, chief of the FCC's office of plans and policy, as
> > saying. "The other option is for us to just stay home. That doesn't
> benefit
> > anyone."
> > --
> > NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> > http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
> > Death to 19th century horse and buggy technology in ham radio tests!
> > Eliminate the Morse Code test in 2004!
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1601. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 02:42:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030524224233.04554.00000149@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67702

In article <3ece2622$1@snipnews.snip.net>, "Arch Stanton"
<Nate4metalshop@att.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com...
>> Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
>> coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
>> spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services.
>
>I say let the commercial interests have 5 GHz.

Me, too! Been saying that for years! IMNSHO, hams have no hope
whatever of holding to any spectrum above 500 MHz.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1602. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 02:42:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030524224233.04554.00000150@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67850

In article <20030523060127.20217.00000192@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Suppose there was a piece of land set aside by the govt. as a park. But very
>few people used it, because it was hard to reach, lacked certain facilities
>and
>there were closer, "better" parks. Would the govt. be wrong to change the
>park
>into, say, an area for oil exploration? Particularly when there's a big need
>for new oil sources?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

You're absolutely correct. I say let's send some oil exploration crews up to ANWAR, shoot any of those steenkeeng Caribou that might be in the way, and start drilling for black gold!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1603. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 02:42:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030524224234.04554.00000151@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67701

In article <20030523001307.08597.00000154@mb-m24.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Back when I was an EE, I went to one club's repeater site.
>
>At their club meeting, I told of my interest in electronics. They seemed like
>there could be some activities. I contacted some people. Somehow, never
>materialized. Something always came up.
>
>Yet, Hams will take a day off and show up on Friday for a Hamfest. It seems
>like its really a matter of priorities.
>
>Generally Hams are nice people, but when I asked about the repeater, the
>person was snobby, and said they had someone for that and that they didn't need my
>input.

I think you'll find that to be a pretty standard response when some newcomer, regardless of technical qualifications, shows up and "volunteers" to start tweaking an already good working repeater. Once a repeater is set up and working well, most club members, and the repeater technical committee in particular, tend to want it to be left alone. They will also seek to limit the number of "control operators" with the access codes, for much the same reasons. Repeaters just don't lend themselves to being tinkered with by a lot of different people, once they're working right. Now, if they are having problems with their repeater, and you can fix it, then they're only shooting themselves in the foot by including you out. But this would be a relatively rare instance.

>I bet if I said I wanted to learn CW, they would enthustically help me do
>that.

I certainly hope so. Morse/CW is a valuable operating skill.

>Please realize that I was courteous, both at the meeting and at the repeater
>site when I made my requests.

I'm sure you were. Unfortunately, there is no good way to be told that a repeater group doesn't want another unnecessary pair of hands working on their machine!

>At my local club, there was an EE there. He usually does not attend the
>meetings. Anyway I asked him if I could work with him on some project. His
>response was snobby also.

This is not uncommon. A lot of what hams do does not lend itself to group effort. Perhaps if you offered to lead a club project aimed at those who are

beginners in the technical arena, you would get a better response.

>It seems the problem is that most Hams aren't interested and those that do
>handle these aspects are too snobby to include others. Ham radio is driving
>away those that can contribute and have technical interests and capabilities-
>in favor of other activites.

You're just running into the nature of ham radio. It is very much an
individual hobby, as opposed to a group activity.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1604. Re: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 02:59:35 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250258540.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67703

On Sat, 24 May 2003, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> Subject: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003
> From: radionews@aol.com (Radionews)
> Date: 5/24/2003 12:14 AM Central Daylight Time
> Message-id: <20030524011447.06840.00000201@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
> >Subject: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003
> >From: radionews@aol.com (Radionews)
> >Date: 5/24/2003 12:15 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030524011524.06840.00000202@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
> No doubt Bill posted this twice just to get Dieter's goat!

Posting it ONCE is enough to generate the abuse report.

He knows that he's supposed to post it to "rec.radio.info", not here, per the log of permitted parties that post to the info group. Newsline got permission back in 1996.

We all know that he's a spammer and that if anyone really cared to read his [mis-]information, they would go to his web site or listen to his program.

1605. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 03:12:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250309260.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 24 May 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305232158530.3124@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Thu, 22 May 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > > On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >ell so far I've seen both 1.5 and 1.4 "calculated" by knowledgeable
> > > > >folks here...so what willit be?
> > > >
> > > > 1.5 puts a 3000 Hz baseband signal at the top of the channel,
> > > > and a 200 Hz baseband signal at the bottom of the channel.
> > >
> > Actually, no it doesn't. The center of that range is 1600Hz, so one needs
> to
> > be 1.6kHz down to make that centered.
> >
> > Adjusting by 1.5Khz means that 3kHz will be 1.5kHz above, but 200Hz will
> only
> > be 1.3kHz below. That's not symmetrical and therefore not centered.
> >
> The ARRL has now posted the recommended settings on their web site.

You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't mean that they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that the center audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the maximum bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make that 300Hz to 2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that doesn't automatically make their settings optimal.

1606. Re: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 03:21:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030524232112.08487.00000188@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67705

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 5/24/2003 9:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250258540.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>> No doubt Bill posted this twice just to get Dieter's goat!
>
>Posting it ONCE is enough to generate the abuse report.

I see the goat's been got!

Steve, K4CAP

1607. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 03:25:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bapd8r$h9r$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67706

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030524194406.23114.00000252@mb-m13.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 5/24/2003 3:24 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <baokjr$3bm$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >> This is like having unprotected sex with a casual partner, Bill.
> >Maybe
> >> you WON'T have a problem...but then again...
> >
> >Bad anaology.
>
> Why?
>
> >The "odds" of having a problem for the unprotected
> >sex act are far higher than any odds that my Kenwood rig is suddently
> >going to put out a bad signal and even less likly that if the
> >Kenwood started doing so, that another ham at the other end of the
> >QSO wouldn't notice it and tell me
>
> Just like the unsafe sex analogy, Bill, it only takes one error to
cause a
> problem or solicit an FCC QSL card.

The unprotected sex act can result in a life long problem or worse
yet, paying for it with your life. An FCC notice is something
easily managed and of far less consequence..

> >> >Do you really think any significant percentage
> >> >of hams today...or at any time for that matter,
> >> >made periodic measurements of their commercial
> >> >equipment's signal?
> >>
> >> I do. So there's your percentage of 1/670,000 ! ! !
> >> Steve, K4CAP
> >
> >Whatever floats your boat. If that's something
> >you wish to do, you are certainly free to do so.
> >Is that something I am mandated to do by any specific Part 97
> >rule? Not at all.
>
> Better re-read the rules, Bill. Does it SPECIFY certain steps or
time
> intervals to do this? Certainly not. Do the rules require you keep your

> station "legal"? You betcha.

EXACTLY! And that does NOT require me to measure anything
at anytime. Of course the rules require me to operate a legal
station. Would you expect otherwise. The fact that the FCC has
never added any certification requirements for some 80 or more years
indicates there has been no serious problem that would tend to
lead to such a mandate.

> You can argue the semantics of you doing it yourself or sending it
off to
> "whiomever" to get it done, but it needs to be done. If you want to wait
until
> you are told there's a problem, then you've waited too long.

40 years and no problem. I think I'll just keep doing what I have been.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1608. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 03:34:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bapdpeoq1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67707

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030524201628.23114.00000255@mb-m13.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 5/24/2003 3:56 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <baomev$m6q$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"
> >
> >Because the manufacturer built it to those specs and, there
> >has not been any long term empirical evidence that suggests
> >I should be concerned. Do you have your auto speedometer
> >calibrated or do you believe it will stay pretty
> >accurate for the life of the vehicle.
>
> The radio is an electro/mechanical device, subject to the vagrities
of
> manufacturing errors, enviromental factors, and out-and-out Acts of God.
It may
> have been God's Gift to the Technically Inept when it left the front door,
but
> everything after that is a crap shoot.
>
> >The same ZERO maintenance is today widespread throughout
> >the telecommunications industry. Why? Because we have found that
> >today's equipment is rock stable and that doing "periodic" maintence
> >measurements causes more problems than it finds. The same
> >is true for the vast array of consumer products.
>
> "ZERO maintenance"...?!?! Where are you getting THAT, Bill?

Personal history and a 30+ year career in telephony is where I get that.

> Yes,
> decreasing maintenence IS an engineering goal, and many devices (including
> cellphones) are essentially throw-away items when they fail. But not so
bigger
> assets.

I can tell you that most telcom gear has literally NO maintenance
associated with. It is all self diagnostic and has literally no or
at most only minor adjustments that can be made to it.

> >Your point? The fact is, that there is NO rule that mandates
> >I measure anything. I am responsible for my signal and I accept that.

> >What's the worst thing that could happen? I get a note from
> >the FCC telling me that my signal was out of band, that I had too
> >broad a signal, etc?
>
> How about your signal; was dropping a harmonic on an EMS or Public
Safety
> repeater and traffic was interrupted until you were found?

And just how do you expect "most" hams to know their signal has a harmonic?
Spectrum analyzers aren't too often typical ham shack items.

> How about a VOR was interfered with and an aircraft on an ILS
approach
> breaks out of minimums to find itself 2 miles from the REILS and 300 feet
from
> KRUD's 700ft tower?

Ditto my last comment.

> >The law sez I am responsible for my signal. The law does
> >not proscribe any specific measurments, calibration or
> >testing I must do to be a ham. Again, I accept the
> >responsibility for my signal and operate as I see fit.
>
> Bill...is that REALLY you in there?

Absolutely.

> >I have consistently stated and accept responsibility
> >for my signal. What don't you understand about that.
>
> I don't understand how you can "accept" it, but then run head-long
into
> ignorance about avoiding a problem.

Because I don't have any such problem.

> >I HAVE NEVER TAKEN ANY STANCE OTHER
> >THAN FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR MY SIGNAL.
>
> But how can you take "repsonsibility" for something you can't
quantify or
> qualifiy?

The same way that I take responsibility for the speed I am going in a car if
the speedometer doesn't work...and trust me, I've had more than one
car with a nonfunctioning speedometer.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1609. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 03:41:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfeakts.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67708

On Sat, 24 May 2003 12:19:38 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>Why are there non-hams trying to play traffic cop?

I asked my ex-boss that for 25 years and all I got was dirty
looks and more performance scrutiny... <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1610. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 03:41:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfeaeer.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67709

On 24 May 2003 05:05:22 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Seems likely that all this concern with holding onto all
> possible spectum for homeland security use will fade with time as
> needs become clear.

Don't bet on it. It's "theirs" (NTIA's) and they don't want to
give it away like they were forced to release the microwave
bands which are going to be auctioned to wireless-networking
and cell-phone users. A classic case of "I've got mine...."

> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you
> guys have been raving about? The stuff that was completely
> secure, spread spectrum bulletproof and interference immune?

The money in the Homeland Security game is going to build
bureaucracies, not for equipment and operating funds for the
agencies who were sucked up in the vacuum and who can't afford
to buy that stuff any more than the stand-alone pauper agencies
such as the FCC can.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1611. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 03:48:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305241948.610620fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67710

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030524182432.04554.00000145@mb-m20.aol.com>...

> Back during the comment period, I was amazed at how many active hams had
> little idea of what was being proposed. And despite the ECFS system and lots of
> explanations about how to comment, there were less than 2500 total comments and
> reply comments to 98-143.

Nobody lost anything via 98-143 plus in general the earlier creation
of the nocode ticket paved the way for the concept of reduced code
speed tests. 98-143 was for the most part a snoozer in the general ham
population.

> Back in the '60s, when everything was by mail and
> there were only 250K US hams, FCC got over 6000 comments about incentive
> licensing.

No surprise there, everybody who held a General or Conditional - which
was the huge majority of us then - lost prime space on top of being
barred from the expanded phone bands.

The number of complaints regulators get on NPRMs goes up exponentially
in proportion the the number of wounded revised regs generate. There
is no comparison in this respect between the impacts of 98-143 and
Incentive Licensing.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1612. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 04:22:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525002200.08632.00000269@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67711

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 5/24/2003 10:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bapdpeoq1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>

>> "ZERO maintenance"...?!?! Where are you getting THAT, Bill?
>
>Personal history and a 30+ year career in telephony is where I get that.

Oh? And WHAT "telephony" device has been 100% maintenence free for 30
years, Bill?

>I can tell you that most telcom gear has literally NO maintenance
>associated with.

Oh?

I have family working for Mom Bell in Smyrna, GA, and she'd beg to differ
with you.

>It is all self diagnostic and has literally no or
>at most only minor adjustments that can be made to it.

Above reiterated.

>> I don't understand how you can "accept" it, but then run head-long
>into
>> ignorance about avoiding a problem.
>
>Because I don't have any such problem.

That you KNOW of.......

>> But how can you take "repsonsibility" for something you can't
>quantify or
>> qualifiy?
>
>The same way that I take responsibility for the speed I am going in a car if
>the speedometer doesn't work...and trust me, I've had more than one
>car with a nonfunctioning speedometer.

I don't doubt it, Bill.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1613. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 04:46:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED04AB4.6090101@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67712
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>>the ARRL has now posted the recommended settings on their web site.
>>
>>
>
>You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't mean that
>they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that the center
>audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the maximum
>bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make that 300Hz to
>2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that doesn't
>automatically make their settings optimal.
>
>
Well, everyone needs to use the same setting if we want to talk to each
other
and not sound like Donald Duck.... So the -1.5 KHz seems the most
reasonable
one to use so far.

1614. Re: FCC takes trips to Vegas from Paying Customers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 05:12:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hff5six.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67713

On Sun, 25 May 2003 02:08:37 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:

>I've news for you; it's bigger than the FCC. The whole US
>government stinks of the culture you speak of.

Not "the whole US government" - only the upper echelon
decision-makers.

Working-level staff, and even mid-level managers, are never
invited to attend conferences on the sponsor's nickel. Either
they use available travel funds (which were never approved
unless we were doing an enforcement sweep on the show floor) or
they go there on their own personal funds. Been there, done
that.

The son of friends of ours worked a year as a "home office"
intern for a Congressrep. He never got invited either.

Oh, the process is legal - the law allows it under specific
circumstances.

IIRC the Federal Personnel Manual (Title 5, C.F.R.) requires
that such invitations to conferences be related to the official
duties of the invitee, that the conference be open to the public
as spectators (but not necessarily free of charge), that the
invitee is a speaker or other integral part of the program, that
prior approval from the executive level (in the FCC that's Bureau
Chief or Commissioner) be granted in advance certifying that
official funds have not been allocated, and that the accounting
for the reimbursement be open to public inspection under the
FOIA.

There is no limitation as to where the conference is held
because it's not on Uncle Sam's nickel. Rest assured that the
NAB or the IEEE or any other trade or professional organization
is not going to hold their conferences in North Wastewater.....
and international broadcast qnd spectrum management conferences
are not held inside the United States on a regular basis. They
are held in such places as Paris and Rio and the Spanish coast.

Bill Moyer's TV show on PBS didn't point the above out because
that would have weakened the attack. The reimbursement process
was legalized because without it, an auful lot of business
would never get done. The quality and ethics of the business is
left as an exercise to the ranter.

It would be an OK process if it was applied fairly and across the board, but it isn't, so I agree it's a stinky process as carried out.

Illegal it's not until The Congress passes a law saying so. If they do, I hope that they will also pass a law allocating the funds from the US Treasury so that there is no need to even appear beholden to any interest.

Don't hold your breath.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1615. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 05:12:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hff6jvy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67714

On 24 May 2003 11:53:39 -0700, Bert Craig wrote:

>> Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
>> matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
>> all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
>> think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
>> drives them.
>
>That's a mighty big blanket statement, Phil. Do you really believe
>this applies to ALL who disagree with the FCC's way of "gettin' it
>dun?"

Anyone can agree or disagree with anything they want. The
anti-FCC-ers that I have dealt with are, overwhelmingly,
unaware of the process and how the agency works and what its
good points and shortcomings are. All they see is "big
government" and anyone who doesn;t agree with them is an
"apologist".

In my book the Satchell Paige Criterion applies to them.

Maybe it's because I've been working the process, both "inside"
and "outside" that leads me to the practical approach - "these"
are the rules and "this" is how we get what you want working
within the rules and "that" is how we get the rules changed if
you can't get what you want. Calling the FCC or its
protagonists or its antagonists or anyone else names or
mounting ad hominem attacks on them will not get that done.

>> Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
>> pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
>> the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
>> and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
>> the action causes personal harm.
>
>This would be a good thing if the "commish's" legislative process were
>more...well, more...American. (Checks & balances?)

Read what I posted. The "checks and balances" are there.
The FCC does not have the final word - both the courts and The
Congress can, and during the history of the FCC quite often did,
overrule the FCC's decisions.

What other "checks and balances" are you thinking of?

As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
it's over and even then it may not be over.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1616. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 05:12:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hff6qtz.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67715

On Sat, 24 May 2003 15:50:14 -0400, Spectrum wrote:

>Lets put it this way, I bet a dollar that Phil is no fan of Rush
>Limbaugh.

You're damn right - and neither am I a fan of any so-called
"liberal" commentator/talkshow clown either.

A pox on both houses.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1617. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 07:44:08 UTC
From: Rene <deleterene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <baps88$27p20$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67716
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Arch Stanton" <Nate4metalshop@att.net> wrote in message
news:3ece2622$1@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030522222711.02197.00000144@mb-m12.aol.com...
> > Ooops -- another of my predictions on the future of ham radio apparently
> > coming true! The FCC wants to pull a significant amount of our 5 GHz
> > spectrum out from under us for more unlicensed Part 15 services.
>
> I say let the commercial interests have 5 GHz.
>
> Really now, let's be honest. If there are a
> grand total of 3 or 6 ham radio operators
> in the whole of the USA who are
> using 5 gHz once or twice for a
> one minute QSO over the course of a Year
> then we are very lucky. All we need
> is 144, 220 and 440 MHz
> FM voice and perhaps some
> cw for the once-a-year contests.

You seem to forget that IF the 5 GHz band was given to the industry, it would be world wide. And your statement implies that world wide, 144, 220 and 440 MHz should be enough. Well: in Region 1, we don't have 220 MHz and only 430-440 MHz on 70 cm. So it is hardly possible to operate ATV on 70cm, we need the SHF bands! And over here, they already have given the 13 cm band to the industry, with amateurs also on secondary priority, so...

Rene

1618. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 09:18:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525051858.04264.00000261@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67717

>Subject: Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future
>From: "Rene" deleterene.altena@gmx.net
>Date: 5/25/2003 2:44 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <baps88$27p20$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>

>And over here, they already have given the 13 cm band
>to the industry, with amateurs also on secondary priority, so...

Where is "over here?"

Steve, K4CAP

1619. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 09:25:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED08C99.1101B03D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67718

Spectrum wrote:

> Phil was a federal bureaucrat for many years, so it is not
> surprising that he is an apologist for the FCC. And even less
> surprising that his politics gravitate to a very liberal big
> government view of things. Lets put it this way, I bet a dollar
> that Phil is no fan of Rush Limbaugh.
>
> Spectrum

"Spectrum", old boy. You seem to post quite a bit of anti-FCC, anti-Phil Kane stuff under a variety of pseudonyms. To a fellow like you, anyone who works for the Federal Government is automatically a bureaucrat. Anyone who has worked for a particular agency becomes an apologist for that agency. There is no requirement for anyone to listen to or become a fan of Rush. Limbaugh was not a government employee nor was he ever elected to anything.

What is your claim to fame and why do you need to hide your identity?

Dave K8MN

1620. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 09:32:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED08E4B.45D2CDBF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67719

No CW Test wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 5/22/03 6:16 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3ECD4C02.962C2F15@earthlink.net>
> >
>
> >As Leonard has lectured on numerous occasions, his only
> >interest here is in civil debate on the removal of morse code
> >testing.
>
> Really?

That's really what he says.

> When's he going to start?

I've been here for at least seven years. I haven't noted any move on
his part toward actual implementation of his stated goal.

> >He is, as you are no doubt aware, a self-appointed
> >advocate for the removal of morse
> >testing and the elimination of licensing for children.
>
> Why?

He is likely a self-appointed advocate because no group asked him to
become its advocate. He is for the removal of morse testing because he
finds morse difficult. He is for instituting a minimum age for amateur
radio because he is a PROFESSIONAL and doesn't want to be involved in
any activity where mere CHILDREN may be participants.

> >Those items aside, Len will launch random insults as the
> >opportunity presents itself.
>
> Looks like he doesn't wait for opportunities.

To Len, any post by another on any topic is seen as an opportunity.

> >Leonard doesn't play well with others.
> >
> Obviously.

I see you've been paying attention.

Dave K8MN

1621. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 09:49:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED0923E.711DCC16@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67720

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Sat, 24 May 2003 12:19:38 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >Why are there non-hams trying to play traffic cop?
>
> I asked my ex-boss that for 25 years and all I got was dirty
> looks and more performance scrutiny... <ggg>

That triggered a grin!

Dave K8MN

1622. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 10:08:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED0968E.D0369880@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67721

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> At their club meeting, I told of my interest in electronics. They seemed
> >like
> >> there could be some activities. I contacted some people. Somehow, never
> >> materialized. Something always came up.
> >
> >Maybe someone thought your record was stuck and decided that you made
> >watching paint dry seem exciting.
>
> No, thats not what happened. The person gave me his email. I was courteous and
> didn't hear back from him.

Either the matter slipped his mind, he had other things to do or you
weren't perceived as courteous.

> Yet somehow certain things get done. I guess you
> must be in the Ham "click" to be involved in these things. Also, another person
> said he will contact me if something else interesting comes up. I have not
> heard from him again. That was a while ago.

Given your attitude (which appears in the second sentence above), I'm
not too surprised. Have you learned anything from the experience?

> >> Yet, Hams will take a day off and show up on Friday for a Hamfest. It seems
> >> like its really a matter of priorities.
> >
> >Let's see....On one hand, an evening of circuit designing with Vipul.
> >On the other--a hamfest. Yep, priorities work for me.
>
> For one thing, I never asked anyone to take a day off from work.

You brought up taking off a day from work. What keeps you from taking a
day off from work?

> Take a day off for a Hamfest to go and buy stuff, when that stuff is available
> on Saturday also? Thats sounds intelligent. Oh, and Hamfests are really fun
> too.

Yes, hamfests can be fun. Taking an extra day off and going on a trip
can be fun. Buying stuff can be fun. Chatting with other radio
amateurs can be fun. Do you find the concept of "fun" to be strange,
Vipul?

> >> Generally Hams are nice people, but when I asked about the repeater, the
> >person
> >> was snobby, and said they had someone for that and that they didn't need my
> >> input.
> >
> >...or the club could have a repeater committee which handles such things
> >and the person you asked was simply being honest with you.
>
> Actually, that could be the club's activities instead.

It could be but I don't personally know of any club in which the whole
membership looks after the repeater. That just doesn't make much sense.

> So what if someone is
> already handling it?

So...someone is already handling it. Someone has been designated.
Someone has it under control. Someone is doing it. Where do you come
in?

> I believed, with thier different facilities, this club
> would be different. But, it was not.

Looks as if you're doomed to a life of disappointments.

> >Maybe you believed you were being courteous. Maybe some folks there
> >thought you were being pushy.
>
> No, thats not what happened.

Filtered through time and through your explanation, it is the way it
appears.

> >It had to be rough, being rejected by radio amateurs AND EE's.
>
> At least that EE was smart enough not to attend the meetings, unlike myself
> (now former EE). He probably didn't know I was an EE and assumed I was a
> typical Ham like everyone else at the meeting. In that case, he was making an
> assumption that Hams are generally non technical. In that case, he was right to
> be snobby.

Maybe he knew that you were (almost) a EE and decided to be snobby
anyway.

> Also, I was offered a project from one Prof of the classes I took, so I think
> it has more to do with Ham radio than EEs. Obviously, I didn't take that offer,
> or I could still be considered an EE.

...or at least a student. The project part doesn't make too much sense.
I have the feeling that we're drifting into one of those situations
where you give us information a little at a time.

> >> It seems the problem is that most Hams aren't interested and those that do
> >> handle these aspects are too snobby to include others.
> >

> >Aren't interested in what? They aren't interested in what YOU want them
> >to be interested in? The self-centered bastards!
>
> Yes, its frustrating. Ham radio is a culture.

Let's see. You're a ham but you want other hams to do what you want to
do. What is keeping you from doing what you want all by yourself?

> Hams like to only do certain
> aspects of the hobby.

That'd be incorrect. Some hams enjoy ATV. Some hams enjoy VHF. Some
hams like to homebrew. Some hams chase DX. Some do all of those
things. What are you--the activities director?

> Also, at the gathering I joined a few weeks ago, I wanted to take a break, but
> the host urged me to operate radios and make contacts.

How cruel and unfeeling of him.

Dave K8MN

1623. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 10:17:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED098AE.C6810342@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67722

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >We'd have never known what you name is if Steve hadn't outted you.
> >You certainly never volunteered it.
>
> I never volunteered my callsign.

...or your name.

> But then, when I asked an antenna lab person
> what his callsign was and he wouldn't give it to me.

What does that have to do with anything here?

> (He said its not "right". I didn't know what he was talking about. It was an
> ungraded lab tour.)

...and I don't know what you're talking about. See, it evens out.

> And I didn't keep my name hidden.

You attempted to do so.

> >.and we know from experience that you have difficulty with quite a
> >number of existing definitions.
>
> Like how many? The word contest, "Ham" radio vs amateur radio, (and Title
> Engineer) are the only definitions I challenged(contested).

I can't provide you an exact number, Vipul. You seem to have difficulty
with the definition of "cult". There's one example. You've also tried
to introduce a number of new terms like "only coder".

Dave K8MN

1624. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 10:46:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED09ECC.613AB9CF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67723

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ECD7B75.AF3322F6@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:

> I noticed that in the specs. It's a hybrid which makes huge sense.
> That takes it out of the "all DSP" category in a big way. I'm very
> leery of the all-DSP rigs so far because I've had some not-so-hot
> experiences with DSP but there is no doubt that the promise is there.
> It hasn't been fulfilled in the particular radios I've used, not even
> close so I'm in a "show me" frame of mind. I've attributed lousy DSP
> to processing speeds which simply ain't high enough yet to compete
> with, for instance, the shape factors of really good xtal filters like
> those INRAD supplies. But once higher-speed chips become available . .
> ? We're in the 8086 days of ham DSP. Maybe even Z-80 days.

The discussion of Ten-Tec's stock four-pole roofing filters vs Inrad's
six pole Orion filters has been a recent TT reflector topic. It seems
that the four-pole units are well chosen for their purpose and that
installing the Inrad filters with their better skirt selectivity can
actually degrade the performance of the Orion.

> > The DSP filter
> > skirts are razor sharp and there's no ringing down to 100 Hz.
>
> . . So far so good . .
>
> > There are FOUR band stacking registers per band making it easy to set
> > one up for CW, SSB, AM, RTTY or whatever your favorites happen to be.
>
> Boy that should save a lotta hassles for mode-hoppers. Me. I have a
> terminal dose of menuitis, drives me nuts.

In Orion's case, the accessing the menus is easy. I just don't want to
have to go to them to change modes.

> > DSP noise reduction (nine levels) is phenomenal.
>
> There's a hot topic. There are apparently major differences in the
> various rigs when it comes to the effectiveness of DSP noise blankers.
> Been a lotta comments about DSP noise abatement implementations
> ranging from superb to useless in the high-end rigs. Beats me.

Don't confuse blankers with the DSP noise reduction. The Orion offers
nine levels of noise reduction, a choice of DSP noise blanker or

hardware noise blanker (multiple levels), Automatic DSP notch and manual DSP notch (featuring adjustable width and adjustable center frequency.

> OK now 'fess up David: What *warts* does the Orion have? Don't be
> silly and tell me it doesn't have any, all xcvrs have notable warts.
> There's lists of MP warts and their fixes out there and some of 'em
> can't be fixed.

There don't appear to be any mechanical warts or any ergonomic warts. In fact, the TT reflector has the usual nit pickers bickering over the lack of a color display and the fonts used. A few (not those who actually HAVE the radio are bitching over fit and finish and over knob eccentricity. The warts I've found are all firmware related. A number have been addressed already. If the passband tuning and AGC settings are able to be retained in the band stacking registers and if a couple of tuning step settings can be modified, I'll be completely satisfied. These can all be accomplished rapidly. I can download them and not have to buy an Orio Pro or Orion ProII :)

Ten-Tec survives by being innovative and responsive to customer desires. The service department bends over backward to assist customers and to achieve rapid turnaround. When I call the company, I'm greeted by a real receptionist and don't get shunted off into an endless loop of menu selections and voice mail boxes.

Dave K8MN

1625. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 11:53:03 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <baqam0$m84$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 67789

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bam27a$1asn2$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...

[snip]

And no answer here, either.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/2003

1626. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 12:48:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EY2Aa.3437$4G.1466182@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250309260.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't mean
that
> they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that the
center
> audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the maximum
> bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make that
300Hz to
> 2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that doesn't
> automatically make their settings optimal.

Still going with the ARRL recommendations is probably the "safest." The
ARRL recommendations would carry more weight with the FCC than a person's
own individual calculation.

However, I personally don't plan to operate on these new frequencies for two
reasons. One, five frequencies is too limiting to the potential number of
QSOs. Two, I don't agree with prohibiting CW on a ham frequency.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1627. Re: FCC takes trips to Vegas from Paying Customers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 14:12:54 UTC
From: Spectrum <Spread@Spreadspectrumnuts.net>
Message-ID: <baqj1svid0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67725

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hff5six.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 25 May 2003 02:08:37 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >I've news for you; it's bigger than the FCC. The whole US
> >government stinks of the culture you speak of.
>
> Not "the whole US government" - only the upper echelon
> decision-makers.
>
> Working-level staff, and even mid-level managers, are never
> invited to attend conferences on the sponsor's nickel. Either
> they use available travel funds (which were never approved
> unless we were doing an enforcement sweep on the show floor) or
> they go there on their own personal funds. Been there, done
> that.
>
> The son of friends of ours worked a year as a "home office"
> intern for a Congressrep. He never got invited either.
>
> Oh, the process is legal - the law allows it under specific
> circumstances.
>
> IIRC the Federal Personnel Manual (Title 5, C.F.R.) requires
> that such invitations to conferences be related to the official
> duties of the invitee, that the conference be open to the public
> as spectators (but not necessarily free of charge), that the
> invitee is a speaker or other integral part of the program, that
> prior approval from the executive level (in the FCC that's Bureau
> Chief or Commissioner) be granted in advance certifying that
> official funds have not been allocated, and that the accounting
> for the reimbursement be open to public inspection under the
> FOIA.
>
> There is no limitation as to where the conference is held
> because it's not on Uncle Sam's nickel. Rest assured that the
> NAB or the IEEE or any other trade or professional organization
> is not going to hold their conferences in North Wastewater.....
> and international broadcast qnd spectrum management conferences
> are not held inside the United States on a regular basis. They
> are held in such places as Paris and Rio and the Spanish coast.
>
> Bill Moyer's TV show on PBS didn't point the above out because
> that would have weakened the attack. The reimbursement process

> was legalized because without it, an auful lot of business
> would never get done. The quality and ethics of the business is
> left as an exercise to the ranter.
>
> It would be an OK process if it was applied fairly and across
> the board, but it isn't, so I agree it's a stinky process as
> carried out.
>
> Illegal it's not until The Congress passes a law saying so. If
> they do, I hope that they will also pass a law allocating the
> funds from the US Treasury so that there is no need to even
> appear beholden to any interest.
>
> Don't hold your breath.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>

Spin, Spin, Spin, Bureaucratic Psycho-Babble.
It IS illegal AND unethical, and no amount of spin or
bureaucratic psycho-babble can change that fact!
But feel free to continue to spin your position, afterall, it
is your right to do so.

Spectrum

1628. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 14:18:18 UTC
From: Spectrum <Spread@Spreadspectrumnuts.net>
Message-ID: <baqjbuet0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67726

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfeaeer.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 24 May 2003 05:05:22 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > Seems likely that all this concern with holding onto all
> > possible spectum for homeland security use will fade with time as
> > needs become clear.
>
> Don't bet on it. It's "theirs" (NTIA's) and they don't want to
> give it away like they were forced to release the microwave
> bands which are going to be auctioned to wireless-networking
> and cell-phone users. A classic case of "I've got mine...."
>
> > So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you
> > guys have been raving about? The stuff that was completely
> > secure, spread spectrum bulletproof and interference immune?
>
> The money in the Homeland Security game is going to build
> bureaucracies, not for equipment and operating funds for the
> agencies who were sucked up in the vacuum and who can't afford
> to buy that stuff any more than the stand-alone pauper agencies
> such as the FCC can.
>

"Pauper Agency" ????!!!!!????
HA HA HA HA HA
ROTFLMAO Public funds in the FCC are mismanaged to
the point that the infamous $600 DOD toilet seat would be
dwarfed. How about $12 for a box of 100 paper clips?

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>

1629. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 14:44:48 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525104448.18941.00000328@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67727

From Larry Roll K3LT:

>I think you'll find that to be a pretty standard response when some newcomer,
>regardless of technical qualifications, shows up and "volunteers" to start
>tweaking an already good working repeater.

Yes, that makes sense.

>I'm sure you were. Unfortunately, there is no good way to be told that
>a repeater group doesn't want another unnecessary pair of hands working
>on their machine!

True.

>This is not uncommon. A lot of what hams do does not lend itself to group
>effort. Perhaps if you offered to lead a club project aimed at those who are
>beginners in the technical arena, you would get a better response.

I tried to start one such club. Its not easy to get started. Finding people
with similar interests, and getting members before the club officially opens is
not easy.

>You're just running into the nature of ham radio. It is very much an
>individual hobby, as opposed to a group activity.

Thats what I believe also.

1630. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 14:56:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525105642.18941.00000330@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67728

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> No, thats not what happened. The person gave me his email. I was courteous
>and
>> didn't hear back from him.
>
>Either the matter slipped his mind,

Could be.

>Have you learned anything from the experience?

No. But, I did learn from the event I went to a few weeks ago. Also, I had fun. There should be more events like that.

>Do you find the concept of "fun" to be strange,
>Vipul?

No. The concept of what Hams find "fun" be strange. <Re-arranged your words.>

>It could be but I don't personally know of any club in which the whole
>membership looks after the repeater. That just doesn't make much sense.

Not whole membership. Just those that are interested (like me). This works well because most arent interested, only a few are.

>Someone is doing it. Where do you come
>in?

I can learn about it.

>Looks as if you're doomed to a life of disappointments.

Life, or Ham radio?

>Maybe he knew that you were (almost) a EE and decided to be snobby
>anyway.

Actually, he did give me a small part later, after I persisted. I didn't take it.

>Let's see. You're a ham but you want other hams to do what you want to
>do. What is keeping you from doing what you want all by yourself?

Any project requires a group or the project will take a long time. Hams already help with Antenna setups, something that would take too much work for one person.

1631. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 15:04:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525110430.18941.00000331@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67729

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Are you waiting for somone to spoon feed it to you, Vippy? That's sure
>what it seems like here!

No, I would do my share.

>Yes...Taking a day off, ESPECIALLY on a Friday and ESPECIALLY to go to a
>Ham Radio related event makes sense to me.

Okay. Thats UR idea of fun. Not <most> people's.

> To be a "former EE" you must have at one time BEEN an EE.

Yes, I worked as an EE.

>Remember how you "refused" to ID yourself as an Amateur in the "EE class
>you were allegedly taking? Well, Mr. EE didn't want to be in a group of Hams
>and be identified with YOU. THAT says something.

Maybe antenna lab person saw through me and realized I was not suficiently Ham
like. Mr. EE did give me a small part of his project later, after I persisted.
The part of the project was too small, so I decided not to do it.

>>Also, at the gathering I joined a few weeks ago, I wanted to take a break,
>>but
>>the host urged me to operate radios and make contacts.

> How DARE he encourae you to operate the radios! The PIG!

I already operated the radios. It was a vacation spot. I wanted to do other
things.

1632. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 15:08:18 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525110818.18941.00000332@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 67730

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> I am of the opinion that if I knew you in person I probably wouldn't
>want
>to tell YOU anything about me either.

The gathering I went to a week ago was a whole weekend long. I was re-invited
to their next gathering of this type.

1633. The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 16:13:06 UTC
From: Arch Stanton <Nate4metalshop@att.net>
Message-ID: <3ed0eb98@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

As I type this, the 14.313 Kooks are at it again.

You have the screwball from Evansville ghost-talking
to long dead hams and fictitious stations, #2 and #3
Mr. CW's calling CQ ad-nausea, comments from
what sounds like the infamous "bathroom man"
and many others.

Another typical Sunday morning showtime on 14.313 !

I will make note however, of one *very special* veteran
nutcase who is on 313 right now. It's the kook who is playing
the gospel and country western music I'm hearing.

Everyone knows exactly just who this guy who plays music is.
He's been associated with 14.313 for many years, going
back to the days of the infamous 20 Meter Wars orchestrated
by a now-defunct ham.

Still not sure? Well, our music player is located
in the southeastern USA. If you look at his ham
shack photo on QRZ.com you will see an
inordinate amount of home entertainment
and related audio mixing equipment.
All that stuff is not there for "window dressings" folks......

My question is, when the heck is Mr. Hollingsworth
going to *do his job* and bust this Jake-the-Fake
with another $10K fine, just like he did to
another legendary "14.313 luminary" of
days gone past...?

We are waiting RH.................

1634. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 16:39:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Wk6Aa.3660$4G.1501426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 67732
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Arch Stanton" <Nate4metalshop@att.net> wrote in message
news:3ed0eb98@snipnews.snip.net...
> As I type this, the 14.313 Kooks are at it again.
>
> You have the screwball from Evansville ghost-talking
> to long dead hams and fictitious stations, #2 and #3
> Mr. CW's calling CQ ad-nausea, comments from
> what sounds like the infamous "bathroom man"
> and many others.
>
> Another typical Sunday morning showtime on 14.313 !
>
> I will make note however, of one *very special* veteran
> nutcase who is on 313 right now. It's the kook who is playing
> the gospel and country western music I'm hearing.
>
> Everyone knows exactly just who this guy who plays music is.
> He's been associated with 14.313 for many years, going
> back to the days of the infamous 20 Meter Wars orchestrated
> by a now-defunct ham.
>
> Still not sure? Well, our music player is located
> in the southeastern USA. If you look at his ham
> shack photo on QRZ.com you will see an
> inordinate amount of home entertainment
> and related audio mixing equipment.
> All that stuff is not there for "window dressings" folks......
>
> My question is, when the heck is Mr. Hollingsworth
> going to *do his job* and bust this Jake-the-Fake
> with another $10K fine, just like he did to
> another legendary "14.313 luminary" of
> days gone past...?
>
> We are waiting RH.................
>
>
>

Record it, document it, and send it all to the FCC. How are they going to
know it's happening until someone reports it?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1635. Re: FCC takes trips to Vegas from Paying Customers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 17:35:52 UTC
From: Corrupt Federal Government <Truth@truthnowalways.edu>
Message-ID: <bar0bg$n8l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67734

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hff5six.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 25 May 2003 02:08:37 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >I've news for you; it's bigger than the FCC. The whole US
> >government stinks of the culture you speak of.
>
> Not "the whole US government" - only the upper echelon
> decision-makers.

No. This not true at all. In agencies, such as the FCC,
it is exactly at the lower most levels where fraud, waste, and
abuse is at its greatest. Upper level managers are under too
much scrutiny. This is based on FOI reports obtained via
the Congressional route, which we have examined.

>
> Working-level staff, and even mid-level managers, are never
> invited to attend conferences on the sponsor's nickel. Either
> they use available travel funds (which were never approved
> unless we were doing an enforcement sweep on the show floor) or
> they go there on their own personal funds. Been there, done
> that.
>

Again, not true! It is the working level staff and mid-level
managers who are abusing official credit cards and padding
travel claims. Been there, saw it on GAO repors.

> The son of friends of ours worked a year as a "home office"
> intern for a Congressrep. He never got invited either.

Which Congress rep. ???

>
> Oh, the process is legal - the law allows it under specific
> circumstances.

No it is not legal, or ethical.

>
> IIRC the Federal Personnel Manual (Title 5, C.F.R.) requires
> that such invitations to conferences be related to the official
> duties of the invitee, that the conference be open to the public
> as spectators (but not necessarily free of charge), that the
> invitee is a speaker or other integral part of the program, that
> prior approval from the executive level (in the FCC that's Bureau

> Chief or Commissioner) be granted in advance certifying that
> official funds have not been allocated, and that the accounting
> for the reimbursement be open to public inspection under the
> FOIA.
>

The above is rubbish! Does not even apply to what is
the issue. Errr, is this what bureaucrats refer to as, "If you
can't convince them, then snow them in B.S."? Sorry, doesn't
hold water here, or anywhere.

> There is no limitation as to where the conference is held
> because it's not on Uncle Sam's nickel. Rest assured that the
> NAB or the IEEE or any other trade or professional organization
> is not going to hold their conferences in North Wastewater.....
> and international broadcast qnd spectrum management conferences
> are not held inside the United States on a regular basis. They
> are held in such places as Paris and Rio and the Spanish coast.

What does this have to do with anything?

>
> Bill Moyer's TV show on PBS didn't point the above out because
> that would have weakened the attack. The reimbursement process
> was legalized because without it, an auful lot of business
> would never get done. The quality and ethics of the business is
> left as an exercise to the ranter.

You are ranting incoherently here. Again, what does this have
to do with anything? For that matter, what in the world are you
talking about?

>
> It would be an OK process if it was applied fairly and across
> the board, but it isn't, so I agree it's a stinky process as
> carried out.

Fair? Nothing is fair in the bloated federal bureaucracy. It
is always who you know and what you have on them, in order
to coerce them to get what you want.

>
> Illegal it's not until The Congress passes a law saying so. If
> they do, I hope that they will also pass a law allocating the
> funds from the US Treasury so that there is no need to even
> appear beholden to any interest.

Not illegal? Since when? Based on what? Perhaps liberal
big government myths which the sheeple never question, but never
legal or ethical, never! What law did Congress pass? When?

>
> Don't hold your breath.

I'm not. Are You?

>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>

73 de Spectum (Truth)
net held nightly on 3827
All are welcome, even Liberals!

1636. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 17:42:22 UTC
From: Corrupt Federal Government <Truth@truthnowalways.edu>
Message-ID: <bar0bi$n8l$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67735

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hff6qtz.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sat, 24 May 2003 15:50:14 -0400, Spectrum wrote:
>
> >Lets put it this way, I bet a dollar that Phil is no fan of Rush
> >Limbaugh.
>
> You're damn right - and neither am I a fan of any so-called
> "liberal" commentator/talkshow clown either.
>

There are no "liberal" commentators that last, except on PBS
where they are financed with taxpayer money. Mr. Limbaugh
has attracted and held the largest audience in the history of talk radio
and WITHOUT ONE PENNY OF TAXPAYER MONEY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

> A pox on both houses.

What are you ranting about? SARS? Pox was
eliminated years ago.

>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>

1637. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 17:53:16 UTC
From: nobodybutme <nbm@aol.com>
Message-ID: <a78553fd478dd256576e93b7137992c2@TeraNews>
Source record: 67733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I'm sure that's been done hundreds of times by now. I was listening to the same old 14.313 antics 10+ years ago, then I grew up and moved on to more mature interests.

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:Wk6Aa.3660$4G.1501426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

> Record it, document it, and send it all to the FCC. How are they going to
> know it's happening until someone reports it?

1638. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 17:58:54 UTC
From: Corrupt Federal Government <Truth@truthnowalways.edu>
Message-ID: <bar0bl$n8l$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67736

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hff6jvy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 24 May 2003 11:53:39 -0700, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >> Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
> >> matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
> >> all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
> >> think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
> >> drives them.
> >
> >That's a mighty big blanket statement, Phil. Do you really believe
> >this applies to ALL who disagree with the FCC's way of "gettin' it
> >dun?"
>
> Anyone can agree or disagree with anything they want. The
> anti-FCC-ers that I have dealt with are, overwhelmingly,
> unaware of the process and how the agency works and what its
> good points and shortcomings are. All they see is "big
> government" and anyone who doesn;t agree with them is an
> "apologist".

Liberals are noted for saying you can agree or disagree
with me, as long as you see it my way.

>
> In my book the Satchell Paige Criterion applies to them.

They stopped selling insurance years ago.

>
> Maybe it's because I've been working the process, both "inside"
> and "outside" that leads me to the practical approach - "these"
> are the rules and "this" is how we get what you want working
> within the rules and "that" is how we get the rules changed if
> you can't get what you want. Calling the FCC or its
> protagonists or its antagonists or anyone else names or
> mounting ad hominem attacks on them will not get that done.

The only "practical" view is that the U.S. Constitution is the
supreme law of the land. I didn't say it was so. The Founding
Fathers said it over 200 years ago.

>
> >> Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
> >> pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
> >> the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,

> >> and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
> >> the action causes personal harm.
> >
> >This would be a good thing if the "commish's" legislative process were
> >more...well, more...American. (Checks & balances?)
>
> Read what I posted. The "checks and balances" are there.
> The FCC does not have the final word - both the courts and The
> Congress can, and during the history of the FCC quite often did,
> overrule the FCC's decisions.

Federal bureaucratic agencies do not deal in "checks and
balances." They rule by fiat, and this is EXACTLY what makes
them unconstitutional.

>
> What other "checks and balances" are you thinking of?

Uhhhh, lets start with those in the U.S. Constitution. And while
you are at it, please refer me to the part of the U.S. Constitution
which SPECIFICALLY authorizes a federal bureaucracy and
bureaucratic agencies such as a FCC. Oh, I forgot, liberals believe
we have an "elastic" Constitution. That is why liberals have
brought us such atrocities as Roe v. Wade and school bussing,
and tell us the Second Ammendment is a "group" right and not an
individual right. Sorry, that doesn't float, except maybe in the
Socialist Republic of California and on the left coast.

>
> As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
> it's over and even then it may not be over.
>
You got that right, and Yogi was no big government liberal!
Ever hear of Judge Moore? Remember that name. He
is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama, a fine
gentleman and an American hero.

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
Spectrum (Truth)
ref 378xxd42d
xxx applicable

1639. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:04:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bar0hs$bi2$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67737
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

He is right 'Dee'. Nothing is done. Same jammers, same illegal stations.
Same Same. Only thing gone is the fools that used their calls.

Dan/W4NTI

"nobodybutme" <nbm@aol.com> wrote in message
news:a78553fd478dd256576e93b7137992c2@TeraNews...
> I'm sure that's been done hundreds of times by now. I was listening to the
> same old 14.313 antics 10+ years ago, then I grew up and moved on to more
> mature interests.
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:Wk6Aa.3660$4G.1501426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> > Record it, document it, and send it all to the FCC. How are they going
to
> > know it's happening until someone reports it?
>
>
>

1640. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:24:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525142441.14837.00000229@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67738

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd2i6l.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 24 May 2003 00:24:35 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Now we're back to one code test speed and three license classes - just like
>>before the 1951 restructuring. Go figure.
>
> "What goes around comes around"......

I prefer Joni Mitchell singing "Circle Game"

73 de Jim, N2EY

1641. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:24:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525142443.14837.00000230@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67742

In article <b7d1465c.0305241053.4c915f82@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hfcjfpa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> On 23 May 2003 09:41:14 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >Perhaps this is one reason some citizens are so anti-FCC.
>>
>> Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
>> matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
>> all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
>> think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
>> drives them.
>
>That's a mighty big blanket statement, Phil. Do you really believe
>this applies to ALL who disagree with the FCC's way of "gettin' it
>dun?"

I wouldn't say it applies to all, but it does apply to most. IMHO, anyway. Still, it just doesn't sit right that that The Commish can propose one thing in an NPRM, then enact something completely different.

>
>> >Commission can propose one thing but enact something completely
>> >different, without having to reopen the rulemaking process. Some folks
>> >might say it's like offering one thing for sale but then supplying
>> >something else after you place your order.
>>
>> Not in the least, and thank goodness that the Commish'
>> occasionally realizes that what the petitioner proposed was bad
>> policy and should be changed.

I'm talking about when the Commission proposes something itself. For example, the restructuring NPRM proposed keeping the Advanced and increased the written tests. Also included requirements of how many questions on each subject would be in each test element. The R&O dumped Advanced and eliminated the content requirements. Huh?

>> We have had a bunch of those in
>> the ARS over the years.
>
>Agreed.

Recall also the Errata to 98-143 which was even more confusing than the original NPRM.
>

>> Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
>> pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
>> the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
>> and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
>> the action causes personal harm.

When's the last time a petition for reconsideration or an appellate court ruling caused a change in Part 97?

Showing personal harm is pretty difficult, wouldn't you say?

I recall how the Wormser, Adsit, Dinelli petition was handled by FCC, particularly the sloppiness of language. It didn't foster confidence in the system.
>
>This would be a good thing if the "commish's" legislative process were
>more...well, more...American. (Checks & balances?)

Exactly.

FCC is also in the process of enacting limitations on petitions they consider repetitive.
>
>> There have been several station
>> licensing cases (one that I am intimately familiar with) that have
>> kicked around between the FCC and the courts for over 30 years.
>
>Is this something to be proud of?

Depends on the case. I doubt they are amateur licensing cases. Besides, Phil may not be at liberty to speak about them.
>
>> >Thoughts, anyone?
>>
>> As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
>> it's over and even then it may not be over.

It's Deja Vu all over again.

Here in Philly we had By Saam, who announced the Phillies for many years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1642. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:24:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525142444.14837.00000231@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67741

In article <3ED09ECC.613AB9CF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>There don't appear to be any mechanical warts or any ergonomic warts.
>In fact, the TT reflector has the usual nit pickers bickering over the
>lack of a color display and the fonts used. A few (not those who
>actually HAVE the radio are bitching over fit and finish and over knob
>eccentricity. The warts I've found are all firmware related. A number
>have been addressed already. If the passband tuning and AGC settings
>are able to be retained in the band stacking registers and if a couple
>of tuning step settings can be modified, I'll be completely satisfied.
>These can all be accomplished rapidly. I can download them and not have
>to buy an Orio Pro or Orion ProII :)

Really cool. TT started that game with the Pegasus and it just keeps getting
sweeter.

Elecraft does something similar with their firmware, but it's not free. They
keep a database on the firmware in every rig they've ever sold. If you buy an
accessory that will work better with a newer firmware version than what you
have, they send you a new chip free. Otherwise you have to buy the new chip.
The new K2DSP accessory is user-reprogrammable, too.
>
>Ten-Tec survives by being innovative and responsive to customer desires.
>The service department bends over backward to assist customers and to
>achieve rapid turnaround. When I call the company, I'm greeted by a
>real receptionist and don't get shunted off into an endless loop of menu
>selections and voice mail boxes.
>
Yup. They also support rigs that they don't make anymore. I dunno if they will
continue their boardswap service with the Orion. In previous rigs, if you had
or suspected a bad board in your rig, TT sent a replacement, and you swapped
'em out, sending the bad board back. No shipping the whole rig, and they'd
trust you to ship the bad one when you got the good one.

As I recall, TT started up in 1968, when all of the old-line ham manufacturers
were packing it in. They started out making cute little QRP CW transceivers.
Digi-Key started out about the same time, selling RTL chips and kits to make IC
keyers (hence the name).

73 de Jim, N2EY

1643. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:24:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525142445.14837.00000232@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67740

In article <3ECF65C4.ADAF92F6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Ah yes, but what of the third order intercept points? What about the
>noise floor? What happens if you activate the noise blanker? Arno
>OH7XM (see below) brought his TS-50 to Botswana. You should have seen
>the thing fold up when hooked to a 2 element 40m beam. It sounded
>pretty good when a dipole was connected.

There can be a BIG difference between lab tests and real-world conditions. For example, BDR measurements are usually made by tuning in a weak "wanted" signal, putting a strong "unwanted" signal a certain number of kHz away (usually 20 kHz) and then increasing the unwanted signal until the copy of the wanted signal is degraded by the unwanted signal. Great test for how well the rx behaves in the presence of a single strong unwanted signal. But what about when the band is full of dozens of strong signals, none of which is strong enough by itself to cause degradation of the wanted signal? Depending on the rx design, the results can be very different.
>
>> The 200 Hz filter in the 75S-3B is probably the worst filter
>> I've ever used. Tried to use.

The 75S3-C at W3ABT/N3KZ had one of those. Rang like mad. My homebrew FT-241A filter was better.

>> The meatball only tunes 200 Khz segemnts
>> and it goes downhill from there. Donkey rcvr to the core by today's
>> reckonings.

All depends what you want in a receiver.

The real test is to compare rx's side-by-side in the same real-world conditions and see which copies a given signal better.
>>
>> . . . has to do with the proclivity we all have for looking behind us
>> with the rose-colored glasses. Until the lab reports pee on the parade
>> and impose the reality checks.
>
>OH7XM is a fellow who does factory repair of Icom, Yaesu and Kenwood
>equipment in Finland. In '97 he came to my place with a calibrated test
>oscillator to run some comparative measurements on my Omni VI and his
>TS-870 along with OH2MM's FT-1000MP. The Omni VI held its own but did
>show some filter leakage. For grins, Arno hooked the oscillator to my
>KWM-2A. It blew the other rigs away. Yes, you had to tune it up. Yes,
>it had those 200 KHz segments and yes, it had a tighter receiver.

"If it happens, it must be possible".

>Of course when you mention the C-Line, I assume that the words "Sherwood
>modified" preceed it. That stuff is *still* competitive.
>
Yup.

Here's another data point - the second place entry (single op, low power, probably the most competitive class) in the Nov. CW SS (NP2B) ran a pair of K2/100s. Total rig cost about $2500. Yes, there's an advantage in that callsign, and he prolly had nice antennas, but do you think everybody he beat spent less?

--

Let's see...how many tube sockets do I have to sell to buy an Orion?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1644. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:24:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525142446.14837.00000233@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 67739

In article <d22b54c3.0305241948.610620fa@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030524182432.04554.00000145@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>
>> Back during the comment period, I was amazed at how many active hams had
>> little idea of what was being proposed. And despite the ECFS system and
>> lots of
>> explanations about how to comment, there were less than 2500 total comments
>> and reply comments to 98-143.
>
>Nobody lost anything via 98-143 plus in general the earlier creation
>of the nocode ticket paved the way for the concept of reduced code
>speed tests. 98-143 was for the most part a snoozer in the general ham
>population.

Interesting point! Even if we count the closed-out license classes as losses, they pale in comparison to the changes of 1968-69.

>> Back in the '60s, when everything was by mail and
>> there were only 250K US hams, FCC got over 6000 comments about incentive
>> licensing.
>
>No surprise there, everybody who held a General or Conditional - which
>was the huge majority of us then - lost prime space on top of being
>barred from the expanded phone bands.

"Expanded phone bands"?

Let's see - there were about 250,000 US hams back then. Of those, there were only about 4,000 Extras. Yep, a lot of interest....
>
>The number of complaints regulators get on NPRMs goes up exponentially
>in proportion the the number of wounded revised regs generate. There
>is no comparison in this respect between the impacts of 98-143 and
>Incentive Licensing.
>
Agreed.

But look at the converse of that statement. Lots of people, hams as well as prospective hams, stood to gain a lot by the restructuring. Heck, the ARRL proposal would have handed a free General upgrade to every Novice and Tech Plus on the books (that's over 175,000 hams!)

More important, the restructuring did not result in a flood of new hams. And as K2UNK points out, for some reason a relatively small percentage (~15%) of Advanceds have upgraded.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1645. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:43:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED10F43.9C70A6D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67743

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> No, thats not what happened. The person gave me his email. I was courteous
> >and
> >> didn't hear back from him.
> >>
> >Either the matter slipped his mind,
>
> Could be.
>
> >Have you learned anything from the experience?
>
> No.

Sorry to hear that.

> But, I did learn from the event I went to a few weeks ago. Also, I had fun.
> There should be more events like that.

> >Do you find the concept of "fun" to be strange,
> >Vipul?
>
> No. The concept of what Hams find "fun" be strange. <Re-arranged your words.>

Right. This seems to be another instance where you're okay but whatever
a group of hams believe to be fun is "strange".

> >It could be but I don't personally know of any club in which the whole
> >membership looks after the repeater. That just doesn't make much sense.
>
> Not whole membership. Just those that are interested (like me). This works well
> because most arent interested, only a few are.

Just because you are interested doesn't mean that the club is interested
in having another set of hands tweaking the repeater.

> >Someone is doing it. Where do you come
> >in?
>
> I can learn about it.

You may have the cart before the horse.

> >Looks as if you're doomed to a life of disappointments.
>

> Life, or Ham radio?

I can only surmise that the same peculiar logic which governs your thinking about amateur radio also governs your thinking in the other things which you do.

> >Maybe he knew that you were (almost) a EE and decided to be snobby
> >anyway.
>
> Actually, he did give me a small part later, after I persisted. I didn't take
> it.

So you wheedled until he gave in and then turned down the project? See my comments above about a life of disappointment.

> >Let's see. You're a ham but you want other hams to do what you want to
> >do. What is keeping you from doing what you want all by yourself?
>
> Any project requires a group or the project will take a long time.

I've seen projects involving a group take several times longer than it would take a single individual.

Hams already
> help with Antenna setups, something that would take too much work for one
> person.

For some hams, that is indeed the case. That certainly depends on what is being erected and what supports are available. I can raise and lower any antenna on the two towers here quite easily with no help. Back in the days when I had no towers and relied on wires in trees, I could still do it all with no help. Even erecting the towers required the assistance of only one retired ironworker with a farm tractor. What we really could have used was a sidewalk superintendent like Len Anderson...but then we would have had to install a sidewalk and it just seemed like too much work.

Dave K8MN

1646. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:49:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfg3m40.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67745
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 24 May 2003 15:51:34 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:

>Make "white noise" by blowing at your mic. Have him take a look
>at the width of your signal. Also do a test in AM mode (so your
>carrier shows up on his display) so he knows where your
>suppressed carrier really is. If the 10dB down skirts of your
>signal don't exceed say 2.8KHz you should be acceptable. And
>2.6KHz 3 dB down. From 200 to 2800Hz.

Where does the "10 dB down" come from? The acceptred standard
for measuring occupied bandwidth is 26 dB down.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1647. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:49:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfg6ao3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67744

On Sat, 24 May 2003 23:34:24 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> >The same ZERO maintenance is today widespread throughout
>> >the telecommunications industry. Why? Because we have found that
>> >today's equipment is rock stable and that doing "periodic" maintence
>> >measurements causes more problems than it finds. The same
>> >is true for the vast array of consumer products.
>>
>> "ZERO maintenance"...?!?! Where are you getting THAT, Bill?
>
>Personal history and a 30+ year career in telephony is where I get that.

And the fact that the industry is no longer under a regulatory
scheme where the cost of maintenance would be plugged into the
rate-base and in today's unregulated or rate-capped models the
rule is to not expend any more than is absoluteley necessary to
provide minimum-quality service has nothing to do with it?

>> Yes,
>> decreasing maintenence IS an engineering goal, and many devices (including
>> cellphones) are essentially throw-away items when they fail. But not so
>bigger
>> assets.
>
>I can tell you that most telcom gear has literally NO maintenance
>associated with. It is all self diagnostic and has literally no or
>at most only minor adjustments that can be made to it.

Self-diagnostics ARE maintenance. Just not human hands-on
maintenance.

When your (or my) Kenwood becomes self-checking, I can see not
having to do periodic "to ensure proper operation" tests.
Until then, I borrow the use of necessary test equipment from
time to time to show me what I expected - that I have no
problems.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1648. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:49:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfg4891.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67746

On Sat, 24 May 2003 16:56:13 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"
>
>Because the manufacturer built it to those specs and, there
>has not been any long term empirical evidence that suggests
>I should be concerned.

Do you remember the joke from engineering school about
measuring the secondary voltage of a power transformer
by reading the nameplate? Same thing.

>Do you have your auto speedometer calibrated or do you believe it
>will stay pretty accurate for the life of the vehicle.

As a matter of fact, the Auto Club in both Northern and
Southern California has speedo test facilities available at
nominal charge and I used to take my cars there four times a
year "just for grins". The results: the speedo was off a few
mph (in the driver's favor) but the "few" varied over time.
Nylon drive gears do not last forever.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1649. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 18:52:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfg5rm2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67747

On Sat, 24 May 2003 23:25:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>The unprotected sex act can result in a life long problem or worse
>yet, paying for it with your life. An FCC notice is something
>easily managed and of far less consequence..

I prefer not to have to deal with either at any time.

>The fact that the FCC has
>never added any certification requirements for some 80 or more years
>indicates there has been no serious problem that would tend to
>lead to such a mandate.

At one time there was a specific rule that mandated that all
signal components be contained within the authorized
bands/subbands. This appears to have been transmogrified into
a general rule [s. 97.103(a)] that the operator and
licensee are responsible for ensuring that the station is
operated in compliance with the Rules.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1650. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:02:16 UTC
From: Nutley Nood <nnood5ff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ed12150@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 67748
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Agreed Dan. As another fine example
there are jammers on 3.865 and 3.898
that have been screwing around up there for years!

Seems to me that the FCC and Mr. Hollingsworth
both are nothing more than * Paper Tigers * who make
speeches every now and then to make us seem to
all feel better. (better known as the warm-fuzzies approach)

Thanks Dan and good health 2-U :)

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bar0hs$bi2$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> He is right 'Dee'. Nothing is done. Same jammers, same illegal stations.
> Same Same. Only thing gone is the fools that used their calls.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "nobodybutme" <nbm@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:a78553fd478dd256576e93b7137992c2@TeraNews...
> > I'm sure that's been done hundreds of times by now. I was listening to
the
> > same old 14.313 antics 10+ years ago, then I grew up and moved on to
more
> > mature interests.
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:Wk6Aa.3660$4G.1501426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > > Record it, document it, and send it all to the FCC. How are they
going
> to
> > > know it's happening until someone reports it?
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1651. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:03:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525160319.23745.00000199@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67749

In article <baomev$m6q$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030524141521.15462.00000208@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> In article <bam508$7g$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030523013238.16581.00000197@mb-m17.aol.com...
>> >> In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> >> >> In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>> >> >> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> >> >> >> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> >> >> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
>> >> >> >> filters?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
>> >> >> >that answer.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
>> >> >> counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a
>> >> >> dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.
>> >> >
>> >> >Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.
>> >>
>> >> TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
>> >> of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?
>> >
>> >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
>> >to make any specific measurements. The rules require
>> >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
>> >spec I don't have to measure anything.

>>
>> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"
>
>Because the manufacturer built it to those specs and, there
>has not been any long term empirical evidence that suggests
>I should be concerned. Do you have your auto speedometer
>calibrated or do you believe it will stay pretty
>accurate for the life of the vehicle.

Bill, amateur radio equipment isn't built to Bell Standards to
guarantee a useful life of 30+ years continuous service. :-)

As to "auto speedometer calibrations," I just check it out
on the various highway stretches marked as specific for
a certain distance. Done it that way for years on the
highways from Pacific coast through mountain zone and
through most of the midwest states. Indicated speedometer
rate will vary according to tire wear. Our little travel
calculator is also a four-function arithmetic calculator, makes
it a snap to compute actual speed with time through a marked
zone. Time through a zone timed to the second with a digital
watch (Timex) kept calibrated with a portable radio clock updating
automatically every 24 hours with WWVB (Oregon Scientific). :-)

>> Laying-on of hands is not sufficient.
>
>It is for me and there's NO FCC rule requiring otherwise.

Don't get up-tight, Bill. You aren't being charged with
anything. :-)

>> If someone in a QSO says "your signal is good" that isn't
>> a qualifier on frequency or filter bandpass or much of
>> anything else. A "599" signal report is commonly heard
>> but it isn't really that good everywhere all the time, is it? :-)
>
>If my frequency is not where I should be I think the
>other ham would know that. As to my filter bandpass,
>I think if I was spitting out a 6KHz SSB signal that someone would likly
>notice. The reality is that commercial ham rigs have an excellent
>track record of doing what they are supposed to with zero maintenace.

Okay...do we mark you down as a "Believer" then? :-)

>The same ZERO maintenance is today widespread throughout
>the telecommunications industry. Why?

Having done some design work FOR the telecommunications
industry I will agree with you in general. But, you are arguing
a "zero defects" situation and my empirical observation over
a half century says there ain't NO such thing as "zero defects."

Why are MTBF values ever calculated? With that "zero defect"
claim there would be NO failures and the mean time would be
infinite. Not so.

The whole "zero defects" philosophy is a GOAL, Bill, something
to shoot for, to improve the state of the art, to eliminate as many
maintenance folks as possible (they cost a telecom company
money).

>Because we have found that
>today's equipment is rock stable and that doing "periodic" maintence
>measurements causes more problems than it finds.

"Rock stable?!?" Bill, were you ever involved in metrology? :-)

I never mentioned "periodic maintenance," Bill. I just questioned
your knowledge (or any ready-built equipment owner's knowledge)
of how they KNOW their equipment is exactly within specified
parameters. Pretty advertising brochures and thick technospeak
specification sheets are just paper and ink...they don't reference
the actual performance of your particular ready-built equipment
other than a manufacturer's word on it.

If you want to take a manufacturer's WORD for something without
checking it, that's your perogative. No problem to me...unless you
interfere with what I am doing through improper operation. Then
it's up to the FCC and the FCC demands tests of equipment to
insure compliance with the law.

>The same is true for the vast array of consumer products.

Well, then, you ought to write the FCC and say they don't have
to do all that type acceptance testing...they can just take the
manufacturer's WORD that they comply with the law! :-)

While we are at it, we can also eliminate a whole standards
division within NIST and just take all manufacturer's WORDS
that they are "rock solid" stable and don't do any badness.

>> In Subpart D of Part 97 (all paragraphs of 97.3nn) there is
>> nothing about "measurement" but there are a whole heap
>> of "shalls" on signal emission. Each one of those "shall"
>> statements applies to the individual licensee. The FCC
>> gives all licensees considerable latitude on HOW they do
>> their "shall" thing but the bottom line is that each licensee
>> SHALL be within technical standards.
>
>Your point? The fact is, that there is NO rule that mandates
>I measure anything. I am responsible for my signal and I accept that.
>What's the worst thing that could happen? I get a note from
>the FCC telling me that my signal was out of band, that I had too
>broad a signal, etc? In the old tube days with simple VFO's
>that happened far more than with today's digitally programed
>rigs. 30 years ago what happen could afford a frequency

>counter? Accuracy today is incredible when compared to
>the 50s/60s.

As one who did metrology for a living in the 1960s, I agree that
overall accuracy has improved by several orders of magnitude.
It isn't perfect, though, and "zero defects" is a concept, a goal
to reach for, not something we can take for granted.

Today is not the "old tube days" either and those five little
60m micro-bands of FCC 03-105 are specified rather tight.

If you want to lay eyes on some "perfect" appearing numerical
digits on a display and Believe in them being "rock solid" and
that your transmitted RF is Believed to stay within the 2.8 KHz
legal specification, then fine with me. That's NOT any sort of
test of performance. It is just a Belief System.

>> >> No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
>> >> the licensee are responsible.
>> >
>> >Agreed. That does not, however, require any periodic or
>> >speciifc measurements to be made by me.
>>
>> So...you have NO way of knowing if you are operating
>> responsibly as to technical characteristics of your RF
>> emissions?
>
>Nor does over 90% of licensed hams.

Okay, that's about 560 thousand licensees. Was there a poll
of that many re-affirming that? :-)

>> Not acceptible in a technical activity, Bill. The law is the
>> law and Phil just recently reminded everyone that "ignorance
>> is not an excuse."
>
>The law sez I am responsible for my signal. The law does
>not proscribe any specific measurments, calibration or
>testing I must do to be a ham. Again, I accept the
>responsibility for my signal and operate as I see fit.

Okay...do we put you down as a Believer then? :-)

>I do NOT need to measure my actual signal to be confident that
>my signal meets specs. Do you measure your microwave
>to be sure it isn't eminating RF beyond the specs permitted
>for such devices (be the specs mandated by FCC, OSHA or whatever)?

Yes I did. A new Amana over-the-range-with-vent-hood model
microwave was installed with lots of other things on our
southern house kitchen complete make-over three years ago.
Borrowed a nice little portable spectrum analyzer (in calibration,
by the way) over a weekend to check it out. No problems on

radiation leakage, didn't even budge a wideband E-H Field
Monitor. Found out the halogen light under-counter wall wart
switcher tossed out too much EMI for my taste and replaced
it with an ordinary 12 VAC transformer. The 2.4 GHz cordless
telephone tested okay, too. :-)

>I have consistently stated and accept responsibility
>for my signal. What don't you understand about that.

Okay, you can sense RF performance by the Laying On of
Hands. Fine. :-)

>I know enough about the cross section of amateur demographics
>to believe that few hams have the test equipment you would expect
>to use to verify compliance.

I don't expect anything of the "cross section of amateur
demographics," Bill. If any of those "cross section" folks
are in technical violation of the radio regulations, courts aren't
going to take Belief System opinions as metrological tests.

>> FCC 03-105 give US amateurs five micro-bands, each with less
>> than 3 KHz bandwidth. That is tight with a capital T. In order to
>> operate there legally, it would take some measurements of
>> several parts of an amateur transmitter to insure compliance
>> with the law.
>
>Bull. I'm certain the FCC fully expects the vast array of commercial
>ham gear to be no problem as that equipment operates with similar
>specs today. As before, if in operation on 60m, the FCC were to
>cite me for improper operation, I'd then take whatever response was
>necessary. Until then, however, I have every confidence that my
>Kenwood operates just fine per the specs.

Whatever you say. :-)

>I HAVE NEVER TAKEN ANY STANCE OTHER
>THAN FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR MY SIGNAL.

OK. :-)

>> >> US Hams didn't have them before
>> >> 14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away from all of
>> >> you.
>> >
>> >If there's a point you're making on that statement,
>> >it eludes me.
>>
>> Really? :-)
>>
>> US radio amateurs had 9 bands below 30 MHz on 13 May 2003
>> with a total bandwidth of 2.75 MHz. FCC 03-105 added 14 KHz
>> to that total bandwidth, an increase of 0.5%.

>>
>> Seems like there's a whole heap of bitching, moaning, whining,
>> ranting, shouting about that half-percent increase. :-)
>
>I'm not complaining. I think it's great.

Let me correct a mistyped numerical value. 3.75 MHz of total
US MF-HF bandspace allocated to US radio amateurs, not
2.75 MHz. :-)

Okay, the FCC allocated a total of 14 KHz of 60m bandspace
instead of ARRL's request of 150 KHz contiguous. US amateurs
got less than 10% of the requested bandspace. That's still more
than all the available bandspace on MF-HF as of 13 May 2003,
right?

>> Well then, just address your complaints to the FCC. You have
>> their address. Come to think of it, you were there at least once.
>> :-)
>
>It's not catastrophic and I'm sure the clarity will be found via the
>pages of CQ and QST magazine.

There ya go! Look to the magazines instead of the Federal
Register. If it's in real ink on real paper, everyone can absolutely
trust ARRL to interpret radio law, right? :-)

1652. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:15:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED12421.9CA65588@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67750

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3ED09ECC.613AB9CF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >There don't appear to be any mechanical warts or any ergonomic warts.
> >In fact, the TT reflector has the usual nit pickers bickering over the
> >lack of a color display and the fonts used. A few (not those who
> >actually HAVE the radio are bitching over fit and finish and over knob
> >eccentricity. The warts I've found are all firmware related. A number
> >have been addressed already. If the passband tuning and AGC settings
> >are able to be retained in the band stacking registers and if a couple
> >of tuning step settings can be modified, I'll be completely satisfied.
> >These can all be accomplished rapidly. I can download them and not have
> >to buy an Orio Pro or Orion ProII :)
>
> Really cool. TT started that game with the Pegasus and it just keeps getting
> sweeter.

It is like having the bottle genie tell you that you have unlimited
wishes. Just type the words "I wish my Orion did..." and *poof* it is
done.

> Elecraft does something similar with their firmware, but it's not free. They
> keep a database on the firmware in every rig they've ever sold. If you buy an
> accessory that will work better with a newer firmware version than what you
> have, they send you a new chip free. Otherwise you have to buy the new chip.

I don't think Ten-Tec users would gripe if they had to pay for downloads
(but I'm not going to suggest that to Ten-Tec).

> The new K2DSP accessory is user-reprogrammable, too.

I love the new flexibility. An example is the Orion's AGC. The medium
AGC setting is nearer to being "right" for CW. The fast setting is
simply too fast for my liking. By using the programmable AGC setting, I
have something between the two which suits my operating nicely.

> >Ten-Tec survives by being innovative and responsive to customer desires.
> >The service department bends over backward to assist customers and to
> >achieve rapid turnaround. When I call the company, I'm greeted by a
> >real receptionist and don't get shunted off into an endless loop of menu
> >selections and voice mail boxes.
> >
> Yup. They also support rigs that they don't make anymore. I dunno if they will
> continue their boardswap service with the Orion. In previous rigs, if you had

> or suspected a bad board in your rig, TT sent a replacement, and you swapped
> 'em out, sending the bad board back. No shipping the whole rig, and they'd
> trust you to ship the bad one when you got the good one.

Shipping would have been an impossibility for me during the years I was in Africa. Sometimes Ten-Tec would send me a couple of different boards and I'd return whatever was defective and what wasn't needed to effect repairs.

> As I recall, TT started up in 1968, when all of the old-line ham manufacturers
> were packing it in. They started out making cute little QRP CW transceivers.

...and paddles. Al Kahn was bored after retirement as president of Electrovoice. He was spending his summers in Gatlinburg and wintering at his Michigan place. He and Jack Burchfield began Ten-Tec as something to do. When Al retired a second time, he gave his interest in Ten-Tec to the employees.

In my electronic sales days we had a Bud salesman conducting an after hours seminar for us. He was introducing the new Bud "Contempo" series of cabinets. I said that the stuff looked very much like cabinets made by Ten-Tec. He had a sheepish grin on his face when he announced that Bud was buying the cabinets from Ten-Tec.

> Digi-Key started out about the same time, selling RTL chips and kits to make IC
> keyers (hence the name).

...and Digi-Key has gone great guns. Where have all the old distributors gone?

Dave K8MN

1653. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:27:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525162722.15462.00000232@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67751

In article <20030524212829.02076.00000229@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> The "Feds" have had "full control" on US amateur radio since 1934.

1912, actually.
>
> I realize that may come as a rude awakening to those who
> thought ARRL ran the whole thing... :-)

Who thought that, besides you? ;-)

>> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have
>> been raving about?
>
> It's still there and was there before "Homeland Security" was an
> administration secretarial agency.

But apparently it is so highly vulnerable to interference from amateur stations that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50 watts ERP.
>
> Read up on ALE or Automatic Link Establishment on HF. SHARES
> uses that. Can you recognize an ALE signal if you hear one? You
> can find out via the Internet with one site having sound samples.
> Hint: It doesn't sound like OOK CW or FSK RTTY.

There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs be able to recognize ALE signals.
>
>>The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum
>>bulletproof and interference immune?
>
> ALE doesn't need spread spectrum techniques yet can find an
> open frequency automatically and send data at high rates
> regardless of claims by olde-tymers that "phase shifting on HF
> makes it no good." :-)

Apparently, though, ALE is so vulnerable to interference from amateur stations that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50 watts ERP.
>
> Sorry, Dickie, but OOK CW went the way of the dinosaurs faced
> with a gigantic meteor for radio messaging.

Have you ever actually listened to the amateur radio HF bands, Len?

> This is the new millenium, not the days of the 1930s.

You mean Morse Code/CW wasn't used for "radio messaging" in WW2?

1654. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:34:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED128BD.10FF0B93@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67752

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3ECF65C4.ADAF92F6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Ah yes, but what of the third order intercept points? What about the
> >noise floor? What happens if you activate the noise blanker? Arno
> >OH7XM (see below) brought his TS-50 to Botswana. You should have seen
> >the thing fold up when hooked to a 2 element 40m beam. It sounded
> >pretty good when a dipole was connected.
>
> There can be a BIG difference between lab tests and real-world conditions. For
> example, BDR measurements are usually made by tuning in a weak "wanted" signal,
> putting a strong "unwanted" signal a certain number of kHz away (usually 20
> kHz) and then increasing the unwanted signal until the copy of the wanted
> signal is degraded by the unwanted signal. Great test for how well the rx
> behaves in the presence of a single strong unwanted signal. But what about when
> the band is full of dozens of strong signals, none of which is strong enough by
> itself to cause degradation of the wanted signal? Depending on the rx design,
> the results can be very different.

I'm reminded of the Heath SB-104 which looked good on paper but which,
because of its receiver problems, turned out to be a dog for reasons
precisely like those you described.

> >> The 200 Hz filter in the 75S-3B is probably the worst filter
> >> I've ever used. Tried to use.
>
> The 75S3-C at W3ABT/N3KZ had one of those. Rang like mad. My homebrew FT-241A
> filter was better.

Yep. I'd agree. A narrow filter with a little worse shape factor would
work much better. The Drake 250 Hz filter worked much better but it
can't touch the four-pole roofing filter/DSP combo.

> >OH7XM is a fellow who does factory repair of Icom, Yaesu and Kenwood
> >equipment in Finland. In '97 he came to my place with a calibrated test
> >oscillator to run some comparative measurements on my Omni VI and his
> >TS-870 along with OH2MM's FT-1000MP. The Omni VI held its own but did
> >show some filter leakage. For grins, Arno hooked the oscillator to my
> >KWM-2A. It blew the other rigs away. Yes, you had to tune it up. Yes,
> >it had those 200 KHz segments and yes, it had a tighter receiver.
>
> "If it happens, it must be possible".

I think Arno was more than a little disappointed that his new TS-870
with its big-signals-directly-into-DSP setup was at the bottom of the
pile.

> >Of course when you mention the C-Line, I assume that the words "Sherwood
> >modified" preceed it. That stuff is *still* competitive.
> >
> Yup.

Switching from the original filter to the 600 Hz roofing filter
certainly limited how many of those big signals could get into the
receiver.

> Here's another data point - the second place entry (single op, low power,
> probably the most competitive class) in the Nov. CW SS (NP2B) ran a pair of
> K2/100s. Total rig cost about $2500. Yes, there's an advantage in that
> callsign, and he prolly had nice antennas, but do you think everybody he beat
> spent less?

That's a pretty good endorsement for Elecraft!

> --
>
> Let's see...how many tube sockets do I have to sell to buy an Orion?

Only one if you price it right :)

Dave K8MN

1655. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:35:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED12948.4030300@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67753

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future
>>From: "Rene" deleterene.altena@gmx.net
>>Date: 5/25/2003 2:44 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <baps88$27p20$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
>
>
>>And over here, they already have given the 13 cm band
>>to the industry, with amateurs also on secondary priority, so...
>
>
>
> Where is "over here?"

Over there somewhere! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1656. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:45:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED12B9B.8010407@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67754

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>
>>>No, thats not what happened. The person gave me his email. I was courteous
>>
>>and
>>
>>>didn't hear back from him.
>>
>>Either the matter slipped his mind,
>
>
> Could be.
>
>
>>Have you learned anything from the experience?
>
>
> No. But, I did learn from the event I went to a few weeks ago. Also, I had fun.
> There should be more events like that.
>
>
>>Do you find the concept of "fun" to be strange,
>>Vipul?
>
>
> No. The concept of what Hams find "fun" be strange. <Re-arranged your words.>
>
>>It could be but I don't personally know of any club in which the whole
>>membership looks after the repeater. That just doesn't make much sense.
>
>
> Not whole membership. Just those that are interested (like me). This works well
> because most arent interested, only a few are.
>
>
>>Someone is doing it. Where do you come
>>in?
>
>
> I can learn about it.
>
>

>>Looks as if you're doomed to a life of disappointments.
>
>
>
> Life, or Ham radio?
>
>
>>Maybe he knew that you were (almost) a EE and decided to be snobby
>>anyway.
>
>
> Actually, he did give me a small part later, after I persisted. I didn't take
> it.
>
>
>>Let's see. You're a ham but you want other hams to do what you want to
>>do. What is keeping you from doing what you want all by yourself?
>
>
> Any project requires a group or the project will take a long time. Hams already
> help with Antenna setups, something that would take too much work for one
> person.

Lessee, since I've become a ham, I've made 4 antennas: 2 dipoles, a magloop, and a 2 meter ground plane.

I've made an interface for PSK31. I'v made lots of other little doo-dads for my hobby. I'm restoring an old linear amplifier. Not one of these projects was done as a group effort.

Don't limit yourself.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1657. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 20:54:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED12DCC.70702@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67755

Activities Magnate Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>>Are you waiting for somone to spoon feed it to you, Vippy? That's sure
>>what it seems like here!
>
>
> No, I would do my share.
>
>
>>Yes...Taking a day off, ESPECIALLY on a Friday and ESPECIALLY to go to a
>>Ham Radio related event makes sense to me.
>
>
> Okay. Thats UR idea of fun. Not <most> people's.

Well, sometimes it seems that <most> people want to have fun by watching "American Idol or "Survivor (wherever)". DIfferent strokes for different folks, Vipul. I'll take the Friday ham activity off with Steve, thank you very much.

>
>>To be a "former EE" you must have at one time BEEN an EE.
>
> Yes, I worked as an EE.

Can't we get this straight?

When you refer to EE do you refer to "Electrical Engineer"?

Typically here in the US, an EE is a person who has a bachelors degree (at least) in the field of electrical engineering.

It isn't something that goes away when you aren't working in the field.

Others who work in the industry but haven't recieved a full degree are usually referred to as Electrical technicians. This includes two year associate degrees.

Either is a fine way to make a living, but I wonder if you are confused over the terminology.

- Mike KB3EIA -

>
>>Remember how you "refused" to ID yourself as an Amateur in the "EE class

>>you were allegedly taking? Well, Mr. EE didn't want to be in a group of Hams
>>and be identified with YOU. THAT says something.
>
>
> Maybe antenna lab person saw through me and realized I was not suficiently Ham
> like. Mr. EE did give me a small part of his project later, after I persisted.
> The part of the project was too small, so I decided not to do it.
>
>
>>>Also, at the gathering I joined a few weeks ago, I wanted to take a break,
>>>but
>>>the host urged me to operate radios and make contacts.
>>
>
>> How DARE he encourae you to operate the radios! The PIG!
>
>
> I already operated the radios. It was a vacation spot. I wanted to do other
> things.

1658. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 21:14:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED13244.4050000@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> Where does the "10 dB down" come from? The accepted standard
> for measuring occupied bandwidth is 26 dB down.
>
>
>
Wasn't sure what the number really was. Now I have a better number to use,
thanks for telling me.

73 deWA2ISE

1659. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 21:22:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED13412.40502@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67757
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Arch Stanton wrote:

>As I type this, the 14.313 Kooks are at it again.
>
>
>
At 21:19 zulu May 25th, there's nothing there. Oh, there's a foreign
language
QSO at 14.310, but there's nothing wrong with that.

1660. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 22:21:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525182138.27503.00000190@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67759

In article <20030525162722.15462.00000232@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030524212829.02076.00000229@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> The "Feds" have had "full control" on US amateur radio since 1934.
>
>1912, actually.

Not for you, grasshopper. :-)

The FCC came into existance in 1934. Those are the folks who
granted you your amateur radio license.

>> I realize that may come as a rude awakening to those who
>> thought ARRL ran the whole thing... :-)
>
>Who thought that, besides you? ;-)

ARRL still seems to think they run the whole thing. <shrug>

>>> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have
>>> been raving about?
>>
>> It's still there and was there before "Homeland Security" was an
>> administration secretarial agency.
>
>But apparently it is so highly vulnerable to interference from amateur
stations
>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50
>watts ERP.

Was that in FCC 03-105? I don't think so.

You are speculating again. You mental telepathic communicator
is malfunctioning.

>> Read up on ALE or Automatic Link Establishment on HF. SHARES
>> uses that. Can you recognize an ALE signal if you hear one? You
>> can find out via the Internet with one site having sound samples.
>> Hint: It doesn't sound like OOK CW or FSK RTTY.
>
>There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs be able to recognize ALE
>signals.

There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs HAVE to test their
equipment, either. Just plug and play, Jimmie. Don't worry, be
happy, keep the faith, baby.

>>>The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum
>>>bulletproof and interference immune?
>>
>> ALE doesn't need spread spectrum techniques yet can find an
>> open frequency automatically and send data at high rates
>> regardless of claims by olde-tymers that "phase shifting on HF
>> makes it no good." :-)
>
>Apparently, though, ALE is so vulnerable to interference from amateur stations
>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50
>watts ERP.

Feedback! Echo chamber! Speculation, Jimmie, just speculation.

Perhaps you didn't get the inferences tuned in correctly. Think
about THIS speculation instead:

The FCC might have gotten pished at the ARRL pushing for the
60m band (and all that fuss over "pioneering and testing" 60m
by a special group of ARRL-selected hams) that they tossed out
5 little micro-band crumbs. The FCC can truthfully say they've
given out more spectrum to US radio amateurs. Nobody can say
otherwise. :-)

What the FCC actually gave out is NOT what ARRL wanted and
those little 2.8 KHz BW micro-bands aren't good for the usual QSO
activity on other bands. NO OOK CW! :-) USB only, VOICE!
[are paddle-twiddlers furious or what? :-)] But, what was granted
is very close to the "necessary emergency" operation asked for
by ARRL, wasn't it? ARRL did all that "emergency" palaver in PR
statements and political lobbying and that is what it got!

OK, 5 little micro-bands good for "emergency" communications
and not much else. No CW contest elbow room and there's not
much chance of squeezing in two separate SSB voice QSOs
in one micro-band. No problem. FCC gave ARRL what it said it
wanted! One more lobbying monkey off the FCC's back.

ARRL rationalized itself a bit too far...except you will spin the
hell out of that as a built-in ARRL apologist, believer, and
athletic (radiosport) supporter. :-)

>> Sorry, Dickie, but OOK CW went the way of the dinosaurs faced
>> with a gigantic meteor for radio messaging.
>
>Have you ever actually listened to the amateur radio HF bands, Len?

Now, now, Jimmie, you are getting snarly again!

Yes, I have listened to every band below 30 MHz. The dinosaurs
didn't all die off after that big meteor hit. They lingered on, angry
and afraid, while their known world changed all around them.
Unable to support themselves or reproduce under such conditions,
they vanished through biodegrading (a few stumbled and fell into
fossil pool places, leaving only bare bones behind).

Like all those old dinos, the morsemen are still there on the ham
bands and hardly anywhere else. They are still angry and afraid,
unable to come to terms with a changing radio environment.
Once in a while an amateur T. Rex will try to step on other life,
still thinking it is "superior." Us ordinary life forms just dodge
around and watch Morsus Hammus Tyrannosaurus bellow
and stumble around. Bye, bye, dino..

>> This is the new millenium, not the days of the 1930s.
>
>You mean Morse Code/CW wasn't used for "radio messaging" in WW2?

The USA didn't get into WW2 until the 1940s, grasshopper.
Even so, the commercial communications carrier services and
US military relied on RTTY in several modes for the majority of
"radio messages" during WW2. The US Navy began using
on-line encryption among heavier-class warships (cruiser class
and heavier) via TTY in 1939. After full entry into WW2, even
USN submarines had encrypted RTTY sets (see the USS
Pampanito Museum website for a picture).

The majority of US military radio communications during WW2
was VOICE, Jimmie. Voice in the aircraft, voice between tanks,
voice between foot soldiers, even voice between ships. OOK CW
was on the way out even back then. Yes, there was
morsemanship taught and used in the US military way back then
but it was still a secondary mode. That secondary role gave way
to a tertiary role later and finally to oblivion. Bye, bye military
morsie.

All you Hammus Morsus Tyranosaurus types ought to learn to
play with other life forms. Your way of life is disappearing and
you remain defiant in denial of the obvious.

1661. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 22:21:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525182140.27503.00000191@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 67758

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfg4891.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sat, 24 May 2003 16:56:13 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>>> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"
>>
>>Because the manufacturer built it to those specs and, there
>>has not been any long term empirical evidence that suggests
>>I should be concerned.
>
> Do you remember the joke from engineering school about
> measuring the secondary voltage of a power transformer
> by reading the nameplate? Same thing.

It's an Article of Faith, Phil. :-)

>>Do you have your auto speedometer calibrated or do you believe it
>>will stay pretty accurate for the life of the vehicle.
>
> As a matter of fact, the Auto Club in both Northern and
> Southern California has speedo test facilities available at
> nominal charge and I used to take my cars there four times a
> year "just for grins". The results: the speedo was off a few
> mph (in the driver's favor) but the "few" varied over time.
> Nylon drive gears do not last forever.

The one time I went to such a place about 6 years ago,
the speedometer tester was down for maintenance! :-)

Since us Californians got biennial smog testing some years
ago, the smog test station has a form of speedometer check
built into the smog test repertoire. Maybe not as accurate
as a separate, dedicated tester but it is an easy task to
have the programmed computer check the dynamometer
rotation against the tester's setting to speedometer reading.

WWV and WWVH are readable in any of the US states for
radio frequency checking. No nominal charges apply nor is
there any need for membership other than a radio and ears.

1662. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 22:22:43 UTC
From: BARF <BARFnuts@barfpsychos.net>
Message-ID: <barfokmti0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Frequency 14313 stands as an enduring living monument
how one person, KV4FZ, can destroy what was used as a
public service frequency for years. Then the stupid FCC
gives him his license back! In all fairness, it appears he may
have finally learned how to control his mouth though. Has
anyone heard him on any freq.????

BARF

1663. Re: I Don't do Public Service Because

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 22:43:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525184302.15119.00000288@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67761

>Subject: Re: I Don't do Public Service Because
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/25/2003 10:08 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030525110818.18941.00000332@mb-m20.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>> I am of the opinion that if I knew you in person I probably wouldn't
>>want
>>to tell YOU anything about me either.
>
>The gathering I went to a week ago was a whole weekend long. I was re-invited
>to their next gathering of this type.

As the court jester, no doubt...

Steve, K4CAP

1664. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 22:48:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525184807.15119.00000290@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67762

>Subject: Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/25/2003 3:54 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED12DCC.70702@adelphia.net>
>
>Activities Magnate Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>
>>
>>>Are you waiting for somone to spoon feed it to you, Vippy? That's sure
>>>what it seems like here!
>>
>>
>> No, I would do my share.
>>
>>
>>>Yes...Taking a day off, ESPECIALLY on a Friday and ESPECIALLY to go to a
>>>Ham Radio related event makes sense to me.
>>
>>
>> Okay. Thats UR idea of fun. Not <most> people's.
>
>Well, sometimes it seems that <most> people want to have fun by watching
>"American Idol or "Survivor (wherever)". DIfferent strokes for different
>folks, Vipul. I'll take the Friday ham activity off with Steve, thank
>you very much.

Thanks Mike...IO'll even put on a clean shirt and try to avoid blowing my
nose on the sleeves while we're out!

>>>To be a "former EE" you must have at one time BEEN an EE.
>>
>> Yes, I worked as an EE.

No, he didn't. Maaaaaaayyyyybbeeeeeee as an "Enviromental" Engineer...You
know...the guy with the dust mop, window cleaner, trash bags, etc...

> Can't we get this straight?
> When you refer to EE do you refer to "Electrical Engineer"?
> Typically here in the US, an EE is a person who has a bachelors degree
>(at least) in the field of electrical engineering.
>
> It isn't something that goes away when you aren't working in the field.
>
> Others who work in the industry but haven't recieved a full degree are

>usually referred to as Electrical technicians. This includes two year
>associate degrees.
>
> Either is a fine way to make a living, but I wonder if you are confused

1665. "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:15:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67763

From The ARRL Website:

>The FCC has granted amateurs 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373, and 5405 kHz--the last
>channel common to the UK amateur experimental band plan. These are all
>"channel center frequencies," the National Telecommunications and Information
>Administration (NTIA) said in a March 13 letter to FCC Office of Engineering
and >Technology Chief Edmond J. Thomas.

Guess that solves that.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1666. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:21:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67764

>Subject: "Uncle says..."
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>

> Guess that solves that.

And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...

Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency

5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz

5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz

5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz

5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz

5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz

1667. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...herb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:30:49 UTC
From: euro930nospam@attbi.com
Message-ID: <3ED15266.26C826AF@attbi.com>
Source record: 67765
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> He is right 'Dee'. Nothing is done. Same jammers, same illegal stations.
> Same Same. Only thing gone is the fools that used their calls.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "nobodybutme" <nbm@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:a78553fd478dd256576e93b7137992c2@TeraNews...
> > I'm sure that's been done hundreds of times by now. I was listening to the
> > same old 14.313 antics 10+ years ago, then I grew up and moved on to more
> > mature interests.
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:Wk6Aa.3660$4G.1501426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > > Record it, document it, and send it all to the FCC. How are they going
> to
> > > know it's happening until someone reports it?
> >
> >
> >

speaking about 10 yrs ago on 14 313, i recall a ham with lots of power in the virgin islands that was named Herb as i recall....lots of chatter on the band back then about him and illegal power...something about stealing radios durring a hurricane as best i remember....don't remember what his call sign was but a regular from back then should remember...what ever happened to him?

regards

1668. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:32:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525193242.29002.00000199@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67767

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd2s5m.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 24 May 2003 00:24:36 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Bit of railroad trivia....
>>
>>For quite some years the Pennsylvania Railroad referred to steam
>>and diesel-electric locomotives as "engines" and referred to
>>electric locomotives (third-rail or overhead wire) as "motors".
>
> IIRC the NEC DS-es still refer to them as "motors".

"As God and the Pennsylvania Railroad intended" - Nelson Bowers, at the rededication of GG-1 4935

Here's another bit of RR trivia: What does the letter F mean when painted on multiple-unit cars and locomotives like the GG-1, P-5 and AEM-7?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1669. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:32:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525193243.29002.00000200@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67766

In article <3ED12421.9CA65588@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Really cool. TT started that game with the Pegasus and it just keeps
>> getting sweeter.
>
>It is like having the bottle genie tell you that you have unlimited
>wishes. Just type the words "I wish my Orion did..." and *poof* it is
>done.

.....ze barracuda knowz in which waterz ze tastiezt fish svim.....
>
>> Elecraft does something similar with their firmware, but it's not free.
>>They
>> keep a database on the firmware in every rig they've ever sold. If you buy
>> an
>> accessory that will work better with a newer firmware version than what you
>> have, they send you a new chip free. Otherwise you have to buy the new
>> chip.
>
>I don't think Ten-Tec users would gripe if they had to pay for downloads
>(but I'm not going to suggest that to Ten-Tec).

What I did was to time accessory purchases to match software upgrades....
>
>> The new K2DSP accessory is user-reprogrammable, too.
>
>I love the new flexibility. An example is the Orion's AGC. The medium
>AGC setting is nearer to being "right" for CW. The fast setting is
>simply too fast for my liking. By using the programmable AGC setting, I
>have something between the two which suits my operating nicely.

Easier than soldering in different time constant caps.....

I rarely if ever use AGC on CW. Better without it.
>
>Shipping would have been an impossibility for me during the years I was
>in Africa. Sometimes Ten-Tec would send me a couple of different boards
>and I'd return whatever was defective and what wasn't needed to effect
>repairs.

'zactly what I was talking about.
>
>> As I recall, TT started up in 1968, when all of the old-line ham
>> manufacturers
>> were packing it in. They started out making cute little QRP CW

>> transceivers.
>
>...and paddles. Al Kahn was bored after retirement as president of
>Electrovoice. He was spending his summers in Gatlinburg and wintering
>at his Michigan place. He and Jack Burchfield began Ten-Tec as
>something to do. When Al retired a second time, he gave his interest in
>Ten-Tec to the employees.

wadda guy....
>
>In my electronic sales days we had a Bud salesman conducting an after
>hours seminar for us. He was introducing the new Bud "Contempo" series
>of cabinets. I said that the stuff looked very much like cabinets made
>by Ten-Tec. He had a sheepish grin on his face when he announced that
>Bud was buying the cabinets from Ten-Tec.

bwaahaahaa
>
>> Digi-Key started out about the same time, selling RTL chips and kits to
>> make IC keyers (hence the name).

Cover article of QST, April, 1968.
>
>...and Digi-Key has gone great guns. Where have all the old distributors
>gone?
>
Allied and Newark are still in business. Mouser is very good. Lots of others,
like Hosfelt. Also specialized folks like The Wireman, RF Parts, etc. (Standard
disclaimer applies). The 'net has actually helped by reducing/removing the cost
of printing and distributing paper catalogs.

Cardwell, of all people, still makes air variables and roller inductors. B&W,
now in Florida, still makes Miniductor. Their prices look high compared to
decades ago until you factor in inflation.

Is that Carly I hear in the background? Land of milk and honey....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1670. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:32:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525193244.29002.00000201@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67768

In article <3ED128BD.10FF0B93@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I'm reminded of the Heath SB-104 which looked good on paper but which,
>because of its receiver problems, turned out to be a dog for reasons
>precisely like those you described.

A dog for some uses, a champ for others. We could talkn about the R-1051
receivers and their transceiver relatives, too....

>> >> The 200 Hz filter in the 75S-3B is probably the worst filter
>> >> I've ever used. Tried to use.
>>
>> The 75S3-C at W3ABT/N3KZ had one of those. Rang like mad. My homebrew
>> FT-241A filter was better.
>
>Yep. I'd agree. A narrow filter with a little worse shape factor would
>work much better. The Drake 250 Hz filter worked much better but it
>can't touch the four-pole roofing filter/DSP combo.

The Southgate Type 7 uses two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz filters and an LC audio
filter. Could be a little narrower, though.

>> >OH7XM is a fellow who does factory repair of Icom, Yaesu and Kenwood
>> >equipment in Finland. In '97 he came to my place with a calibrated test
>> >oscillator to run some comparative measurements on my Omni VI and his
>> >TS-870 along with OH2MM's FT-1000MP. The Omni VI held its own but did
>> >show some filter leakage. For grins, Arno hooked the oscillator to my
>> >KWM-2A. It blew the other rigs away. Yes, you had to tune it up. Yes,
>> >it had those 200 KHz segments and yes, it had a tighter receiver.
>>
>> "If it happens, it must be possible".
>
>I think Arno was more than a little disappointed that his new TS-870
>with its big-signals-directly-into-DSP setup was at the bottom of the
>pile.

Same principle applies.
>
>> >Of course when you mention the C-Line, I assume that the words "Sherwood
>> >modified" preceed it. That stuff is *still* competitive.
>> >
>> Yup.
>
>Switching from the original filter to the 600 Hz roofing filter
>certainly limited how many of those big signals could get into the

>receiver.

A principle known at least as far back as 1957.
>
>> Here's another data point - the second place entry (single op, low power,
>> probably the most competitive class) in the Nov. CW SS (NP2B) ran a pair
>> of
>> K2/100s. Total rig cost about $2500. Yes, there's an advantage in that
>> callsign, and he prolly had nice antennas, but do you think everybody he
>> beat
>> spent less?
>
>That's a pretty good endorsement for Elecraft!
>
Of course the guy had some nice antennas and world-class op skills. Point is he prolly could have run a pair of FT-1000s or whatever.

Then there's what Tree (you know who he is, I presume) did with a K2 in the QRP class. Scary.
>> --
>>
>> Let's see...how many tube sockets do I have to sell to buy an Orion?
>
>Only one if you price it right :)
>
HAW!!!!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1671. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:40:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bark85$h4m$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67769
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

And when you (see 'me') has the gonads to say so on the air, they get
banned. Whatever.

Dan/W4NTI

"Nutley Nood" <nnood5ff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ed12150@snipnews.snip.net...
> Agreed Dan. As another fine example
> there are jammers on 3.865 and 3.898
> that have been screwing around up there for years!
>
> Seems to me that the FCC and Mr. Hollingsworth
> both are nothing more than * Paper Tigers * who make
> speeches every now and then to make us seem to
> all feel better. (better known as the warm-fuzzies approach)
>
> Thanks Dan and good health 2-U :)
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bar0hs$bi2$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > He is right 'Dee'. Nothing is done. Same jammers, same illegal
stations.
> > Same Same. Only thing gone is the fools that used their calls.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "nobodybutme" <nbm@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:a78553fd478dd256576e93b7137992c2@TeraNews...
> > > I'm sure that's been done hundreds of times by now. I was listening to
> the
> > > same old 14.313 antics 10+ years ago, then I grew up and moved on to
> more
> > > mature interests.
> > >
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > > news:Wk6Aa.3660$4G.1501426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > > Record it, document it, and send it all to the FCC. How are they
> going
> > to
> > > > know it's happening until someone reports it?
> > >
> > >
> > >

> >
> >
>
>

1672. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:43:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <barkd9lmp1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67770
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BARF= PUKE.

Don Quixote (Herby) is a very intelligent individual. He has the sense NOT to continue his association with the misfits on 313. More power to him.

And the poster is quite correct. The various MM/Intercon nets that are NOW ON 300 used to operate on 313. And thanks to those misfits were run off.

Dan/W4NTI

"BARF" <BARFnuts@barfpsychos.net> wrote in message news:barfokmti0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Frequency 14313 stands as an enduring living monument
> how one person, KV4FZ, can destroy what was used as a
> public service frequency for years. Then the stupid FCC
> gives him his license back! In all fairness, it appears he may
> have finally learned how to control his mouth though. Has
> anyone heard him on any freq.????
>
> BARF
>
>
>

1673. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...herb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-25 23:47:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <barkkqbpa1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67771
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
<euro930nospam@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:3ED15266.26C826AF@attbi.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > He is right 'Dee'. Nothing is done. Same jammers, same illegal
stations.
> > Same Same. Only thing gone is the fools that used their calls.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "nobodybutme" <nbm@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:a78553fd478dd256576e93b7137992c2@TeraNews...
> > > I'm sure that's been done hundreds of times by now. I was listening to
the
> > > same old 14.313 antics 10+ years ago, then I grew up and moved on to
more
> > > mature interests.
> > >
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > > news:Wk6Aa.3660$4G.1501426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > > Record it, document it, and send it all to the FCC. How are they
going
> > to
> > > > know it's happening until someone reports it?
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
>
> speaking about 10 yrs ago on 14 313, i recall a ham with lots of power in
the
> virgin islands that was named Herb as i recall....lots of chatter on the
band
> back then about him and illegal power...something about stealing radios
durring
> a hurricane as best i remember....don't remember what his call sign was
but a
> regular from back then should remember...what ever happened to him?
>
> regards
>
>
```

KV4FZ....he was shut down, license removed. 2 years or so later he took his test, passed, went before FCC judge, was allowed to become a ham again. Got a call....applied to FCC for Vanity....KV4FZ...imagine that. Herby is back.

BUT NOT PLAYING THE SAME GAMES.

Heard him on 160 last season.

Dan/W4NTI

1674. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 00:05:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525200538.04207.00000257@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67772

In article <20030525182138.27503.00000190@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030525162722.15462.00000232@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030524212829.02076.00000229@mb-m14.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> The "Feds" have had "full control" on US amateur radio since 1934.
>>
>>1912, actually.
>
> Not for you, grasshopper. :-)

For everyone.
>
> The FCC came into existance in 1934.

Before that, there was the FRC, and before the FRC was the Department of
Commerce. And before that, the Navy. All are/were "the Feds".

> Those are the folks who
> granted you your amateur radio license.

In 1967.
>
>>> I realize that may come as a rude awakening to those who
>>> thought ARRL ran the whole thing... :-)
>>
>>Who thought that, besides you? ;-)
>
> ARRL still seems to think they run the whole thing. <shrug>

Only seems that way to you.
>
>>>> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have
>>>> been raving about?
>>>
>>> It's still there and was there before "Homeland Security" was an
>>> administration secretarial agency.
>>
>>But apparently it is so highly vulnerable to interference from amateur
>>stations
>>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50

>>watts ERP.
>
> Was that in FCC 03-105? I don't think so.

It's clear that NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs.

>>> Read up on ALE or Automatic Link Establishment on HF. SHARES
>>> uses that. Can you recognize an ALE signal if you hear one? You
>>> can find out via the Internet with one site having sound samples.
>>> Hint: It doesn't sound like OOK CW or FSK RTTY.
>>
>>There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs be able to recognize ALE
>>signals.
>
> There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs HAVE to test their
> equipment, either.

So?

>>>>The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum
>>>>bulletproof and interference immune?
>>>
>>> ALE doesn't need spread spectrum techniques yet can find an
>>> open frequency automatically and send data at high rates
>>> regardless of claims by olde-tymers that "phase shifting on HF
>>> makes it no good." :-)
>>
>>Apparently, though, ALE is so vulnerable to interference from amateur
>>stations
>>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50
>>watts ERP.
>
> Feedback! Echo chamber! Speculation, Jimmie, just speculation.

By you.
>
> Perhaps you didn't get the inferences tuned in correctly. Think
> about THIS speculation instead:
>
> The FCC might have gotten pished at the ARRL pushing for the
> 60m band (and all that fuss over "pioneering and testing" 60m
> by a special group of ARRL-selected hams) that they tossed out
> 5 little micro-band crumbs. The FCC can truthfully say they've
> given out more spectrum to US radio amateurs. Nobody can say
> otherwise. :-)

Nonsense. The NPRM proposed amateur access to a 150 kHz wide band with many
modes permitted, not 5 channels of USB. The NPRM was written by the FCC, not
the ARRL.
>
> What the FCC actually gave out is NOT what ARRL wanted and
> those little 2.8 KHz BW micro-bands aren't good for the usual QSO

> activity on other bands.

They're not micro-bands. They're channels.

> NO OOK CW! :-) USB only, VOICE!

No LSB. No PSK31. No data modes of any kind, in fact.

> [are paddle-twiddlers furious or what? :-)]

Nope. Just a little disappointed.

>
>>> This is the new millenium, not the days of the 1930s.
>>
>>You mean Morse Code/CW wasn't used for "radio messaging" in WW2?
>
> The USA didn't get into WW2 until the 1940s, grasshopper.

That's the point.

> Even so, the commercial communications carrier services and
> US military relied on RTTY in several modes for the majority of
> "radio messages" during WW2.

How do you know? Do you have message totals for WW2?

> The US Navy began using
> on-line encryption among heavier-class warships (cruiser class
> and heavier) via TTY in 1939. After full entry into WW2, even
> USN submarines had encrypted RTTY sets (see the USS
> Pampanito Museum website for a picture).

Doesn't change the fact that Morse code/CW was used extensively by the US
military in WW2, and for years afterward. Which really seems to bother you.
>
> The majority of US military radio communications during WW2
> was VOICE, Jimmie.

How do you know?

> Voice in the aircraft, voice between tanks,
> voice between foot soldiers, even voice between ships. OOK CW
> was on the way out even back then. Yes, there was
> morsemanship taught and used in the US military way back then
> but it was still a secondary mode.

Not really.
>
> That secondary role gave way
> to a tertiary role later and finally to oblivion. Bye, bye military
> morsie.
>
So?

There was a time when almost all ships were sailing ships. Over time sails were replaced by steam, diesel, and even nuclear engines. Sailing is now almost totally a recreational activity. Yet it's far from extinct or obsolete.

1675. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 01:01:42 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030525210142.14544.00000406@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67773

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/25/03 5:32 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED08E4B.45D2CDBF@earthlink.net>
>
>No CW Test wrote:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>> >Date: 5/22/03 6:16 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <3ECD4C02.962C2F15@earthlink.net>

>> >As Leonard has lectured on numerous occasions, his only
>> >interest here is in civil debate on the removal of morse code
>> >testing.
>>
>> Really?
>
>That's really what he says.

Sounds like an untruth, then.
>
>> When's he going to start?
>
>I've been here for at least seven years. I haven't noted any move >on his
part toward actual implementation of his stated goal.

Incredible.

>> >He is, as you are no doubt aware, a self-appointed
>> >advocate for the removal of morse
>> >testing and the elimination of licensing for children.
>>
>> Why?
>
>He is likely a self-appointed advocate because no group asked him >to become
its advocate.

Well, there's the group composed of Avery Fine, Avery Fineman, Len Of 21, Len
Over 21.....

>He is for the removal of morse testing because he
>finds morse difficult.

He does? When did he say he'd ever tried the mode?

>He is for instituting a minimum age for amateur
>radio because he is a PROFESSIONAL and doesn't want to be >involved in
>any activity where mere CHILDREN may be participants.
>
Sounds childish.

>> >Those items aside, Len will launch random insults as the
>> >opportunity presents itself.
>>
>> Looks like he doesn't wait for opportunities.
>
>To Len, any post by another on any topic is seen as an >opportunity.
>
>> >Leonard doesn't play well with others.
>> >
>> Obviously.
>
>I see you've been paying attention.
>
2.75 MHz?

1676. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 01:06:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfgpa84.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67774

On 25 May 2003 18:24:43 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Recall also the Errata to 98-143 which was even more confusing than the
>original NPRM.

>I recall how the Wormser, Adsit, Dinelli petition was handled by FCC,
>particularly the sloppiness of language. It didn't foster confidence in the
>system.

I do have to agree with your criticism that the quality of
language, thought, and details has gone down the drain, in
parallel with the decline of proper grammar and language usage
in American society in general.

With regard to FCC amateur radio stuff, perhaps it's because
Monte DePont, the attorney who wrote the language of most of the
notices (and corrected the sloppiness of the original drafters)
during the years that I was there retired about the same time
as I did, and "it's so hard to get decent help nowadays" who
have that skill.

>>more...well, more...American. (Checks & balances?)

>Exactly.

>FCC is also in the process of enacting limitations on petitions they
>consider repetitive.

Both Federal and state courts have had similar rules limiting
repetitive court filings and lawsuits for many decades. There
are even penalties which can be imposed on attorneys who file
those, and causes of action for defendants to recover damages for
repetitive filing of losing civil lawsuits ("common barratry")
and repetitive filing of losing criminal cases ("abuse of process").

>> There have been several station licensing cases (one that I am
>> intimately familiar with) that have kicked around between
>> the FCC and the courts for over 30 years.

> Is this something to be proud of?

The shame is on the litigants who don't want to settle the
issues and seem to enjoy keeping high-priced lawyers in luxury.

>Depends on the case. I doubt they are amateur licensing cases.

The two that I am thinking of are AM broadcast pizzing contests.

> Besides, Phil may not be at liberty to speak about them.

No problem - they are all in the public record and were finally settled.

One involved KOB in Albuquerque versus WABC, the ABC "flagship" station in New York. ABC claimed that because the NBC and CBS "flagship" stations in New York were 50 kW clear-channel stations, ABC was entitled to have WABC not share 770 kHz with anyone, no matter how distant or how configured to protect them, while KOB's posture was that they were entitled to 50 kW status because they were the only full-power station capable of covering the whole state. This went up and down to the Supreme Court of the United States over a period of 30 some odd years and when all the dust settled, KOB had to take secondary status because by that time there were enough other stations licensed to provide coverage to all parts of the state. On the other hand, KABC had to accept the channel sharing because the concept of "clear channel" stations was no longer in effect.

The other involved WNYC, owned and operated by the City of New York versus WCCO in Minneapolis. I followed this because in my college years I was what is now known as a "broadcast intern" at WNYC but in those days I was just one of the college kids who hung around at night and on weekends staying out of the way of the station management while learning the broadcast engineer trade. WCCO was the "clear channel" 50 kW station on 830 kHz owned by CBS while WNYC was running 1 kW Non-Directional days, and 1 kW directional at night up until 10 pm at which time they had to leave the air to "protect" WCCO. They could hardly be heard at the Hudson River (the western boundary of the city). CBS/WCCO in 1954 decided that enough was enough, and in the reflected light of the KOB/ABC case (above) they started proceedings to shaft WNYC, including spreading some very bad propaganda in the industry. This too went back and forth for more than 30 years on both the engineering and the policy issues, also involving side issues of WCCO wanting to put up a monster AM tower in the flight path of Minneapolis' airport which was fought by the airline pilot's association as a safety hazard, and WNYC getting involved in waiver requests to permit full AM-FM program duplication which were denied. Finally, WNYC was ordered to shift frequency to 820 kHz which involved settling a potential interference problem with WHSL in Louisville and to put up a more complex antenna system west of New York City which dumped their entire signal eastward to cover the city and allowed them to operate full-time. This settlement was imposed at a time when the City was virtually bankrupt and it took a while before they were ready to make the move. Eventually the station was spun off to a "Listener's Foundation" and the few times that I have heard WNYC's programming in recent years have shown me that they have degenerated into just another NPR station instead of being the leader in quailty programming and operation that they were in the '50s.

"Lo, how the mighty have fallen".

The attorney at the FCC's Broadcast Bureau who handled this case got the case when he first joined the Commission right out of law school, and he retired a few months before the case was settled. I talked to him on the phone at that time to congratulate him on the double victory and he was relieved that at last there was a solution on the horizon.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1677. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 02:18:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305251818.60219b79@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67775

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030525142446.14837.00000233@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0305241948.610620fa@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> >No surprise there, everybody who held a General or Conditional - which
> >was the huge majority of us then - lost prime space on top of being
> >barred from the expanded phone bands.
>
> "Expanded phone bands"?

Yes, expanded phone bands. From the end of WW2 thru the timeframe
under discussion U.S phone ops were not permitted below 3.800, 7.200,
14.200 and 21.300. As a General ~1954~1968 I could and did operate
phone down to those limits. Then along came the FCC with The Brainfart
we call Incentive Licensing. Part of that overall package included
reshuffling the phone bands to provide a very big incentive to become
an Extra. Whether or not this particular reshuffling was part of the
fundamental Incentive Licensing R&O is long lost minutia on my part.
All I cared about was that if I didn't take the test I was dead meat
as a dxer/contester so I took the test and haven't spent much time
looking back.

If I recall the details correctly the first wave of this reshuffling
maneuver specifically on 20 was to (a) boot Generals out of
14.200-14.225 (b) allow Advanceds to continue to operate above 14.200
and (c) the FCC opened 14.175 and up for Extras running phone. The
other bands were similarly rearranged. Which very significantly
changed the dynamics of phone dxing and dx contesting and created one
helluva uproar from Advanceds and the DX which all of a sudden found
volumes of us damned Ugly Americans operating in their "preserves"
below the former U.S. phone band edge limits.

> K2UNK points out, for some reason a relatively small percentage (~15%) of
> Advanceds have upgraded.

They don't have any particular incentive to upgrade is howcum. Unless
they're hellbent on having a 1x2 or a 2x1.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1678. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 02:22:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfgtuz6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67776

On 26 May 2003 00:05:38 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>It's clear that NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs.

That's the "public" face. Behind the scenes, chances are very
good that the NTIA was concerned about not having direct
control over "others" playing in NTIA's playyard, whether they
caused interference or not.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1679. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 02:52:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED18121.856F2DB8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67777

No CW Test wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 5/25/03 5:32 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3ED08E4B.45D2CDBF@earthlink.net>
> >
> >No CW Test wrote:
> >>
> >> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >> >Date: 5/22/03 6:16 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >> >Message-id: <3ECD4C02.962C2F15@earthlink.net>
>
> >> >As Leonard has lectured on numerous occasions, his only
> >> >interest here is in civil debate on the removal of morse code
> >> >testing.
> >>
> >> Really?
> >
> >That's really what he says.
>
> Sounds like an untruth, then.

I think you're on to something.

> >> When's he going to start?
> >
> >I've been here for at least seven years. I haven't noted any move >on his
> part toward actual implementation of his stated goal.
>
> Incredible.

What's incredible is there is no ground swell of support for Len's
advocacy after all these years. Zip. Zilch. Nil. Zed.

> >> >He is, as you are no doubt aware, a self-appointed
> >> >advocate for the removal of morse
> >> >testing and the elimination of licensing for children.
> >>
> >> Why?
> >
> >He is likely a self-appointed advocate because no group asked him >to become
> its advocate.
>

> Well, there's the group composed of Avery Fine, Avery Fineman, Len Of 21, Len
> Over 21.....

How many times have you heard of a case where an individual has multiple
personalities but they are all basically the same?

> >He is for the removal of morse testing because he
> >finds morse difficult.
>
> He does? When did he say he'd ever tried the mode?

He has said that at one time, he knew morse at something like eight
words per minute. I substract a little for the embellishment factor.

> >He is for instituting a minimum age for amateur
> >radio because he is a PROFESSIONAL and doesn't want to be >involved in
> >any activity where mere CHILDREN may be participants.
> >
> Sounds childish.

There's the rub!

> >> >Those items aside, Len will launch random insults as the
> >> >opportunity presents itself.
> >>
> >> Looks like he doesn't wait for opportunities.
> >
> >To Len, any post by another on any topic is seen as an >opportunity.
> >
> >> >Leonard doesn't play well with others.
> >> >
> >> Obviously.
> >
> >I see you've been paying attention.
> >
> 2.75 MHz?

He spent a couple of weeks working me over for a similar mistake.

Dave K8MN

1680. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 02:56:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <barvv8$up3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67778

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030525002200.08632.00000269@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 5/24/2003 10:34 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bapdpeoq1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >> "ZERO maintenance"...?!?! Where are you getting THAT, Bill?
> >
> >Personal history and a 30+ year career in telephony is where I get that.
>
> Oh? And WHAT "telephony" device has been 100% maintenence free for 30
> years, Bill?

I never said that. Most telco devices don't have a life that lasts 30
years. Most ham gear doesn't either. Even at that, unless something
breaks,
just what would you expect to go "out-of-compliance" in today's commercial
ham rigs?

> >I can tell you that most telcom gear has literally NO maintenance
> >associated with.
>
> Oh?

Oh Yes.

> I have family working for Mom Bell in Smyrna, GA, and she'd
> beg to differ with you.

Beg to differ all they want. What job function do they
fill? Today's all digital networks
are literaly maintenance free. Do things break? At
times, but the concept and use of preventive maintenance,
routine maintenance is almost nil. Also, FYI, Ma Bell was
killed off as of 1/1/1983.

> >It is all self diagnostic and has literally no or
> >at most only minor adjustments that can be made to it.
>
> Above reiterated.

Ditto mine also.

> >> I don't understand how you can "accept" it, but then run
> >> head-long into ignorance about avoiding a problem.
> >

> >Because I don't have any such problem.
>
> That you KNOW of.......

Works for me.

> >> But how can you take "repsonsibility" for something you can't
> >> quantify or qualifiy?
> >
> >The same way that I take responsibility for the speed I am going in a car
if
> >the speedometer doesn't work...and trust me, I've had more than one
> >car with a nonfunctioning speedometer.
>
> I don't doubt it, Bill.

Glad you agree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1681. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 03:24:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bas1ivldm1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67779

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030525160319.23745.00000199@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <baomev$m6q$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030524141521.15462.00000208@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >> In article <bam508$7g$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030523013238.16581.00000197@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <bak76p$qm8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:20030522233221.06400.00000158@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >> >> >> In article <bajqgp$5l1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >> >> >> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfb2spy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >> >> >> >> On Thu, 22 May 2003 18:45:59 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
> >> >> >> >> filters?
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>You'll have to ask the equipment makers for
> >> >> >> >>that answer.
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> You don't have to. Get a good audio generator, frequency
> >> >> >> >> counter (if you need it), RF sampler and power meter, plus a
> >> >> >> >> dummy load. Go through the procedure I gave in here before.
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> That's not rocket science, just rather ordinary metrology.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >Sorry, I don't have a 3 of the 5 test equipment pieces at home.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> TS. Then I suppose you will cop out of your responsibility
> >> >> >> of measuring the RF quality of your radios' signals, too?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >What responsibility? Please point to the regs that require me
> >> >> >to make any specific measurements. The rules require

> >> >a signal within certain criteria. As long as my rig is within
> >> >spec I don't have to measure anything.
> >>
> >> The question is "how do you KNOW it is within spec?"
> >
> >Because the manufacturer built it to those specs and, there
> >has not been any long term empirical evidence that suggests
> >I should be concerned. Do you have your auto speedometer
> >calibrated or do you believe it will stay pretty
> >accurate for the life of the vehicle.
>
> Bill, amateur radio equipment isn't built to Bell Standards to
> guarantee a useful life of 30+ years continuous service. :-)

Nobody expects most telco equipment to last 30 years either.

> As to "auto speedometer calibrations," I just check it out
> on the various highway stretches marked as specific for
> a certain distance. Done it that way for years on the
> highways from Pacific coast through mountain zone and
> through most of the midwest states. Indicated speedometer
> rate will vary according to tire wear. Our little travel
> calculator is also a four-function arithmetic calculator, makes
> it a snap to compute actual speed with time through a marked
> zone. Time through a zone timed to the second with a digital
> watch (Timex) kept calibrated with a portable radio clock updating
> automatically every 24 hours with WWVB (Oregon Scientific). :-)
>
> >> Laying-on of hands is not sufficient.
> >
> >It is for me and there's NO FCC rule requiring otherwise.
>
> Don't get up-tight, Bill. You aren't being charged with
> anything. :-)

I'm just making the point.

> >> If someone in a QSO says "your signal is good" that isn't
> >> a qualifier on frequency or filter bandpass or much of
> >> anything else. A "599" signal report is commonly heard
> >> but it isn't really that good everywhere all the time, is it? :-)
> >
> >If my frequency is not where I should be I think the
> >other ham would know that. As to my filter bandpass,
> >I think if I was spitting out a 6KHz SSB signal that someone would likly
> >notice. The reality is that commercial ham rigs have an excellent
> >track record of doing what they are supposed to with zero maintenace.
>
> Okay...do we mark you down as a "Believer" then? :-)

I would take the report as an indication to do further checking.
The fact is that I have not encountered such a situation and I

remain confident that my not doing periodic testing of my
rig with external test gear is at all needed. In another
post you mention WWV...and that certainly allows me
to "validate" the digital readout of my rigs frequency
settings without any other equipment needed. Additionally,
my rig (as well as many others) used for HF have some degree
of metering to provide indications of relative power, modulation, etc.

> >The same ZERO maintenance is today widespread throughout
> >the telecommunications industry. Why?
>
> Having done some design work FOR the telecommunications
> industry I will agree with you in general. But, you are arguing
> a "zero defects" situation and my empirical observation over
> a half century says there ain't NO such thing as "zero defects."

Agreed, and most actual failures today result in a more
obvious fault condition than the type of frequency variation or
braoder than allowed bandwidth.

> Why are MTBF values ever calculated? With that "zero defect"
> claim there would be NO failures and the mean time would be
> infinite. Not so.

Even so, the failure usually results in a plug-in replacement. No
"routine maintence" takes place.

> The whole "zero defects" philosophy is a GOAL, Bill, something
> to shoot for, to improve the state of the art, to eliminate as many
> maintenance folks as possible (they cost a telecom company
> money).

Agree completely. The same is true for any product.

> >Because we have found that
> >today's equipment is rock stable and that doing "periodic" maintence
> >measurements causes more problems than it finds.
>
> "Rock stable?!?" Bill, were you ever involved in metrology? :-)
>
> I never mentioned "periodic maintenance," Bill. I just questioned
> your knowledge (or any ready-built equipment owner's knowledge)
> of how they KNOW their equipment is exactly within specified
> parameters. Pretty advertising brochures and thick technospeak
> specification sheets are just paper and ink...they don't reference
> the actual performance of your particular ready-built equipment
> other than a manufacturer's word on it.

And I accept the manufacturer's stated specs for my amateur rig.

> If you want to take a manufacturer's WORD for something without
> checking it, that's your perogative. No problem to me...unless you
> interfere with what I am doing through improper operation. Then

> it's up to the FCC and the FCC demands tests of equipment to
> insure compliance with the law.

Agree completely.

> >The same is true for the vast array of consumer products.
>
> Well, then, you ought to write the FCC and say they don't have
> to do all that type acceptance testing...they can just take the
> manufacturer's WORD that they comply with the law! :-)

The "type acceptance" testing is done on only a handful of units...
it isn't done or required against every unit coming off a manufacturer's
assembly line. QST and ARRL do technical reviews of almost every
new piece of ham gear that hits the market. Those reviews identify
the compliance per manufacturer's stated specs. Would you
expect every ham to do the same test of a newly purchased rig
that ARRL does?

> While we are at it, we can also eliminate a whole standards
> division within NIST and just take all manufacturer's WORDS
> that they are "rock solid" stable and don't do any badness.

The standards are what drives the manufacturer to produce
within those specs. I am not suggesting or championing
the end of standards for manufactured products.

> >> In Subpart D of Part 97 (all paragraphs of 97.3nn) there is
> >> nothing about "measurement" but there are a whole heap
> >> of "shalls" on signal emission. Each one of those "shall"
> >> statements applies to the individual licensee. The FCC
> >> gives all licensees considerable latitude on HOW they do
> >> their "shall" thing but the bottom line is that each licensee
> >> SHALL be within technical standards.
> >
> >Your point? The fact is, that there is NO rule that mandates
> >I measure anything. I am responsible for my signal and I accept that.
> >What's the worst thing that could happen? I get a note from
> >the FCC telling me that my signal was out of band, that I had too
> >broad a signal, etc? In the old tube days with simple VFO's
> >that happened far more than with today's digitally programed
> >rigs. 30 years ago what happen could afford a frequency
> >counter? Accuracy today is incredible when compared to
> >the 50s/60s.
>
> As one who did metrology for a living in the 1960s, I agree that
> overall accuracy has improved by several orders of magnitude.
> It isn't perfect, though, and "zero defects" is a concept, a goal
> to reach for, not something we can take for granted.
>
> Today is not the "old tube days" either and those five little
> 60m micro-bands of FCC 03-105 are specified rather tight.

>
> If you want to lay eyes on some "perfect" appearing numerical
> digits on a display and Believe in them being "rock solid" and
> that your transmitted RF is Believed to stay within the 2.8 KHz
> legal specification, then fine with me. That's NOT any sort of
> test of performance. It is just a Belief System.

Fair enough and that is all I have said.

> >> >> No one else, not the manufacturer, not the dealer. You as
> >> >> the licensee are responsible.
> >> >
> >> >Agreed. That does not, however, require any periodic or
> >> >speciifc measurements to be made by me.
> >>
> >> So...you have NO way of knowing if you are operating
> >> responsibly as to technical characteristics of your RF
> >> emissions?
> >
> >Nor does over 90% of licensed hams.
>
> Okay, that's about 560 thousand licensees. Was there a poll
> of that many re-affirming that? :-)

It's a SWAG based on my contacts with other hams and
knowing the equipment they have and the operating practices
they follow.

> >> Not acceptible in a technical activity, Bill. The law is the
> >> law and Phil just recently reminded everyone that "ignorance
> >> is not an excuse."
> >
> >The law sez I am responsible for my signal. The law does
> >not proscribe any specific measurments, calibration or
> >testing I must do to be a ham. Again, I accept the
> >responsibility for my signal and operate as I see fit.
>
> Okay...do we put you down as a Believer then? :-)

You put me down as a ham responsibility for my signal and
operation as I see fit.

> >I do NOT need to measure my actual signal to be confident that
> >my signal meets specs. Do you measure your microwave
> >to be sure it isn't eminating RF beyond the specs permitted
> >for such devices (be the specs mandated by FCC, OSHA or whatever)?
>
> Yes I did. A new Amana over-the-range-with-vent-hood model
> microwave was installed with lots of other things on our
> southern house kitchen complete make-over three years ago.
> Borrowed a nice little portable spectrum analyzer (in calibration,
> by the way) over a weekend to check it out. No problems on

> radiation leakage, didn't even budge a wideband E-H Field
> Monitor. Found out the halogen light under-counter wall wart
> switcher tossed out too much EMI for my taste and replaced
> it with an ordinary 12 VAC transformer. The 2.4 GHz cordless
> telephone tested okay, too. :-)

Whatever makes you happy.

> >I have consistently stated and accept responsibility
> >for my signal. What don't you understand about that.
>
> Okay, you can sense RF performance by the Laying On of
> Hands. Fine. :-)

Works for me.

> >I know enough about the cross section of amateur demographics
> >to believe that few hams have the test equipment you would expect
> >to use to verify compliance.
>
> I don't expect anything of the "cross section of amateur
> demographics," Bill. If any of those "cross section" folks
> are in technical violation of the radio regulations, courts aren't
> going to take Belief System opinions as metrological tests.

Courts? Other than an FCC pink slip, why would the courts
get involved...unless the ham cited grossly ignored and failed
to take corrective action to eliminate an identified non compliance?

> >> FCC 03-105 give US amateurs five micro-bands, each with less
> >> than 3 KHz bandwidth. That is tight with a capital T. In order to
> >> operate there legally, it would take some measurements of
> >> several parts of an amateur transmitter to insure compliance
> >> with the law.
> >
> >Bull. I'm certain the FCC fully expects the vast array of commercial
> >ham gear to be no problem as that equipment operates with similar
> >specs today. As before, if in operation on 60m, the FCC were to
> >cite me for improper operation, I'd then take whatever response was
> >necessary. Until then, however, I have every confidence that my
> >Kenwood operates just fine per the specs.
>
> Whatever you say. :-)
>
> >I HAVE NEVER TAKEN ANY STANCE OTHER
> >THAN FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR MY SIGNAL.
>
> OK. :-)

Good!

> >> >> US Hams didn't have them before
> >> >> 14 May 2003 so it's not like something taken away

> >> >> from all of you.
> >> >
> >> >If there's a point you're making on that statement,
> >> >it eludes me.
> >>
> >> Really? :-)
> >>
> >> US radio amateurs had 9 bands below 30 MHz on 13 May 2003
> >> with a total bandwidth of 2.75 MHz. FCC 03-105 added 14 KHz
> >> to that total bandwidth, an increase of 0.5%.
> >>
> >> Seems like there's a whole heap of bitching, moaning, whining,
> >> ranting, shouting about that half-percent increase. :-)
> >
> >I'm not complaining. I think it's great.
>
> Let me correct a mistyped numerical value. 3.75 MHz of total
> US MF-HF bandspace allocated to US radio amateurs, not
> 2.75 MHz. :-)
>
> Okay, the FCC allocated a total of 14 KHz of 60m bandspace
> instead of ARRL's request of 150 KHz contiguous. US amateurs
> got less than 10% of the requested bandspace. That's still more
> than all the available bandspace on MF-HF as of 13 May 2003,
> right?

I have no clue as to what you are trying to make a point
about.

> >> Well then, just address your complaints to the FCC. You have
> >> their address. Come to think of it, you were there at least once.
> >> :-)
> >
> >It's not catastrophic and I'm sure the clarity will be found via the
> >pages of CQ and QST magazine.
>
> There ya go! Look to the magazines instead of the Federal
> Register. If it's in real ink on real paper, everyone can absolutely
> trust ARRL to interpret radio law, right? :-)

Works for me and a significant number of other hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1682. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 04:25:41 UTC
From: BARF <BARFnuts@barfpsychos.net>
Message-ID: <bas4vsoe0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67780
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Wasn't it Doc who used to say, "Cut the head off the snake,
and the body will die"? Meaning where are Herbie's gang of
misfits? It seems like they just vanished. I see where several
are silent keys now, but where are the others? I heard rumors
that a few are awaiting legal action in the courts, but does anyone
know who they are and what type of legal trouble they are in?

BARF

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:barkd9lmp1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> BARF= PUKE.
>
> Don Quixote (Herby) is a very intelligent individual. He has the sense
NOT
> to continue his association with the misfits on 313. More power to him.
>
> And the poster is quite correct. The various MM/Intercon nets that are
NOW
> ON 300 used to operate on 313. And thanks to those misfits were run off.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "BARF" <BARFnuts@barfpsychos.net> wrote in message
> news:barfokmti0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Frequency 14313 stands as an enduring living monument
> > how one person, KV4FZ, can destroy what was used as a
> > public service frequency for years. Then the stupid FCC
> > gives him his license back! In all fairness, it appears he may
> > have finally learned how to control his mouth though. Has
> > anyone heard him on any freq.????
> >
> > BARF
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1683. Re: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 04:32:07 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305260432080.3590@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67781

On Sun, 25 May 2003, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1345 - May 23 2003
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 5/24/2003 9:59 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250258540.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
> >> No doubt Bill posted this twice just to get Dieter's goat!
> >
> >Posting it ONCE is enough to generate the abuse report.
>
> I see the goat's been got!

There's no goat there. He remains in violation of the rules for this newsgroup
and continues to be with each post. An example of a group who does it
correctly is the group responsible for the Ohio/Penn DX bulletin.

1684. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 04:36:41 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305260436430.3590@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67782
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 25 May 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> >>the ARRL has now posted the recommended settings on their web site.
> >
> >You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't mean that
> >they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that the center
> >audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the maximum
> >bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make that 300Hz to
> >2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that doesn't
> >automatically make their settings optimal.
> >
> Well, everyone needs to use the same setting if we want to talk to each other
> and not sound like Donald Duck.... So the -1.5 KHz seems the most reasonable
> one to use so far.

So did the one that needed a -1.6kHz shift. It all depends on which audio
frequencies one wants to pass - then take the middle of that range and that
becomes the shift.

1685. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 04:49:18 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0305260448100.3590@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 67783
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 25 May 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250309260.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't mean
> that
> > they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that the
> center
> > audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the maximum
> > bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make that
> 300Hz to
> > 2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that doesn't
> > automatically make their settings optimal.
>
> Still going with the ARRL recommendations is probably the "safest." The
> ARRL recommendations would carry more weight with the FCC than a person's
> own individual calculation.

Not if the computation is improper. Just because the ARRL is "in bed with" the
FCC doesn't automatically mean that they do everything correctly.

1686. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 05:41:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bas9f1$8e1$0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 67784
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Sun, 25 May 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250309260.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't mean
> > that
> > > they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that the
> > center
> > > audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the maximum
> > > bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make that
> > 300Hz to
> > > 2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that doesn't
> > > automatically make their settings optimal.
> >
> > Still going with the ARRL recommendations is probably the "safest." The
> > ARRL recommendations would carry more weight with the FCC than a person's
> > own individual calculation.
>
> Not if the computation is improper. Just because the ARRL is "in bed with" the
> FCC doesn't automatically mean that they do everything correctly.

I'd bet that ARRL ran it by the FCC before publishing. Normal procedure. That way there's never a false move or incorrect procedure published in such cases. And no egg on face. ARRL doesn't like to get caught with egg on face.

1687. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 05:51:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526015136.25815.00000242@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67785

In article <20030525193242.29002.00000199@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfd2s5m.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
><Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
>>On 24 May 2003 00:24:36 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>Bit of railroad trivia....
>>>
>>>For quite some years the Pennsylvania Railroad referred to steam
>>>and diesel-electric locomotives as "engines" and referred to
>>>electric locomotives (third-rail or overhead wire) as "motors".
>>
>> IIRC the NEC DS-es still refer to them as "motors".
>
>"As God and the Pennsylvania Railroad intended" - Nelson Bowers, at the
>rededication of GG-1 4935
>
>Here's another bit of RR trivia: What does the letter F mean when painted on
>multiple-unit cars and locomotives like the GG-1, P-5 and AEM-7?

Can't you find enough OTHER newsgroups to post about your
choo-choo train interest? :-)

Or is everyone supposed to gabble about railroading in a RADIO
newsgroup? [anagramists could assemble "radio" from "rail-
roading" but that is stretching credulity... :-)]

Policeman, police yourself.

1688. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 05:51:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526015140.25815.00000243@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67786

In article <20030525200538.04207.00000257@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030525182138.27503.00000190@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030525162722.15462.00000232@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030524212829.02076.00000229@mb-m14.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>> The "Feds" have had "full control" on US amateur radio since 1934.
>>>
>>>1912, actually.
>>
>> Not for you, grasshopper. :-)
>
>For everyone.

Who is "everyone?"

Who in here was licensed in any radio before 1934?

>> The FCC came into existance in 1934.
>
>Before that, there was the FRC, and before the FRC was the Department of
>Commerce. And before that, the Navy. All are/were "the Feds".

Those old radio regulating agencies are GONE. Defunct.

The US Navy is still around but NOT regulating US civil radio
since before 1934.

The Radio Club of America is still around, founded in 1909, five
years before three New Englanders formed the ARRL to hack
commercial telegram carriers.

>> Those are the folks who
>> granted you your amateur radio license.
>
>In 1967.

That was the FCC. No other "fed" agency.

Do try to keep your timelines straight, old-timer.

>>>> I realize that may come as a rude awakening to those who
>>>> thought ARRL ran the whole thing... :-)
>>>
>>>Who thought that, besides you? ;-)
>>
>> ARRL still seems to think they run the whole thing. <shrug>
>
>Only seems that way to you.

...and the BoD of ARRL, the staff of ARRL, and 170 odd
thousand or so members. Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

>>>>> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have
>>>>> been raving about?
>>>>
>>>> It's still there and was there before "Homeland Security" was an
>>>> administration secretarial agency.
>>>
>>>But apparently it is so highly vulnerable to interference from amateur
>>>stations
>>>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50
>>>watts ERP.
>>
>> Was that in FCC 03-105? I don't think so.
>
>It's clear that NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs.

What is "clear?"

Have you extracted any NTIA documents from the FCC ECFS on
RM-10209? I don't think so.

FCC isn't Google. Try to break away from old, old message
searching and look through the FCC ECFS.

>>>> Read up on ALE or Automatic Link Establishment on HF. SHARES
>>>> uses that. Can you recognize an ALE signal if you hear one? You
>>>> can find out via the Internet with one site having sound samples.
>>>> Hint: It doesn't sound like OOK CW or FSK RTTY.
>>>
>>>There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs be able to recognize ALE
>>>signals.
>>
>> There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs HAVE to test their
>> equipment, either.
>
>So?

Sohl, Bill Sohl. :-)

>>>>>The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum
>>>>>bulletproof and interference immune?

>>>>
>>>> ALE doesn't need spread spectrum techniques yet can find an
>>>> open frequency automatically and send data at high rates
>>>> regardless of claims by olde-tymers that "phase shifting on HF
>>>> makes it no good." :-)
>>>
>>>Apparently, though, ALE is so vulnerable to interference from amateur
>>>stations
>>>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50
>>>watts ERP.
>>
>> Feedback! Echo chamber! Speculation, Jimmie, just speculation.
>
>By you.

No, YOU are the one speculating on what the NTIA is "worried
about."

Now go do an ECFS search on RM-10209 and tell us all what
the NTIA *really* said about all that "worry." :-)

>> Perhaps you didn't get the inferences tuned in correctly. Think
>> about THIS speculation instead:
>>
>> The FCC might have gotten pished at the ARRL pushing for the
>> 60m band (and all that fuss over "pioneering and testing" 60m
>> by a special group of ARRL-selected hams) that they tossed out
>> 5 little micro-band crumbs. The FCC can truthfully say they've
>> given out more spectrum to US radio amateurs. Nobody can say
>> otherwise. :-)
>
>Nonsense. The NPRM proposed amateur access to a 150 kHz wide band with many
>modes permitted, not 5 channels of USB. The NPRM was written by the FCC, not
>the ARRL.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. ARRL can NEVER write any NPRM or even an RM
(ET Docket No. 02-98 and RM-10209 respectively). ARRL can
only request. RM-10209 was *exactly* like what ARRL wanted.

Try to understand federal procedure, grasshopper.

>> What the FCC actually gave out is NOT what ARRL wanted and
>> those little 2.8 KHz BW micro-bands aren't good for the usual QSO
>> activity on other bands.
>
>They're not micro-bands. They're channels.

I call them MICRO-BANDS. You don't like it? Guess where you
can put your don't-like. :-)

"Channels" are they? Mass Media Bureau talks about BC
channels. The narrowest of those are quite a bit bigger than
those five separate little MICRO-BANDS.

>> NO OOK CW! :-) USB only, VOICE!
>
>No LSB. No PSK31. No data modes of any kind, in fact.

Awwwww.

>> [are paddle-twiddlers furious or what? :-)]
>
>Nope. Just a little disappointed.

You into canoes or kayaks, PADDLING in "channels?" :-)

>>>> This is the new millenium, not the days of the 1930s.
>>>
>>>You mean Morse Code/CW wasn't used for "radio messaging" in WW2?
>>
>> The USA didn't get into WW2 until the 1940s, grasshopper.
>
>That's the point.

What "point?" Are you implying the USA had "no radio" before
1941?!?!? I know there was radio here before then...heard it
myself. It's even in all the OTHER radio history outside of ARRL
official outpourings.

>> Even so, the commercial communications carrier services and
>> US military relied on RTTY in several modes for the majority of
>> "radio messages" during WW2.
>
>How do you know? Do you have message totals for WW2?

Actually, I DID have figures on that! :-) But that was some time
ago when I actually served in the US Army Signal Corps and had
access to their radio data between 1953 and 1956.

You never served in ANY branch of the US military. Do YOU
have access to OTHER radio arcana besides old amateur stuff?

>> The US Navy began using
>> on-line encryption among heavier-class warships (cruiser class
>> and heavier) via TTY in 1939. After full entry into WW2, even
>> USN submarines had encrypted RTTY sets (see the USS
>> Pampanito Museum website for a picture).
>
>Doesn't change the fact that Morse code/CW was used extensively by the US
>military in WW2, and for years afterward. Which really seems to bother you.

Try to be OBJECTIVE, grasshopper. Define "extensively."

A LOT of DIFFERENT things were USED EXTENSIVELY by the US
military in WW2. :-)

This is 2003, not 1941 to 1945. You didn't exist in WW2. But,
there are LOTS of history of the US military in WW2. :-)

Let's try land communications among the foot soldiers. Before WW2 the small-unit radio was a kluge of three rucksack-carried radio boxes and used voice. Some invited Motorola civilians saw that and came up with what became known as the "handie-talkie." Motorola in Chicago was producing them when December 7, 1941, came upon us Americans (not you, Jimmie, you didn't exist yet). Handie-talkies were eventually used by all branches of the US military. Motorola followed that with the SCR-300, the "walkie-talkie," again voice but using FM. Armor and artillery units got vehicular FM radios, again voice and FM, frequency-compatible with the SCR-300. Those vehicle radios got the colloquial name of "tank radios" because the tankers loved them to keep in touch reliably with the rest of the troop and squadron. Sure, there were field radios with OOK CW telegraphy but the teleprinters gave commanders very quick printed communications with little error (compared to manual telegraphy). There was considerable support for teleprinters available up close to the battlefields, including radio relay equipment. After the end of WW2 several nations copied the SCR-300 outright (Brit version became WS-31). The US developed the AN/PRC-6, the VHF successor to the handie-talkie (low HF only) and compatible with the AN/PRC-9 family of VHF backpack radios that replaced the SCR-300 during the Korean War. Those are all voice mode radios. By the time of the Vietnam War the AN/PRC-25 had been fielded, again VHF FM voice, but nearly all solid-state. The follow-on PRC-77 was an all solid-state PRC-25. An eighth of a million 25s and 77s were built in its service lifetime. By the first Gulf War the US military was switching over to the SINCGARS family, again FM voice but this one could frequency-hop and digitize the voice (enabling easy voice scrambling) and also send data. By the end of last year a quarter million of the SINCGARS full and improved had been built and fielded. Voice communications in the US military on land was king from about 1938 to the present time.

Also around 1938 the air forces of the US got the first of the "Command Sets." Those were voice and OOK CW but the mode of choice by pilots was voice...pilots on the flight deck got control even though the radios were farther aft. With the SCR-522 and its close cousins, single-seat aircraft were on VHF with voice. Air speeds had climbed along with altitude, pilots couldn't handle high-performance combat aircraft and also tap out slow morse on leg-strapped keys. After the breakoff of the USAF from the Army, all US military aviation used UHF voice for air-air, air-ground communications. US led the way for international civil airways communicating by voice on VHF AM sets after 1955. Yes, long-distance air carriers used telegraphy on over-ocean flights but those were replaced by sideband HF sets and the telegraphy-knowing aircrewmen were out.

The world's navies held onto manual telegraphy the longest. Call it tradition. The maritime world was the first to embrace radio. Ships moved at slow rates. Slower-speed morse was not a

problem afloat. But Flag communications needed good
encryption and they got it with the "Sigaba," the rotor-rolling-
code secure teleprinter. They had that since the late 1930s.
Ships routinely sailed long distances so "CW" was okay for
ordinary messaging. But, ships had to do lots of voice up close
and personal to other ships and in harbors and with support
aircraft.

>> The majority of US military radio communications during WW2
>> was VOICE, Jimmie.
>
>How do you know?

I was IN the US military, Jimmie. Some of the communications
equipment I used was also used in WW2. The immediate history
of the US Army and some other branches was available to me.
I both served with and talked to military members who were IN
WW2 doing many kinds of communications. My service time
began just 7 years after WW2 ended...not enough time to enable
ex-WW2-vets to embellish their stories like some do today.

>> Voice in the aircraft, voice between tanks,
>> voice between foot soldiers, even voice between ships. OOK CW
>> was on the way out even back then. Yes, there was
>> morsemanship taught and used in the US military way back then
>> but it was still a secondary mode.
>
>Not really.

REALLY. Don't try all that denial, Jimmie. It doesn't get you anything
but funny looks from people who know better than you.

>> That secondary role gave way
>> to a tertiary role later and finally to oblivion. Bye, bye military
>> morsie.
>>
>So?

So bye-bye, so long so-so.

>There was a time when almost all ships were sailing ships. Over time sails
were
>replaced by steam, diesel, and even nuclear engines. Sailing is now almost
>totally a recreational activity. Yet it's far from extinct or obsolete.

Sails don't work by radio, grasshopper. :-)

Are you going to find OOK CW radios aboard recreational sailing
vessels today? Only with amateur radio licensee sailors. A couple
months ago I used a little SGC-2020 HF SSB transceiver aboard
such a recreational sailing vessel. No telegraphy key attached.
Just a microphone. How about that? :-)

So now what, mighty morseman?

1689. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 10:02:15 UTC
From: QRP <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <bason1$9r8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BARF" <BARFnuts@barfpsychos.net> wrote in message
news:bas4vsoe0@pita.alt.net...
Wasn't it Doc who used to say, "Cut the head off the snake,
and the body will die"? Meaning where are Herbie's gang of
misfits? It seems like they just vanished. I see where several
are silent keys now, but where are the others? I heard rumors
that a few are awaiting legal action in the courts, but does anyone
know who they are and what type of legal trouble they are in?

BARF
...../////////////////////////////
There is evidence that James O'Brien, W4AMP, once a BARF "enforcer" and
member is now under indictment for Felony Stalking. This can be verified by
looking at the Cobb County Sheriff Dept. web page. His charges are listed
there and he is, according to the site, awaiting trial this July.
The web site also shows that his wife, WA4SEX was also arrested for
stalking, misdemeanor.
Not mentioned is the search warrant the two-county detectives served on him
while he was living in Hiram, GA. They found ample evidence to charge him
with Felony Stalking and even, not surprisingly, found a bit of a
"controlled substance" in his home. They then added a second charge.
Mr. O'B spent around 33-35 days in jail and upon his release he was
re-arrested to face charges in the neighboring county. He allegedly
explained his time away from the radios by telling area Hams that he was out
of town on "business."
Mr. O'Brien is currently facing some serious loss of liberty as a result of
his illegal activities and several of us wish him a long journey.
So much for a fellow BARF member.

1690. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 11:11:04 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <xAidnUQa-JXOa0yjXTWcow@crocker.com>
Source record: 67790

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
> > Guess that solves that.
>
> And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
>
>
> Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
>
> 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
>
> 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
>
> 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
>
> 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
>
> 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
>
and dont' forget... USB voice only... no cw, no rtty, no sstv, no throb or
psk or any of that other stuff, just USB voice.

1691. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 11:56:54 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305260356.589094b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67791

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030525193243.29002.00000200@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <3ED12421.9CA65588@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >I love the new flexibility. An example is the Orion's AGC. The medium
> >AGC setting is nearer to being "right" for CW. The fast setting is
> >simply too fast for my liking. By using the programmable AGC setting, I
> >have something between the two which suits my operating nicely.
>
> Easier than soldering in different time constant caps.....
>
> I rarely if ever use AGC on CW. Better without it.

Was marginally true in 1970. If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1692. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:05:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305260405.1c5d7116@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67792

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030526015140.25815.00000243@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <20030525200538.04207.00000257@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> >
> >Before that, there was the FRC, and before the FRC was the Department of
> >Commerce. And before that, the Navy. All are/were "the Feds".
>
> Those old radio regulating agencies are GONE. Defunct.

No the FRC is not defunct ya Putz, we're still here and still in
control. If you don't believe it check our scores.

http://www.gofrc.org/

w3rv

1693. A Memorial Day Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:12:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526081254.04407.00000443@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67793

As yet another Memorial Day has arrived, more names have been added to those who have fallen in combat in order to allow us to remain free, and under a new banner, allowed others to have freedom they had not know for a generation.

Where do we find such men and women? Will we find them in the future when we need them again?

The following was sent to me as a forward...I couldn't have been this graceful.

To those of you who have served our Nation...To those who serve today and to those who have preceeded us, Thank-you.

Steven J Robeson

Subject: Memorial Day 2003

It is no wonder that many Americans no longer observe Memorial Day with reverence. Schools no longer teach civics, the courts exclude God (officially) from the public square, and the media and malls "celebrate" Memorial Day for commercial sales. Indeed, Memorial Day has been sold out.

Fortunately, Memorial Day is still reserved by American Patriots as a day to honor the service and sacrifice of fallen men and women who donned our Armed Forces uniforms with honor.

When contemplating this Memorial Day, consider these tender words from 3-year-old Taylor Pokorney at the funeral service for his father, Marine Corps 1st Lt. Frederick Pokorney, killed in action recently in Iraqi: "My daddy, my hero, I will take care of Mommy for you as you asked. We will be best friends. I will take her to Sea World for my birthday like you planned. I love you. I need you. I miss you."

We invite you to forward this e-mail with young Taylor's words along to others, as a solemn reminder of who we honor on Memorial Day. One appropriate way to recognize fallen veterans and their families is to join with others and help place flags on the graves of fallen Patriots at your nearest National Cemetery (generally done the Saturday before Memorial Day).

Founding Patriot John Adams said: "I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost to maintain this Declaration, and support and defend these States. Yet through all the gloom I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is worth more than all the means...." Indeed it is!

A MEMORIAL DAY MESSAGE

"Tell them, tell them when you get home that I gave all of my tomorrow's so they could have today!"

Those are the words on a tombstone, far across the Pacific, of someone who gave up his life for our future. Were those words uttered so that those of us who are left could just enjoy our lives without "getting involved" or were they written to remind us that the work of freedom and liberty is never done?

Were those words written to suggest to us that it is not our job nor our responsibility to keep alive what they fought and died for or were they written to remind us that we were given the opportunity of life so that we would continue to defend, and keep alive the memory of what they gave their last full measure for?

Let us here today, tonight, tomorrow, next month and next year - remember these gallant defenders of our freedom. Most were not heroes as defined by the most hallowed Medal of Honor nor even as defined by the silver or bronze star. But they were ALL HEROES. Yes they were heroes because, without hesitation they fought for our country when they were asked to defend her.

Most didn't die throwing themselves on a hand grenade, charging a bunker or manning a machine gun until their ammunition was gone. Most didn't die diving their airplane into an enemy ship or marching in the infamous Bataan Death march -- but they are heroes because they fought when asked to fight. They left their families, friends and good times behind and went to fight for our freedom without hesitation.

Some -- never even fired their weapons because they were killed before they ever reached the beach. But they were heroes because they were there, ready to fight for America - for family, flag and country.

Most were scared to death as they prepared to meet the enemy. Their stomachs were turned upside down and they prayed to God and wished they were with their moms, dads and sweethearts rather than being where they were.

But they were where they were, fighting an enemy that was threatening their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. They were fighting an enemy because they believed in America, they loved Her flag and they wanted to protect American's right to worship as they chose. They were there, without hesitation, fighting for what they believed in and dying for what they believed in so you and I could live the way we chose in a free country.

But they did not die so that we would stop fighting for what they believed and died for. They fought and died knowing that we, the living, would go on fighting for that same freedom, that same country, that same flag and for that same right to worship as we choose.

Abraham Lincoln, at Gettysburg, said:

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us--that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion--that we here highly resolve that these dead

shall not have died in vain--that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom--and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth."

It is for us the living to go on defending what they died for. It is for us the living not to allow history to forget what they gave up all their tomorrow's for. It is for us the living to expect to get a bit uncomfortable as we continue to tell the truth even as the vocal minorities try to silence us.

Good Enough is Not Good Enough! When we open our mouths but once and we're told we shouldn't say that --- we must not say we tried --- good enough! Good enough is not good enough.

If when we attacked Guadalcanal and landed at Salerno, we found that "they" were going to fight back, we didn't give up because they fought back. We continued to fight because we knew our cause was right!

When Americans rode in the landing craft before storming the beaches at Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Sicily, Anzio, Normandy, Peleliu, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Inchon and many other places we had never heard of before and when they fought in North Africa, the Philippines, Italy, France, Bastonne, Germany, Korea, Vietnam, the Gulf and MANY other places foreign to us -- most were scared to death; their stomachs were turned upside down and they wanted to be back home with their loved ones. But that did not stop them from attacking America's enemies bravely and without hesitation. They fought, and many died, but they did not give up because someone shot back at them.

It is for us the living to continue to defend and keep known what they fought and died for -- what they gave up all of their tomorrow's for. They did not die so that we could become complacent; nor did they die so that when we, the living, reached a single obstacle --- we should quit. They died knowing that we would go on defending their actions, defending history and defending what they gave up all their tomorrow's for.

If WE don't remember ---if WE don't defend what they fought and died for and what we fought for -- who will remember? Who will care?

Revisionists are attempting to change history. ---- At the Smithsonian they sought to tell of our supposed atrocious to our past enemies. America's Ambassador to Japan apologized to the Japanese for us without getting any apology, nor even an acknowledgement of wrong-doing.

Peter Jennings had an hour long TV special demonstrating our injustices and he expressed disappointment that the Smithsonian was prevented from displaying all the photographs of the results of our bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He expressed disappointment that veterans blocked the truth from being known. And --- until many Minnesota veterans and Asian Americans protested --- a mass Requiem Hiroshima, was to be played for the dead, caused by America and Americans, of the bombing of Hiroshima without describing the events and atrocities committed that led up to our having to drop the bomb.

Today -- WE are even prevented from protecting our flag by the minority and a few in Washington, DC even though most Americans proclaim that burning our flag is not what they consider free speech. How many of us who fought for our flag and our country remember the feeling as Old Glory" was being raised over a piece of land we fought for ---- and many died for? How many remember seeing or hearing about our valiant warriors, who were fighting on Iwo Jima, as they stood and cheered when they saw the flag being raised over Mt. Suribachi.

Today our flag is not present in many classrooms across this nation and if it is there is no pledge of allegiance. Today even many of America's houses of worship do not fly "Old Glory!" Is it any wonder why America and Americans have changed so drastically?

Who ---- in the future ---- will even remember what our veterans did? Who will remember our sacrifices? Take a walk down the street today and ask people important questions about WWII, Korea and even Vietnam. How many correct answers do you think you'll receive. How many won't even answer at all and how many will say ”All I know is ---- at the end of WWII ---- we shouldn't have dropped the bomb!" "We were wrong to drop the bomb!"

Who would we blame for this? All veterans and all veteran's organizations who would discourage its members from being involved in defending what they gave their lives for - would be to blame. All of us who won't take the time to write or speak or call their representatives ----- will be to blame.

And if, when we're again called to duty ---- this time to guard the streets of Heaven ---- we look down and find that no one wants to defend our nation, no one wants to follow our flag and even the monuments to defenders past - are being torn down, we will hang our heads in shame and say why! Why did we allow ourselves to not defend what we did and what they died for?

And now we are engaged in a war against terrorism and more Americans are sacrificing their lives for your freedom and mine. These young Americans, who are all volunteers, are proud representatives of America and are doing a wonderful job of following up all of those who fought for our freedom in the past.

Each death of a patriot hurts terribly but it especially has to hurt the loved ones left behind even more than before because I'm sure they thought, when there were so few deaths, why?? Why my son or daughter. Why? Why? But they can truly hold their heads high and be proud of the freedom their loved one died to defend.

Thank God for those who risk their lives to save the freedom we hold so dear. Thank God for those who keep our children and grandchildren safe. Thank God for those who don the uniform and pledge to go where they have to go and do what they have to do to keep America free.

In closing, let's remember again what Abraham Lincoln said: "that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain," and what President John F. Kennedy said in his famous inauguration speech -- "Ask not what your country can do for you -- ask what you can do for your country" and last of all remember that gravestone far across the Pacific which states: "Tell them I

gave all my tomorrows so they could have today!"

Let's remember all of the hero’s in this cemetery and in cemeteries all across America and all over the world ------ let's remember that they too gave all their tomorrow's so that we could have today.

By: Kale Danberg

1694. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:16:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526081605.04407.00000444@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67794

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 5/26/2003 7:05 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305260405.1c5d7116@posting.google.com>

>No the FRC is not defunct ya Putz, we're still here and still in
>control. If you don't believe it check our scores

That'll teach him to clarify who his acronyms are about!

FRC Rules!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1695. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:24:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526082440.04407.00000445@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67795

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/25/2003 9:52 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED18121.856F2DB8@earthlink.net>

>> >I've been here for at least seven years. I haven't noted any move >on his
>> part toward actual implementation of his stated goal.
>>
>> Incredible.
>
>What's incredible is there is no ground swell of support for Len's
>advocacy after all these years. Zip. Zilch. Nil. Zed.

And even those who basically support his "advocacy" won't support him
because he's such an evil and lying SOB...Who'd WANT to be associated with him?

>> Well, there's the group composed of Avery Fine, Avery Fineman, Len Of 21,
>Len
>> Over 21.....
>
>How many times have you heard of a case where an individual has multiple
>personalities but they are all basically the same?

At least one!

>> >He is for the removal of morse testing because he
>> >finds morse difficult.
>>
>> He does? When did he say he'd ever tried the mode?
>
>He has said that at one time, he knew morse at something like eight
>words per minute. I substract a little for the embellishment factor.

A whole LOT of embellishment. (And we are surprised...WHY?) He has stated
that he's known Morse Code for quite a while. Again, if an Amateur Radio
license were even a low priority, it could have been accquired a long time ago.

It's not even on his list. He's found a niche where he can aggrivate and
insult to his heart's content with desired results.

He's simply an antagonist and liar. He get's what HE wants, nothing more,
nothing less.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1696. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:24:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526082458.23307.00000271@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 67797

In article <d22b54c3.0305251818.60219b79@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030525142446.14837.00000233@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0305241948.610620fa@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >No surprise there, everybody who held a General or Conditional - which
>> >was the huge majority of us then - lost prime space on top of being
>> >barred from the expanded phone bands.
>>
>> "Expanded phone bands"?
>
>Yes, expanded phone bands. From the end of WW2 thru the timeframe
>under discussion U.S phone ops were not permitted below 3.800, 7.200,
>14.200 and 21.300. As a General ~1954~1968 I could and did operate
>phone down to those limits. Then along came the FCC with The Brainfart
>we call Incentive Licensing.

Hold on a sec...

Before Feb 1953, the only HF/MF 'phone available to Generals & Conditionals was 10/11 meters and what was left of 160. In the 1951 restructure that gave us the Novice, Tech and Extra and renamed the old ABC classes, FCC upped the ante by announcing there would be no more new Advanceds after the end of 1952. Then in December of '52 they went the other way and opened up everything to Generals and Conditionals.

Point of all that is simply that an incentive system existed long before 1968. The period of "Generals get it all" lasted from Feb 1953 to Nov 1968 - just 16 years and 9 months.

>Part of that overall package included
>reshuffling the phone bands to provide a very big incentive to become
>an Extra. Whether or not this particular reshuffling was part of the
>fundamental Incentive Licensing R&O is long lost minutia on my part.
>All I cared about was that if I didn't take the test I was dead meat
>as a dxer/contester so I took the test and haven't spent much time
>looking back.

Same here. In fact the original proposal was that by 1969 it would take an Extra to get access to the lower 50 kHz of 80/40/20/15 CW/digital.
>
>If I recall the details correctly the first wave of this reshuffling

>maneuver specifically on 20 was to (a) boot Generals out of
>14.200-14.225 (b) allow Advanceds to continue to operate above 14.200
>and (c) the FCC opened 14.175 and up for Extras running phone. The
>other bands were similarly rearranged. Which very significantly
>changed the dynamics of phone dxing and dx contesting and created one
>helluva uproar from Advanceds and the DX which all of a sudden found
>volumes of us damned Ugly Americans operating in their "preserves"
>below the former U.S. phone band edge limits.

I think you've got two different historical items mixed up. The original IL implementation did not expand the 'phone bands at all. That happened a few years later. I'll dig up the history and double-check.

>
>> K2UNK points out, for some reason a relatively small percentage (~15%) of
>> Advanceds have upgraded.
>
>They don't have any particular incentive to upgrade is howcum. Unless
>they're hellbent on having a 1x2 or a 2x1.

There ya go!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1697. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:24:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526082459.23307.00000272@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 67796

In article <20030526015136.25815.00000242@mb-m07.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

(N2EY wrote):
>>
>>Here's another bit of RR trivia: What does the letter F mean when painted on
>>multiple-unit cars and locomotives like the GG-1, P-5 and AEM-7?
>
> Can't you find enough OTHER newsgroups to post about your
> choo-choo train interest? :-)

Can't answer the question, can you, Len?
>
> Or is everyone supposed to gabble about railroading in a RADIO
> newsgroup? [anagramists could assemble "radio" from "rail-
> roading" but that is stretching credulity... :-)]

Nobody has to "gabble" about anyhting if they're not interested. You've gone on at length about non-amateur-radio subjects.
>
> Policeman, police yourself.
>
Right back atcha, 12810 ;-)

1698. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:36:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526083641.04407.00000446@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67798

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 5/25/2003 9:56 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <barvv8$up3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>

>> Oh? And WHAT "telephony" device has been 100% maintenence free for 30
>> years, Bill?
>
>I never said that.

Then you don't need to say things like:

>> >>"ZERO maintenance"...?!?! Where are you getting THAT, Bill?
>> >
>> >Personal history and a 30+ year career in telephony is where I get that.

You are saying that in your 30 year history, "telephony" equipment has
been near 100% maintenence free.

>Most telco devices don't have a life that lasts 30
>years. Most ham gear doesn't either. Even at that, unless something
>breaks,
>just what would you expect to go "out-of-compliance" in today's commercial
>ham rigs?

My Yaesu FT757GXMkII did. Had a local oscillator crystal go bad. It was
evident to me, if not others, since I was constantly having to retune to stay
on net. I put it on the bench and found several things wrong. I fixed them.
Had I not kept track of such things, I would not have been "in compliance".

>> I have family working for Mom Bell in Smyrna, GA, and she'd
>> beg to differ with you.
>
>Beg to differ all they want. What job function do they
>fill?

She worked in one of the main switching buses. She was definately NOT the
Maytag Repaiman, longing for something to do.

>Also, FYI, Ma Bell was killed off as of 1/1/1983.

Maybe so, but some of her offspring have the same surname.

>> >Because I don't have any such problem.
>>
>> That you KNOW of.......
>
>Works for me.

Then we can assume you shop at "Mediocrity R Us"...?!?!

>> >The same way that I take responsibility for the speed I am going in a car
>if
>> >the speedometer doesn't work...and trust me, I've had more than one
>> >car with a nonfunctioning speedometer.
>>
>> I don't doubt it, Bill.
>
>Glad you agree.

On some things you don't WANT people to agree. This was one of them,
Bill. Oh Well.

Steve, K4CAP

1699. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 12:39:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526083911.04407.00000448@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67799

>Subject: Re: "Uncle says..."
>From: "David Robbins" k1ttt@arrl.net
>Date: 5/26/2003 6:11 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <xAidnUQa-JXOa0yjXTWcow@crocker.com>

>and dont' forget... USB voice only... no cw, no rtty, no sstv, no throb or
>psk or any of that other stuff, just USB voice.

I forgot that....Thanks!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1700. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 13:12:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526091259.04407.00000452@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67800

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/26/2003 12:51 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030526015140.25815.00000243@mb-m07.aol.com>

>>> ARRL still seems to think they run the whole thing. <shrug>
>>
>>Only seems that way to you.
>
> ...and the BoD of ARRL, the staff of ARRL, and 170 odd
> thousand or so members.

Being an active member and reading the minutes of the board, I can say
that this is utter balderdash.

But then Lennie knew THAT as soon as he wrote it.

>>> Feedback! Echo chamber! Speculation, Jimmie, just speculation.
>>
>>By you.
>
> No, YOU are the one speculating on what the NTIA is "worried
> about."

That's EXACTLY what the NTIA is concerned about, or they wouldn't have
batten an eye over this.

There are significant users of that part of the spectrum, and we were
lucky to even be let in the neighborhood. Our conduct now will determine
future expansion.

>Now go do an ECFS search on RM-10209 and tell us all what
> the NTIA *really* said about all that "worry."

For those of us who DO have to deal with NTIA on issues other than Amateur
Radio, I can say that this WAS an issue for them based upon comments raised by
other NTIA users.

Someone (such as myself) with PRACTICAL experience in such matters might
know better. Lennie does NOT.

>Try to understand federal procedure, grasshopper.

His name is Jim. He calls you by your proper given name, yet you continue
to insult him. This makes you a scumbag.

Also, you place yourself upon a pedestle that you did not earn in doing
so. (calling him "grasshopper", the connotation being that you are the mentor

from the "Kung Fu" series...You are NO "mentor")

>>They're not micro-bands. They're channels.
>
> I call them MICRO-BANDS. You don't like it? Guess where you
> can put your don't-like.

Then, "Mr I-Am-A-Radiocommunications Professional", you would demonstrate your ignorance yet again.

As if we were shocked.

>>How do you know? Do you have message totals for WW2?
>
> Actually, I DID have figures on that! :-) But that was some time
> ago when I actually served in the US Army Signal Corps and had
> access to their radio data between 1953 and 1956.

Rear area radio clerks have access to that info, Jim.

>This is 2003, not 1941 to 1945.

Nor is it 1953...or 1956...or anyother time before May 26th, 2003, yet YOU seem to constantly refer to it, yet assail those who do it also.

>Let's try land communications among the foot soldiers. Before
> WW2 the small-unit radio was a kluge of three rucksack-carried
> radio boxes and used voice....(SNIPPED)

I am sure it was yet another informative barrage of non-germane radio history, however none of it relevent to PRESENT DAY Amateur Radio practice or policy.

You, yourself, Lennie, routinely assail others for such trips down "Nostalgia Lane"...How come it's "OK" when YOU do it?

>Also around 1938 the air forces of the US got the first of the
> "Command Sets."...(SNIPPED)

A left turn off of Nostalgia Lane onto Boatanchor Drive.

>>> The majority of US military radio communications during WW2
>>> was VOICE, Jimmie.
>>
>>How do you know?
>
> I was IN the US military, Jimmie.

One three year active tour in a rear area radio station.

Whewie! We are sooooooooooooo (un)impressed.

>My service time
> began just 7 years after WW2 ended...not enough time to enable
> ex-WW2-vets to embellish their stories like some do today.

And YOUR "service time" ended over 43 years ago...MORE than enough time for YOU to embellish a LOT. Like associating yourself with combat KIA's who died 3 years before yuo were even in boot camp.

I find it even MORE offensive than usual that YOU would even broach the topic on this, Memorial Day. Your ability to offend and insult knows no bounds, Oh Scummy One.

>>> Voice in the aircraft, voice between tanks,
>>> voice between foot soldiers, even voice between ships. OOK CW
>>> was on the way out even back then. Yes, there was
>>> morsemanship taught and used in the US military way back then
>>> but it was still a secondary mode.
>>
>>Not really.
>
> REALLY. Don't try all that denial, Jimmie. It doesn't get you anything
> but funny looks from people who know better than you.

Such as...YOU...?!?!?

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

>So now what, mighty morseman?

So I'd say he pretty well deflated yet another LennieRant. You made even more unfounded and irrelevent twists in the road, insulted people you don't know, and once again dishonored your military service.

Happy Memorial Day, Lying Putz.

Steve, K4CAP

1701. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 13:49:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bat6h4$k5r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67852

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030526083641.04407.00000446@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 5/25/2003 9:56 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <barvv8$up3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >> Oh? And WHAT "telephony" device has been 100% maintenence free for
30
> >> years, Bill?
> >
> >I never said that.
>
> Then you don't need to say things like:
>
> >> >>"ZERO maintenance"...?!?! Where are you getting THAT, Bill?
> >> >
> >> >Personal history and a 30+ year career in telephony is where I get
that.
>
> You are saying that in your 30 year history, "telephony" equipment
has
> been near 100% maintenence free.

Your interpretation. I am saying that in my 30+ year career,
I have seen the evolution of equipment to near
maintenance free state. That does NOT mean a piece of equipment
built 30 years ago is as maintence free as today's.

> >Most telco devices don't have a life that lasts 30
> >years. Most ham gear doesn't either. Even at that, unless something
> >breaks,
> >just what would you expect to go "out-of-compliance" in today's
commercial
> >ham rigs?
>
> My Yaesu FT757GXMkII did. Had a local oscillator crystal go bad. It
was
> evident to me, if not others, since I was constantly having to retune to
stay
> on net.

So you didn't need a periodic maintence measurement to
know there was a problem with your rig. That's exactly my
point. To effect a specific diagnosis and repair may call

into need certain testing, but even you admit in this case
that you knew there was a problem without doing
routine testing.

> I put it on the bench and found several things wrong. I fixed them.
> Had I not kept track of such things, I would not have been "in
compliance".

You just admitted you knew something was wrong because of the
need to frequently retune. If with that knowledge you still continued
to operate, then your common sense would be in question (IMHO).

> >> I have family working for Mom Bell in Smyrna, GA, and she'd
> >> beg to differ with you.
> >
> >Beg to differ all they want. What job function do they
> >fill?
>
> She worked in one of the main switching buses. She was definately NOT
the
> Maytag Repaiman, longing for something to do.

There is plenty of non-maintenace stuff that keeps today's tech's
busy. They don't field repair anything anymore...just plug-in
replacements. You won't find much in the way of test
equipment in today's telco offices either.

> >Also, FYI, Ma Bell was killed off as of 1/1/1983.
>
> Maybe so, but some of her offspring have the same surname.

They may use "Bell", but that's no longer indicative of "Ma Bell"
which represented at the time the AT&T parent company and the
20 odd tellcos under that umbrella (i.e. NJ Bell, Illinois Bell,
SW Bell, etc.) That was what was broken up in 1/1/84 (I mistakenly
said 83 in my original post).

> >> >Because I don't have any such problem.
> >>
> >> That you KNOW of.......
> >
> >Works for me.
>
> Then we can assume you shop at "Mediocrity R Us"...?!?!

How does what I do translate to mediocrity mindest. I just purchased
a brand new truck which does not need to be inspected in NJ until
2007. Should I pay to have it inspected for emmisions anyway? How often?
Or do I drive it and not worry about emissions unless some other
indication occurs (e.g. enigine warning light, change in gas mileage,
loss of power?)?

> >> >The same way that I take responsibility for the speed I am going in a
car
> >if
> >> >the speedometer doesn't work...and trust me, I've had more than one
> >> >car with a nonfunctioning speedometer.
> >>
> >> I don't doubt it, Bill.
> >
> >Glad you agree.
>
> On some things you don't WANT people to agree. This was one of them,

Why? Are you incabable of driving without a speedometer?
Does the car NEED the speedometer to function?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1702. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 13:55:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bat6h5$k5r$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67851
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bas9f1$8e1$0@208.206.142.86...
>
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> > On Sun, 25 May 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > > news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250309260.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't
mean
> > > that
> > > > they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that
the
> > > center
> > > > audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the
maximum
> > > > bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make
that
> > > 300Hz to
> > > > 2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that
doesn't
> > > > automatically make their settings optimal.
> > >
> > > Still going with the ARRL recommendations is probably the "safest."
The
> > > ARRL recommendations would carry more weight with the FCC than a
person's
> > > own individual calculation.
> >
> > Not if the computation is improper. Just because the ARRL is "in bed
with" the
> > FCC doesn't automatically mean that they do everything correctly.
>
> I'd bet that ARRL ran it by the FCC before publishing. Normal procedure.
That way
> there's never a false move or incorrect procedure published in such cases.
And no
> egg on face. ARRL doesn't like to get caught with egg on face.

Nothing wrong with that in my book. If it comes to pass that we all then
set the cxr to 1.5KHz down, at least we are all able to communicate
with each other regardless of specific center frequencies based on
individual signal bandwidth. Does anyone really think that if

a ham's signal cxr is down 1.5KHz and that ham is operating
with a narrow filter which results in his individual center freq being
less than the FCC stated center freq, that the FCC would care one
iota?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1703. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 14:24:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526102446.29002.00000210@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 67853

In article <d22b54c3.0305260405.1c5d7116@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030526015140.25815.00000243@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030525200538.04207.00000257@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:

>> >Before that, there was the FRC, and before the FRC was the Department of
>> >Commerce. And before that, the Navy. All are/were "the Feds".
>>
>> Those old radio regulating agencies are GONE. Defunct.
>
>No the FRC is not defunct ya Putz, we're still here and still in
>control. If you don't believe it check our scores.
>
>http://www.gofrc.org/
>
ohgawd that's funny......

Also true.

1704. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 14:39:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526103921.04299.00000550@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67854

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 5/26/2003 8:49 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bat6h4$k5r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>

>Why? Are you incabable of driving without a speedometer?
>Does the car NEED the speedometer to function?

Only if you want to be sure you are complying with posted speed limits.

I guess you can argue the "need" to test all you want. You don't want to,
that's fine. It's your license. I have caught more than one problem before it
BECAME a problem because I exercised what I consider my responsiblitiy to do
so. The other item I exampled was a problem determined by experience.

Youse pays your money, youse takes your choice.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1705. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 14:54:44 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526105444.15010.00000361@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 67855

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/25/03 10:52 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED18121.856F2DB8@earthlink.net>
>
>No CW Test wrote:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>> >Date: 5/25/03 5:32 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <3ED08E4B.45D2CDBF@earthlink.net>
>> >
>> >No CW Test wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>> >> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>> >> >Date: 5/22/03 6:16 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>> >> >Message-id: <3ECD4C02.962C2F15@earthlink.net>

>> Incredible.
>
>What's incredible is there is no ground swell of support for Len's
>advocacy after all these years. Zip. Zilch. Nil. Zed.

I think you're on to something.

>> Well, there's the group composed of Avery Fine, Avery Fineman, Len Of 21,
>Len
>> Over 21.....
>
>How many times have you heard of a case where an individual has multiple
>personalities but they are all basically the same?

One, so far.
>
>> >He is for the removal of morse testing because he
>> >finds morse difficult.
>>
>> He does? When did he say he'd ever tried the mode?
>
>He has said that at one time, he knew morse at something like
>eight words per minute.

Is there any proof?

>I substract a little for the embellishment factor.

Did he say it was difficult?

>> >I see you've been paying attention.
>> >
>> 2.75 MHz?
>
>He spent a couple of weeks working me over for a similar mistake.

Odd, really odd.

I can truthfully say that Len's postings here have changed my mind.
I used to think that eliminating the code test might be a good idea. He has convinced me that the code test should stay.

1706. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 15:17:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526111752.23745.00000209@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67857

In article <d22b54c3.0305260356.589094b3@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >I love the new flexibility. An example is the Orion's AGC. The medium
>> >AGC setting is nearer to being "right" for CW. The fast setting is
>> >simply too fast for my liking. By using the programmable AGC setting, I
>> >have something between the two which suits my operating nicely.
>>
>> Easier than soldering in different time constant caps.....
>>
>> I rarely if ever use AGC on CW. Better without it.
>
>Was marginally true in 1970.

Why? In 1970 there were plenty of rigs with IF derived AGC.

>If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
>k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?

I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.

Do they have the RF gain all the way up when doing so?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1707. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 15:17:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526111752.23745.00000208@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67858

In article <bamnh1$v67$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>I have no problem with channelized frequency assignments for
>this 60m "special purpose" set of amateur assignments. In fact,
>if done properly to avoid the obvious uncertainty as to what one's
>sup. carrier setting should be, the channelized 60m makes much
>sense over a "band" where internal agreements would then be
>needed as to what channel/frequency should be used for any
>specific emergency.

There's a precedent for all this, y'know. How long has that special ~70 meter
Alaska emergency frequency been authorized?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1708. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 15:18:16 UTC
From: Freddy the Freeloader <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <npb4dv49k8g4ptvur0jn1ln1cvbnr8l91o@4ax.com>
Source record: 67856

On 21 May 2003 18:46:03 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>>Date: 5/21/2003 11:36 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <bbancvghnatit13oescbuj7b119pb8o5vv@4ax.com>
>
>>Haven't looked at this group in some time.
>
> Thank God. Anonymous trolls make it that much worse.
>
>>You're a Bad Ham, Roll. Everybody knows it. Go
>>soak your head.
>
> No, not "everyone knows it". Larry is opinionated, but no more than
>anyone else, and his opinions are backed up with practical experience.
>
> I certainly don't agree with everything Larry has to say, but he's man
>enough to put his name to his opinions and then stand behind them, and that's
>enough for me.
>
>Steve, K4CAP
>
You and your friends here are too dumb to realize what a bigoted
asshole he is. He IS a Bad Ham. He hates anyone who isn't a brass
pounder. If he were a Good Ham, he'd never have started his hate
campaign in the first place, and he'd extend his friendship to all
radio enthusiasts, not just CW freaks like him.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1709. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 15:21:08 UTC
From: Freddy the Freeloader <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <02c4dvonk9k55pntf6g35ba4qffj74vtn7@4ax.com>
Source record: 67859

On 22 May 2003 02:32:54 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <bbancvghnatit13oescbuj7b119pb8o5vv@4ax.com>, Freddy the Freeloader
><bogus@fake.com> writes:
>
>>>Reminds me of a line from a Harry Chapin song: "...And she walked away
>>>in silence; It's strange but you'd never know; We'd both gotten what we'd
>>>asked for, Such a long, long time ago." Unfortunately, for us hams, as it
>>was
>>>for Harry and Sue, "getting what we'd asked for" didn't bring a happy
>>ending.
>>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>Haven't looked at this group in some time. It's sad to see that the
>>king of idiots, Larry Roll, is still spouting his hate and derision
>>of anyone who doesn't want to pound two pieces of brass together to
>>make di-duh sounds. You're a Bad Ham, Roll. Everybody knows it. Go
>>soak your head.
>
>Freddie the Fake Bogus Freeloader:
>
>I always like this kind of response; it lets me know that I've accomplished
>my mission: To get right up the nose of some no-coder non-ham like you.
>Kiss my gleaming white ass.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Nah, you don't need me to kiss your ass, Dumbass. Looks like you have
plenty of asskissers and toadies here already. Go soak your head.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1710. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 16:03:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526120342.15044.00000363@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67860

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>Date: 5/26/2003 10:18 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <npb4dv49k8g4ptvur0jn1ln1cvbnr8l91o@4ax.com>

>You and your friends here are too dumb to realize what a bigoted
>asshole he is. He IS a Bad Ham. He hates anyone who isn't a brass
>pounder.

And if your head wasn't so far up your own, you'd see Larry has promoted
OTHER modes than CW.

But of course that would ruin your lying rant.

>If he were a Good Ham, he'd never have started his hate
>campaign in the first place, and he'd extend his friendship to all
>radio enthusiasts, not just CW freaks like him.

As I said...You haven't been paying attention.

>The Patriot

You are anything BUT a "patriot". Patriots stand for something, and put
thier name and honor behind what they say.

You're just a slithering snake of a scumbag, opinionated, hateful and
cowardly.

>America, Love it or leave it!

Some would call THAT an act of bigotry.

>If you're not with us, You're against us.

Drawing that line in the sand? So who's going to be impressed, cowardly
little shadowman?

Steve Robeson, LPN
K4CAP

1711. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 16:13:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526121341.02197.00000206@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67861

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfgtuz6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
>Date: Mon, 26 May 2003 02:22:49 GMT
>
>On 26 May 2003 00:05:38 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>It's clear that NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs.
>
> That's the "public" face.

Agreed. But it's all most of us will ever see.

> Behind the scenes, chances are very
> good that the NTIA was concerned about not having direct
> control over "others" playing in NTIA's playyard, whether they
> caused interference or not.

Sounds logical.

Do you think 9-11 caused NTIA to rethink its position on amateurs getting more
spectrum?

--

Seems to me that improving the 40 meter situation (which may or may not happen
at WRC 2003) will have a heck of a lot more impact than 60 meters.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1712. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 16:25:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526122525.23044.00000260@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 67862

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>Well, sometimes it seems that <most> people want to have fun by watching
>>"American Idol or "Survivor (wherever)". DIfferent strokes for different
>>folks, Vipul. I'll take the Friday ham activity off with Steve, thank
>>you very much.
>
> Thanks Mike...IO'll even put on a clean shirt and try to avoid blowing
>my
>nose on the sleeves while we're out!

Sorry, I had to attend a ritual ceremony this weekend. Yes, it is required.

In a room without sun, everyone was facing the East direction. Many attended.
Even one American friend of my parents.

Noone knew the <full> details and significance. Only the Priest that performed
the ceremony did.

Not fun, something I had to attend.

>
> No, he didn't. Maaaaaaayyyyybbeeeeeee as an "Enviromental" Engineer.

No, I worked as a lowly Test Engineer.

1713. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 16:32:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526123207.05591.00000367@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67863

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>Date: 5/26/2003 10:21 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <02c4dvonk9k55pntf6g35ba4qffj74vtn7@4ax.com>

>Nah, you don't need me to kiss your ass, Dumbass. Looks like you have
>plenty of asskissers and toadies here already. Go soak your head.

Lot's of profanity and insults meant to evoke a similar response...

From a guy who professes to be a "patriot". Sorry to let you down.

What a loser. The closest this liar ever got to being a "patriot " was
watching Mel Gibson on HBO.

Scumbag.

Steve Robeson, LPN
K4CAP

1714. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 16:34:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305260834.386fccf1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67864

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
> > Guess that solves that.
>
> And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
>
>
> Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
>
> 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
>
> 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
>
> 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
>
> 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
>
> 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz

Wasn't there a hassle here about not being allowed to work DX on 60M??

w3rv

1715. The Day Peace Has No Enemies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 16:34:27 UTC
From: 3@terapeta.org
Message-ID: <ee055965.0305260834.2fd61fb3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67865

Day of Butterflies
To Unknown Soldiers
25 May 2003

From the poppy fields of France, and over the beaches of Normandy, from the jungles to the desserts, Hero's have witnessed the pain of humanity. Suffering that has forever changed the souls of the living.

In our colors we carry white to signify purity and innocence, red to show hardiness and valor, and blue, the color of the Chief, to signify vigilance, perseverance and justice. The stars are a symbol of the heavens and the divine goal to which mankind has aspired from time immemorial. The stripes are symbolic of the rays of light emanating from the sun.

Rest assured, we are all descendents of war and have been granted by our ancestors the ability to create a world of peace. A world where every child can feel safe, every person can be free, and every nation can be understood.

In the darkest of night Hero's have brought forth the brightest of light. Hero's that willing and unwilling paid the ultimate sacrifice to give us the opportunity to carry on.

The seeds of liberty have been planted with faith. The seeds of freedom have been watered in blood. These seeds were planted in hope of a new day, a day when peace shall have no enemies. A day when war shall be erased and Hero's eternally honored.

When we are alone to our thoughts and seem to be trapped in this picture of death, we can remember our brothers and sisters, our husbands and wives, and our friends forever more, knowing that every seed sown has brought forth life.

Remember that day. The day of butterflies. The day of Hero's.

If it is to be, it is up to we.

None shall be forgotten.

1716. Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 16:38:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526123810.05591.00000368@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67866

>Subject: Re: This Doesn't Bode Well For The Future
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/26/2003 11:25 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030526122525.23044.00000260@mb-m13.aol.com>

>No, I worked as a lowly Test Engineer.

If YOU consider yourself a "lowly" test engineer. perhaps that's why you
are an unemployed person.

And NOTHING is "lowly" if it contributes to the needs of the community.
If you err as a "test" technician, then the project fails...or at least does
not progress as desired.

>Noone knew the <full> details and significance. Only the Priest that
>performed
>the ceremony did.

Sounds like a cult to me. CULT! CULT! They're turning Vippy into a
ZOMBIE!~ Arrrrrrrrrrrrgh!

Steve, K4CAP

1717. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 17:11:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bathq3$el4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67867
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305260448100.3590@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 25 May 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250309260.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't
mean
> > that
> > > they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that the
> > center
> > > audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the
maximum
> > > bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make that
> > 300Hz to
> > > 2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that
doesn't
> > > automatically make their settings optimal.
> >
> > Still going with the ARRL recommendations is probably the "safest."
The
> > ARRL recommendations would carry more weight with the FCC than a
person's
> > own individual calculation.
>
> Not if the computation is improper. Just because the ARRL is "in bed
with" the
> FCC doesn't automatically mean that they do everything correctly.

The Military Affiliate Radio System used the 1.5 as a standard. Unless
otherwise stated by the FCC I too will use the 1.5 as a standard.

Dan/W4NTI

1718. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 17:14:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bati0o$1is$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67868
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I don't know...and I don't care. Just as long as they are gone.

Dan/W4NTI

"BARF" <BARFnuts@barfpsychos.net> wrote in message
news:bas4vsoe0@pita.alt.net...
> Wasn't it Doc who used to say, "Cut the head off the snake,
> and the body will die"? Meaning where are Herbie's gang of
> misfits? It seems like they just vanished. I see where several
> are silent keys now, but where are the others? I heard rumors
> that a few are awaiting legal action in the courts, but does anyone
> know who they are and what type of legal trouble they are in?
>
>
> BARF
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:barkd9lmp1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > BARF= PUKE.
> >
> > Don Quixote (Herby) is a very intelligent individual. He has the sense
> NOT
> > to continue his association with the misfits on 313. More power to him.
> >
> > And the poster is quite correct. The various MM/Intercon nets that are
> NOW
> > ON 300 used to operate on 313. And thanks to those misfits were run
off.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "BARF" <BARFnuts@barfpsychos.net> wrote in message
> > news:barfokmti0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > Frequency 14313 stands as an enduring living monument
> > > how one person, KV4FZ, can destroy what was used as a
> > > public service frequency for years. Then the stupid FCC
> > > gives him his license back! In all fairness, it appears he may
> > > have finally learned how to control his mouth though. Has
> > > anyone heard him on any freq.????
> > >
> > > BARF
> > >

> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

1719. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 17:18:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bati84slq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67869

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0305260834.386fccf1@posting.google.com...

> Wasn't there a hassle here about not being allowed to work DX on 60M??
>
> w3rv

As far as I know only England has a spot on 60m. Thats the last 'channel'
we will be allowed on.

Dan/W4NTI

1720. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 17:35:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67870

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED09ECC.613AB9CF@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >

> > OK now 'fess up David: What *warts* does the Orion have? Don't be
> > silly and tell me it doesn't have any, all xcvrs have notable warts.
> > There's lists of MP warts and their fixes out there and some of 'em
> > can't be fixed.
>
> There don't appear to be any mechanical warts or any ergonomic warts.
> In fact, the TT reflector has the usual nit pickers bickering over the
> lack of a color display and the fonts used.

Writeoffs. The eham "reviews" nitwit content can be unbearable. Almost
as bad as RRAP. Where's the BEEF?!

> A few (not those who
> actually HAVE the radio are bitching over fit and finish and over knob
> eccentricity.

Writeoffs. Unfortunately TT does have a bit of a reputation for shaggy
mechanicals which would really piss me off if I had cash into one of
those particular specimens. Me being a mechanical guy and TT hyping
their "precision machining" capabilities and all that.

> The warts I've found are all firmware related. A number
> have been addressed already. If the passband tuning and AGC settings
> are able to be retained in the band stacking registers and if a couple
> of tuning step settings can be modified, I'll be completely satisfied.
> These can all be accomplished rapidly.

OK . . sounds doable on the surface . . . nice.

> I can download them and not have
> to buy an Orio Pro or Orion ProII :)

Don't even go there . . . !

> Ten-Tec survives by being innovative and responsive to customer desires.
> The service department bends over backward to assist customers and to
> achieve rapid turnaround. When I call the company, I'm greeted by a
> real receptionist and don't get shunted off into an endless loop of menu
> selections and voice mail boxes.

Point well taken but I don't think it's much of a product sell point.
At least not for ham gear.

Interesting thread this. We have you obviously ass over tincups
married to TT and Jim likewise with Elecrafty. Further there is
abundant evidence that the TT rcvrs and the K2 have exemplary rcvrs.
And are exemplary in all other Good Things like factory service,
upgrades via firmare revs, Made in USA stamps, competitive pricing,
etc.

How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
K2 have such miniscule market shares? Amongst the hardcore dxers,
contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy
any radio out there?

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1721. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 17:54:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526135443.05591.00000376@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 67871

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 5/26/2003 12:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>

>How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
>K2 have such miniscule market shares? Amongst the hardcore dxers,
>contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy any
radio out there?

Two things...Marketing and availability. Unless Mr Deep Pockets is
looking for that "satisfaction" of building the kit, he's going to want to rip
the box open, hook the antenna up and talk.

It's the Burger King generation...they want it their way, right away, and
having to stop and put it togetehr is not in their game plan,.

The artistis, craftsmen and the purists are building the K2's. They are a
dwindling few.....

73

Steve, K4CAP

1722. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 18:53:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305261053.7b66b643@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67872

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526082458.23307.00000271@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0305251818.60219b79@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> Hold on a sec...
>
> Before Feb 1953, the only HF/MF 'phone available to Generals & Conditionals was
> 10/11 meters and what was left of 160. In the 1951 restructure that gave us the
> Novice, Tech and Extra and renamed the old ABC classes, FCC upped the ante by
> announcing there would be no more new Advanceds after the end of 1952. Then in
> December of '52 they went the other way and opened up everything to Generals
> and Conditionals.

What I sed was that I believe the phone band edges I cited were
established at the end of WW2, I did not say Generals could operate
down to those limits from WW2 forward.

> Point of all that is simply that an incentive system existed long before 1968.
> The period of "Generals get it all" lasted from Feb 1953 to Nov 1968 - just 16
> years and 9 months.

Incentive Licensing came along after I had it all for ~14 years, over
40% of my life in 1968. Thousands of us had to deal with it against
those kinds of histories. You didn't have a ham history in 1968 so go
away with your "just 16 years" thing. Ya newbie.

> >If I recall the details correctly the first wave of this reshuffling
> >maneuver specifically on 20 was to (a) boot Generals out of
> >14.200-14.225 (b) allow Advanceds to continue to operate above 14.200
> >and (c) the FCC opened 14.175 and up for Extras running phone.. . .

> I think you've got two different historical items mixed up. The original IL
> implementation did not expand the 'phone bands at all. That happened a few
> years later. I'll dig up the history and double-check.

I sed I don't remember if the phone bands got reshuffled as part of
the Incentive Licensing R&O. But I know for certain that the band edge
limits were changed at some point in that timframe. From a practical
standpoint the actual details of the dates don't matter. The net
effect was one big ball of wax, the FCC put real teeth in the
incentive to upgrade to Extra via the basic R&O plus the related phone
band edge changes.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1723. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 19:15:28 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <batp4gdlq0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 67873

David Robbins wrote:

> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> > >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
> >
> > > Guess that solves that.
> >
> > And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
> >
> >
> > Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
> >
> > 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
> >
> > 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
> >
> > 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
> >
> > 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
> >
> > 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
> >
> and dont' forget... USB voice only... no cw, no rtty, no sstv, no throb or
> psk or any of that other stuff, just USB voice.

Did you notice the reason for that? So the primary users can ID hams operating there if needed. Never mind that any digital mode should work much better than voice in emergencies. But FCC could grant us instant authority to use them if needed, I presume.

1724. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 19:24:12 UTC
From: "A. Trent Phillips" <atrentphillipsnojunk@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <wRtAa.17681$lo.1571617@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 67874
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Arch Stanton wrote:
> As I type this, the 14.313 Kooks are at it again.
>
<<edited>>
>
> We are waiting RH.....
>
>
>

I tend to stay close to the broadcast bands. What goes on here ? I
didn't know anyone was at it the first time :)

Adam

1725. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 20:25:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526162501.01631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67876

In article <20030526015140.25815.00000243@mb-m07.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030525200538.04207.00000257@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030525182138.27503.00000190@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030525162722.15462.00000232@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20030524212829.02076.00000229@mb-m14.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>
>>>> The "Feds" have had "full control" on US amateur radio since 1934.
>>>>
>>>>1912, actually.
>>>
>>> Not for you, grasshopper. :-)
>>
>>For everyone.
>
> Who is "everyone?"

Everyone in the USA who wants an amateur radio license.
>
> Who in here was licensed in any radio before 1934?
>
>>> The FCC came into existance in 1934.
>>
>>Before that, there was the FRC, and before the FRC was the Department of
>>Commerce. And before that, the Navy. All are/were "the Feds".
>
> Those old radio regulating agencies are GONE. Defunct.

Just like the magazine "Ham Radio".

However, those agencies were "the Feds". And they had full control of US
amateur radio.
>
> The US Navy is still around but NOT regulating US civil radio

> since before 1934.

Since the 1920s, actually.
>
> The Radio Club of America is still around, founded in 1909,

And it has how many members?

> five
> years before three New Englanders formed the ARRL to hack
> commercial telegram carriers.

"Hack commercial telegram carriers"? What is that supposed to mean?
>
>>> Those are the folks who
>>> granted you your amateur radio license.
>>
>>In 1967.
>
> That was the FCC. No other "fed" agency.

Not the issue at all.
>
> Do try to keep your timelines straight, old-timer.
>
I do. You don't.

>>>>> I realize that may come as a rude awakening to those who
>>>>> thought ARRL ran the whole thing... :-)
>>>>
>>>>Who thought that, besides you? ;-)
>>>
>>> ARRL still seems to think they run the whole thing. <shrug>
>>
>>Only seems that way to you.
>
> ...and the BoD of ARRL, the staff of ARRL, and 170 odd
> thousand or so members. Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

You're totally mistaken about that.
>
>>>>>> So where's all that vaunted hi-tech Uncle Sam comms that you guys have
>>>>>> been raving about?
>>>>>
>>>>> It's still there and was there before "Homeland Security" was an
>>>>> administration secretarial agency.
>>>>
>>>>But apparently it is so highly vulnerable to interference from amateur
>>>>stations
>>>>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50
>>>>watts ERP.
>>>

>>> Was that in FCC 03-105? I don't think so.
>>
>>It's clear that NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs.
>
> What is "clear?"

NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs. Otherwise they would not
have objected to the NPRM the way they did.
>
> Have you extracted any NTIA documents from the FCC ECFS on
> RM-10209? I don't think so.

I read the FCC R&O. Quite clear from that.
>
> FCC isn't Google. Try to break away from old, old message
> searching and look through the FCC ECFS.

Why? The R&O shows what matters to the FCC.
>
>>>>> Read up on ALE or Automatic Link Establishment on HF. SHARES
>>>>> uses that. Can you recognize an ALE signal if you hear one? You
>>>>> can find out via the Internet with one site having sound samples.
>>>>> Hint: It doesn't sound like OOK CW or FSK RTTY.
>>>>
>>>>There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs be able to recognize ALE
>>>>signals.
>>>
>>> There's no requirement in Part 97 that amateurs HAVE to test their
>>> equipment, either.
>>
>>So?
>
> Sohl, Bill Sohl. :-)

01331
>
>>>>>>The stuff that was completely secure, spread spectrum
>>>>>>bulletproof and interference immune?
>>>>>
>>>>> ALE doesn't need spread spectrum techniques yet can find an
>>>>> open frequency automatically and send data at high rates
>>>>> regardless of claims by olde-tymers that "phase shifting on HF
>>>>> makes it no good." :-)
>>>>
>>>>Apparently, though, ALE is so vulnerable to interference from amateur
>>>>stations
>>>>that those amateur stations must be limited to 5 channels of USB, and 50
>>>>watts ERP.
>>>
>>> Feedback! Echo chamber! Speculation, Jimmie, just speculation.
>>

>>By you.
>
> No, YOU are the one speculating on what the NTIA is "worried
> about."

Not me.
>
> Now go do an ECFS search on RM-10209 and tell us all what
> the NTIA *really* said about all that "worry." :-)

Tell us. You have all the expertise, remember?

>
>>> Perhaps you didn't get the inferences tuned in correctly. Think
>>> about THIS speculation instead:
>>>
>>> The FCC might have gotten pished at the ARRL pushing for the
>>> 60m band (and all that fuss over "pioneering and testing" 60m
>>> by a special group of ARRL-selected hams) that they tossed out
>>> 5 little micro-band crumbs. The FCC can truthfully say they've
>>> given out more spectrum to US radio amateurs. Nobody can say
>>> otherwise. :-)
>>
>>Nonsense. The NPRM proposed amateur access to a 150 kHz wide band with many
>>modes permitted, not 5 channels of USB. The NPRM was written by the FCC, not
>>the ARRL.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. ARRL can NEVER write any NPRM or even an RM
> (ET Docket No. 02-98 and RM-10209 respectively). ARRL can
> only request. RM-10209 was *exactly* like what ARRL wanted.
>
> Try to understand federal procedure, grasshopper.

I do understand it.

66932
>
>>> What the FCC actually gave out is NOT what ARRL wanted and
>>> those little 2.8 KHz BW micro-bands aren't good for the usual QSO
>>> activity on other bands.
>>
>>They're not micro-bands. They're channels.
>
> I call them MICRO-BANDS.

You're wrong to call them that. Perhaps you and Vshah101 are one and the same
person.

>You don't like it? Guess where you
> can put your don't-like. :-)
>
83801

> "Channels" are they?

Yep.

> Mass Media Bureau talks about BC
> channels.

They are not broadcast channels.

> The narrowest of those are quite a bit bigger than
> those five separate little MICRO-BANDS.
>
Doesn't matter. They're channels.

>>> NO OOK CW! :-) USB only, VOICE!
>>
>>No LSB. No PSK31. No data modes of any kind, in fact.
>
> Awwwww.

Doesn't bother me. Seems to be a big deal to you.

(rest of Len's long, off-topic rant snipped for sanity)

1726. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 20:25:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 67875

In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Ten-Tec survives by being innovative and responsive to customer desires.
>> The service department bends over backward to assist customers and to
>> achieve rapid turnaround. When I call the company, I'm greeted by a
>> real receptionist and don't get shunted off into an endless loop of menu
>> selections and voice mail boxes.
>
>Point well taken but I don't think it's much of a product sell point.
>At least not for ham gear.
>
>Interesting thread this. We have you obviously ass over tincups
>married to TT and Jim likewise with Elecrafty.

Naw, the only radio outfit I'm that close to is Southgate Radio

I've owned and used TT stuff and have always rated it above Ikensu.

>Further there is
>abundant evidence that the TT rcvrs and the K2 have exemplary rcvrs.
>And are exemplary in all other Good Things like factory service,
>upgrades via firmare revs, Made in USA stamps, competitive pricing,
>etc.
>
>How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
>K2 have such miniscule market shares?

Depends what you mean by "miniscule market share"...

Here are some reasons they're not as well known as Yaecomwood:

1) Much less advertising
2) Much smaller line of products
3) Designed for niches in the market (particularly Elecraft)
4) Relative lack of rigs aimed at the raw newcomer - particularly VHF/UHF stuff.

And in the case of Elecraft, the need to build it kills off a large part of the market.

>Amongst the hardcore dxers,
>contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy
>any radio out there?

How many of them exist, really? For every one that buys an FT-1000, there's prolly a dozen FT-1000 buyers who got it just because it's the top-of-the-line

Yaesu.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1727. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 20:36:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <batts0$2b2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67877

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:batp4g$dlq$0@208.207.71.143...
>
>
> David Robbins wrote:
>
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> > > >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > > >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
> > >
> > > > Guess that solves that.
> > >
> > > And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
> > >
> > >
> > > Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
> > >
> > > 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
> > >
> > and dont' forget... USB voice only... no cw, no rtty, no sstv, no throb
or
> > psk or any of that other stuff, just USB voice.
>
> Did you notice the reason for that? So the primary users can ID hams
operating
> there if needed. Never mind that any digital mode should work much better
than
> voice in emergencies. But FCC could grant us instant authority to use them
if
> needed, I presume.
>
IMHO I think this is a 'test'. We must pass this test. If we don't show
the 'primary' users that hams are good partners in the spectrum.....well you
```

know the rest.

If we play our cards right, don't hassle the normal inhabitants I think you will see more goodies coming down the line.

The main reason for this 60 meters request was for emergency communications. To augment our 75 and 40 meter frequencies and to allow better and more reliable commo to the Carribean area. If you think about it....5 channels should do it just fine.

Just my opinion.

Dan/W4NTI

1728. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 21:03:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfi7no7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67880

On Sun, 25 May 2003 23:24:30 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> Well, then, you ought to write the FCC and say they don't have
>> to do all that type acceptance testing...they can just take the
>> manufacturer's WORD that they comply with the law! :-)
>
>The "type acceptance" testing is done on only a handful of units...

And there's a whole array of stuff that formerly needed FCC ID
numbers issued on submitted specs which now only needs "Certification"
which is the manufacturer swearing on a stack of spec-sheets that
the device complies with FCC standards and all units produced
meet the manufacturer's specs and both the consumer and the FCC
takes that as The Revealed Truth. Just like measuring transformer
secondary voltage by reading the nameplate.

I prefer not to mix Faith and Science. I resolved those issues
as a college student.

>Courts? Other than an FCC pink slip,

The FCC stopped issuing off-frequency notices on "pink slips" -
which were really salmon-colored - in the early 1960s. The
"advisory" Official Notices of Violation which carried no
penalties were augmented by field-issued Notices of Apparent
Liability to Monetary Forfeiture in the 1980s when the field
was finally given the ability to bypass the chair-sitters at
headquarters to get the ball rolling on levying penalties.

>why would the courts
>get involved...unless the ham cited grossly ignored and failed
>to take corrective action to eliminate an identified non compliance?

Or unless the "unadvertised enforcement special of the day" is
to bypass the Advisory Notices and go directly to levy a
monetary penalty (forfeiture) for that specific violation. Ask
the tower owners about the "unadvertised specials" that they
get hit with, such as failure to post the antenna tower
registration number at the base of the antenna tower, a far
less technical and more easily avoided problem.

If the "hardball special of thr week" is to not reduce the
penalty amount upon review and to take the case to forced
collection on refusal to pay, it does in fact go to court.
The decisions to levy the penalty and to force collection are
not in your hands.

What is the probability of the above happening? "Conventional wisdom" and "experience" say: very small indeed. But as we all learn in statistics, even if the probability of something happening is small, if it does happen to the individual, the probability of it happening to that individual is adjusted to 100%.

My advice to clients - paying or otherwise - is the same as I gave to my kids when they were growing up: be super-cautious and take steps to avoid doing something for which you can get nailed. Otherwise it's no better than being caught walking naked in the town square at high noon. What do you say then ?? (My kids would probably say "Right on, dude...." <ggg>)

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1729. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 21:03:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfi93z9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67878

On Mon, 26 May 2003 09:49:54 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>So you didn't need a periodic maintence measurement to
>know there was a problem with your rig.

And when you finally find an embarrassing problem, like
off-frequency operation, where do you have to set the "way
back" machine to be able to catch and correct it -before- it
embarassed you on the air amongst your peers?

>There is plenty of non-maintenace stuff that keeps today's tech's
>busy. They don't field repair anything anymore...just plug-in
>replacements. You won't find much in the way of test
>equipment in today's telco offices either.

Tell that to my son who started his "non-existant Bell System"
career with ATT about 10 years ago as a bench repair tech.

>> >Also, FYI, Ma Bell was killed off as of 1/1/1983.
>>
>> Maybe so, but some of her offspring have the same surname.
>
>They may use "Bell", but that's no longer indicative of "Ma Bell"
>which represented at the time the AT&T parent company and the
>20 odd tellcos under that umbrella (i.e. NJ Bell, Illinois Bell,
>SW Bell, etc.) That was what was broken up in 1/1/84 (I mistakenly
>said 83 in my original post).

Well, as my son (who is now with SBC's Pac*Bell operation)
pointed out when I mentioned the above, they may not use the
"Bell" name but most certainly the old "Bell System" is being
soldered back together and EXCLUDING ATT - how does that grab
ya? This came up in the context of his investigating the option
of transferring from SBC/Pac*Bell to Quest (formerly US West,
formerly Pacific Northwest Bell). His seniority and benefits
as well as being considered an "inside" applicant would
transfer across the companies because that was provided for in
the "breakup" agreement. So much for "breakup". Very few
pre-breakup employees are left in the operating companies, but
those "new crop" folks who intend to make a career in the
industry appear to have the "Bell System" ethic whether they
know it or not.

>Does the car NEED the speedometer to function?

Do you need a voltmeter when you have a very functional
nameplate?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1730. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 21:03:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfi7ux8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67879
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

[No readable article body recovered]

1731. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 21:03:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfia1sa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67881

On 26 May 2003 12:24:59 GMT, N2EY wrote:

> Here's another bit of RR trivia: What does the letter F mean
> when painted on multiple-unit cars and locomotives like the GG-1,
> P-5 and AEM-7?

You'll find it on diesel-electrics as well.

>> Or is everyone supposed to gabble about railroading in a RADIO
>> newsgroup? [anagramists could assemble "radio" from "rail-
>> roading" but that is stretching credulity... :-)]
>
>Nobody has to "gabble" about anyhting if they're not interested.
>You've gone on at length about non-amateur-radio subjects.

And some of us do use amateur radio to enhance our other
non-amateur-radio interests. Our local rail photography group
has enough hams that we can and do use 2-m to coordinate rail
photo shoots and chases.

I'm sure that other hobbies have similar uses for amateur
radio communications.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
PNW MP 754 - Tillamook Dist.

1732. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 21:42:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfibk6b.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67882

On 26 May 2003 20:25:02 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>And in the case of Elecraft, the need to build it kills off a
>large part of the market.

Had it been 30 years ago, I would have eagerly built a K2 -
in those days I had been a prolific Heathkit builder and was
ready to step up to something like the K2 of today. But with
the monocular vision that I have now, a hot soldering iron is a
dangerous weapon.

The one thing that I have a need for and would like to see in a
kit or ready-made is a single-channel MF receiver with FSK
decoder....I'd even settle for a FRG7700 or similar that has HF
problems but works well around 500 kHz.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1733. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:06:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bau359$33q$0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 67883

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> The main reason for this 60 meters request was for emergency communications.
> To augment our 75 and 40 meter frequencies and to allow better and more
> reliable commo to the Carribean area. If you think about it....5 channels
> should do it just fine.

But 5 channels of USB using voice only? That can handle a limited amount of traffic under the best of conditions. Crowding of those few channels could easily occur and almost certainly will if any serious emergency use arises. With no freqwuency flexibility available things can go to pot in a hurry. Better to allow digital under emergency conditions but there would need to be lots of drill done before the actual need arose. Not the best situation but at least workable.

1734. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:09:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305261409.392a16e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67884

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030526135443.05591.00000376@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 5/26/2003 12:35 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>
>
> >How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
> >K2 have such miniscule market shares? Amongst the hardcore dxers,
> >contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy any
> radio out there?
>
> Two things...Marketing and availability. Unless Mr Deep Pockets is
> looking for that "satisfaction" of building the kit, he's going to want to rip
> the box open, hook the antenna up and talk.

Which is exactly what Dave did when ripped his new Orion out of the
box, hooked up an antenna and . .

> It's the Burger King generation...they want it their way, right away, and
> having to stop and put it togetehr is not in their game plan,.
>
> The artistis, craftsmen and the purists are building the K2's. They are a
> dwindling few.....

Aw c'mon Steve, the only "arts" involved in scrambling together a kit
radio are a decent soldering technique and the ability to follow the
assembly instructions correctly. The K2 is one replacement of sorts
for the long-gone Heathkit rigs and nobody got any gee-whiz points for
building any of those.
Besides, one can buy an already-assembled K2 from any number of
builders.

So my question remains on the table.

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

w3rv

1735. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:20:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bau3uv$4pu$0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 67885
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bas9f1$8e1$0@208.206.142.86...
> >
> > "D. Stussy" wrote:
> >
> > > On Sun, 25 May 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > > > news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305250309260.3388@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > > You mean, they have posted THEIR recommended settings. That doesn't
> mean
> > > > that
> > > > > they are correct either. In fact, their 1.5Khz down assumes that
> the
> > > > center
> > > > > audio frequency component to be passed will be 1500Hz, and for the
> maximum
> > > > > bandwidth, a range of 100Hz to 2900Hz. A 2.4kHz filter will make
> that
> > > > 300Hz to
> > > > > 2700Hz.... However, other ranges have been proposed here, so that
> doesn't
> > > > > automatically make their settings optimal.
> > > >
> > > > Still going with the ARRL recommendations is probably the "safest."
> The
> > > > ARRL recommendations would carry more weight with the FCC than a
> person's
> > > > own individual calculation.
> > >
> > > Not if the computation is improper. Just because the ARRL is "in bed
> with" the
> > > FCC doesn't automatically mean that they do everything correctly.
> >
> > I'd bet that ARRL ran it by the FCC before publishing. Normal procedure.
> That way
> > there's never a false move or incorrect procedure published in such cases.
> And no
> > egg on face. ARRL doesn't like to get caught with egg on face.
>
> Nothing wrong with that in my book. If it comes to pass that we all then
> set the cxr to 1.5KHz down, at least we are all able to communicate

> with each other regardless of specific center frequencies based on
> individual signal bandwidth. Does anyone really think that if
> a ham's signal cxr is down 1.5KHz and that ham is operating
> with a narrow filter which results in his individual center freq being
> less than the FCC stated center freq, that the FCC would care one
> iota?

With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for operated
several base stations some with callsigns beginning in KAA. For many years
all the operators would sign off with "K Double A...". Then one day an FCC
rep cited one of the stations as being in violation for not properly giving the
callsign. So the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the reverse- he said it
would be better to give the callsign as had originally been done! So the chief
of communications had to write a letter requesting clarification, and the
original method was approved.

Right hand, left hand.

1736. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:20:21 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bau3v5$4pu$1@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 67886

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bamnh1$v67$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I have no problem with channelized frequency assignments for
> >this 60m "special purpose" set of amateur assignments. In fact,
> >if done properly to avoid the obvious uncertainty as to what one's
> >sup. carrier setting should be, the channelized 60m makes much
> >sense over a "band" where internal agreements would then be
> >needed as to what channel/frequency should be used for any
> >specific emergency.
>
> There's a precedent for all this, y'know. How long has that special ~70 meter
> Alaska emergency frequency been authorized?

The Alaska special emergency frequency isn't a general allocation, so I didn't consider it in the same vein. Frankly I believe that the new 60 meter allocation is viewed about the same, though evidently we aren't restricted from using the new channels in other than emergencies. Be interesting to see what activity amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to "slide up" a few Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.

1737. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:31:06 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305261431.39a53095@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67887

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526111752.23745.00000209@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0305260356.589094b3@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> >I love the new flexibility. An example is the Orion's AGC. The medium
> >> >AGC setting is nearer to being "right" for CW. The fast setting is
> >> >simply too fast for my liking. By using the programmable AGC setting, I
> >> >have something between the two which suits my operating nicely.
> >>
> >> Easier than soldering in different time constant caps.....
> >>
> >> I rarely if ever use AGC on CW. Better without it.
> >
> >Was marginally true in 1970.
>
> Why? In 1970 there were plenty of rigs with IF derived AGC.

Because the AGC circuitry today is far more sophisticated and is much
"smarter". I believe in many instances including the Orion that the
AGC action is fully programmable. That certainly was not the case in
1970.

> >If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
> >k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?
>
> I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.

No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.

> Do they have the RF gain all the way up when doing so?

I can't speak for others on this one but when I used the 940 I seldom
had the RF gain cranked all the way up.

The urban mythology behind full QSK has gone by the wayside too. Most
ops today prefer 8-12 mS switching delays rather than put up with the
annoyances associated with very high speed QSK.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1738. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:36:57 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3ED29709.80E1D461@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 67888
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for operated
> several base stations some with callsigns beginning in KAA. For many years
> all the operators would sign off with "K Double A...". Then one day an FCC
> rep cited one of the stations as being in violation for not properly giving the
> callsign. So the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
> Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the reverse- he said it
> would be better to give the callsign as had originally been done! So the chief
> of communications had to write a letter requesting clarification, and the
> original method was approved.
>
> Right hand, left hand.

If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

1739. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:46:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305261446.78178658@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67889

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bati84slq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0305260834.386fccf1@posting.google.com...
>
> > Wasn't there a hassle here about not being allowed to work DX on 60M??
> >
> > w3rv
>
> As far as I know only England has a spot on 60m.

The Canadians are somewhere in this mix, Canadians have worked Brits
on 60M.

> Thats the last 'channel'
> we will be allowed on.

For now. Once the dust settles and they get a leash on this Homeland
Security monster my bet is that we'll eventually wind up with what
amounts to another WARC band.

>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

1740. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 22:49:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030526184909.13344.00000309@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 67890

>Subject: Re: "Uncle says..."
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 5/26/2003 3:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <batts0$2b2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>

>IMHO I think this is a 'test'. We must pass this test. If we don't show
>the 'primary' users that hams are good partners in the spectrum.....well you
>know the rest.

Yep...Just one time of "slide up six" or "down ten" and we're sunk.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1741. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 23:17:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bau78smsj1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67891

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bau359$33q$0@208.206.142.98...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >
> > The main reason for this 60 meters request was for emergency
communications.
> > To augment our 75 and 40 meter frequencies and to allow better and more
> > reliable commo to the Carribean area. If you think about it....5
channels
> > should do it just fine.
>
> But 5 channels of USB using voice only? That can handle a limited
amount of
> traffic under the best of conditions. Crowding of those few channels could
> easily occur and almost certainly will if any serious emergency use
arises.
> With no freqwuency flexibility available things can go to pot in a hurry.
> Better to allow digital under emergency conditions but there would need to
be
> lots of drill done before the actual need arose. Not the best situation
but at
> least workable.
>

There is no large amounts of digital traffic being done. I believe the
initial request was thinking about 'standard' phone stuff....like you hear
on 75/40 when tornados hit, etc.

Dan/W4NTI

1742. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 23:18:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bau7bdqfr1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67892

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0305261446.78178658@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bati84slq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0305260834.386fccf1@posting.google.com...
> >
> > > Wasn't there a hassle here about not being allowed to work DX on 60M??
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > As far as I know only England has a spot on 60m.
>
> The Canadians are somewhere in this mix, Canadians have worked Brits
> on 60M.
>
>
> > Thats the last 'channel'
> > we will be allowed on.
>
> For now. Once the dust settles and they get a leash on this Homeland
> Security monster my bet is that we'll eventually wind up with what
> amounts to another WARC band.
>
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> w3rv

I think your right. We just need to show that we can be good
neighbors....and are part of the solution and not the problem.

Dan/W4NTI

1743. Re: The 14.313 Kooks are at it...again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-26 23:56:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3ED2A9AE.1000208@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 67898
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

QRP wrote:

> There is evidence that James O'Brien, W4AMP, once a BARF "enforcer" and
> member is now under indictment for Felony Stalking. This can be verified by
> looking at the Cobb County Sheriff Dept. web page.

So what's the url for the Cobb County Sheriff Dept. web page?

1744. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 00:05:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bauaa9$j0j$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67893

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030526103921.04299.00000550@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 5/26/2003 8:49 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bat6h4$k5r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >Why? Are you incabable of driving without a speedometer?
> >Does the car NEED the speedometer to function?
>
> Only if you want to be sure you are complying with posted speed
limits.

I comply with the general flow of traffic unless I find myself as the only
vehicle
on the road. Posted speed limits, especially on highways, are routinely
ignored by everyone.

> I guess you can argue the "need" to test all you want. You don't
want to,
> that's fine. It's your license.

EXACTLY!

> I have caught more than one problem before it
> BECAME a problem because I exercised what I consider my responsiblitiy to
do
> so. The other item I exampled was a problem determined by experience.

To each his own.

> Youse pays your money, youse takes your choice.

Exactly.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1745. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 00:13:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bauaonneq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67894

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfi93z9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 26 May 2003 09:49:54 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >So you didn't need a periodic maintence measurement to
> >know there was a problem with your rig.
>
> And when you finally find an embarrassing problem, like
> off-frequency operation, where do you have to set the "way
> back" machine to be able to catch and correct it -before- it
> embarassed you on the air amongst your peers?
>
> >There is plenty of non-maintenace stuff that keeps today's tech's
> >busy. They don't field repair anything anymore...just plug-in
> >replacements. You won't find much in the way of test
> >equipment in today's telco offices either.
>
> Tell that to my son who started his "non-existant Bell System"
> career with ATT about 10 years ago as a bench repair tech.

Where? As part of the AT&T corporate we only had central
depot type of "bench repairs" going on as far back as 1980s.

> >> >Also, FYI, Ma Bell was killed off as of 1/1/1983.
> >>
> >> Maybe so, but some of her offspring have the same surname.
> >
> >They may use "Bell", but that's no longer indicative of "Ma Bell"
> >which represented at the time the AT&T parent company and the
> >20 odd tellcos under that umbrella (i.e. NJ Bell, Illinois Bell,
> >SW Bell, etc.) That was what was broken up in 1/1/84 (I mistakenly
> >said 83 in my original post).
>
> Well, as my son (who is now with SBC's Pac*Bell operation)
> pointed out when I mentioned the above, they may not use the
> "Bell" name but most certainly the old "Bell System" is being
> soldered back together and EXCLUDING ATT - how does that grab
> ya?

Aspects of it may be in a reconfiguration/merger phase, but
the total conglomerate that was the Bell System isn't likly
to happen...especially as to a single company providing
both direct telco services as well as equipment manufacturing
and development (IMHO).

> This came up in the context of his investigating the option
> of transferring from SBC/Pac*Bell to Quest (formerly US West,
> formerly Pacific Northwest Bell). His seniority and benefits
> as well as being considered an "inside" applicant would
> transfer across the companies because that was provided for in
> the "breakup" agreement.

The "consent agreement" had several aspects to "protect"
employees and provide a certain degree of career and pension
portability. That has been the case since the breakup.

> So much for "breakup". Very few
> pre-breakup employees are left in the operating companies, but
> those "new crop" folks who intend to make a career in the
> industry appear to have the "Bell System" ethic whether they
> know it or not.

Not sure what specific ethic exactly you're refering to?

> >Does the car NEED the speedometer to function?
>
> Do you need a voltmeter when you have a very functional
> nameplate?

???

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1746. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 00:49:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED2B606.2070506@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
>
>
>>With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for operated
>>several base stations some with callsigns beginning in KAA. For many years
>>all the operators would sign off with "K Double A...". Then one day an FCC
>>rep cited one of the stations as being in violation for not properly giving the
>>callsign. So the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
>> Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the reverse- he said it
>>would be better to give the callsign as had originally been done! So the chief
>>of communications had to write a letter requesting clarification, and the
>>original method was approved.
>>
>> Right hand, left hand.
>>
>>
>
>
>If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>
>
Or how about KUU. Can't say "K double U"..... :-)

1747. Re: Send Yourself $1,000 Cash - Straight Away! Guaranteed!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 01:30:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030526213038.16581.00000268@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 67896

Uh oh -- another Internet "IQ" test -- with some greedy individual waiting for enough idiots to come by and fail the test! I sure hope this sort of thing is illegal!

73 de Larry, K3LT

In article <0305240425041332@news.fish.co.uk>, e-solutions4u@ziplip.com(Free Cash Loop-hole - Hurry!) writes:

>Subject: Send Yourself $1,000 Cash - Straight Away! Guaranteed!
>From: e-solutions4u@ziplip.com(Free Cash Loop-hole - Hurry!)
>Date: Sat, 24 May 03 04:25:04 GMT
>
>
>You Will Love This ... Because It Works!
>
>Not a PROGRAM - Just A LOOP-HOLE!
>
>This is too easy! (Need quick cash?..read this!)
>
> $$$ - Pay Yourself $1,000 - $$$
>
>Yes, It sounds Crazy, But It's True!!
>
>If you have a US Bank account you can send yourself $1,000 straight to your
>account simply by faxing a Two Page form to the number of the bank shown on
>the form.
>
>This is a one-off payment...you can only do it once!
>
>This totally legal and above-board maneouver, utilizes a loop-hole in the
>banking system which has gone largely unnoticed. The "powers-that-be", have
>known about this for years.
>Why haven't they closed this loop-hole? ......Who knows!!
>
>However, you can guarantee that it won't last long now that it is in the
>public domain...so get your $1,000 cash NOW!
>
>All you have to do is fax two simple forms to the number provided - and No,
>you are not asked to give your banking details on them. They will be
>requested within 24 hours, but that request will come directly from the bank
>involved - so you can deposit YOUR $1,000 CASH!
>
>Remember, ALL you need is a US bank account. You do not have to provide your
>SSN, you do not even need to be a US citizen!!

>
>When I heard about this, I was as skeptical as you probably are - but I tried
>it anyway...and within 24hours I got $1,000 cash paid directly into my
>account from the bank. Now! As I have said, this is a one-off payment...at
>least 1 x $1,000 per bank account...if you have more than 1 account you are
>in luck!
>
>But, as I have already got my free $1,000 (as have all my friends and family,
>and their friends and families etc) I would like to make a little more while
>the opportunity still exists. Therefore, if you are interested - and who
>wouldn't be interested in $1,000 cash - I will send the details of where to
>go to download and print these forms for the princely sum of $19.95.
>
>I have been totally upfront with you in admitting that I would like to make a
>little more cash out of this loop-hole in the system before it is swiftly and
>without warning, closed forever. I don't believe that $19.95 is too much to
>pay for an immediate and guaranteed return of $1,000 - Do you?
>
>And, YES it is Guaranteed!
>
>It works for everyone, as long as they have a US bank account.
>Everyone...Everytime - NO Exeptions!
>
>If you want to claim your FREE $1,000 send your payment of $19.95
>to:
>
>E-gold account # : 480831
>
>Stormpay : e-solutions@ziplip.com
>
>Cashcards International : 286018
>
>Then e-mail us at e-solutions@ziplip.com and provide details of your payment.
>We will then rush you the URL where you can download your forms from the
>official site (not our site) and instructions to claim your $1,000 cash!
>
>The choice is yours - but I can assure you that it will be very difficult to
>find out about this without our help. (I heard about this from a friend of
>mine who works within the banking system.) And the longer you wait, the
>longer it gives the "powers-that-be" to close this loop-hole forever.
>
>Regards
>Chris & Maxxy
>E-solutions
>
>PS If you fail to get your $1,000 cash - ie; if the loop-hole is closed
>before your request is processed, let us know asap and we will give you a
>full refund of your $19.95.
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ------------------- Headers --------------------
>Path:
>lobby!ngtf-m01.news.aol.com!ngpeer.news.aol.com!newsfeed1!bredband!newsfe
ed2.fi.sn.net!fi.sn.net!newsfeed1.fi.sn.net!news2.euro.net!195.129.110.4.M
ISMATCH!lnewspeer00.lnd.ops.eu.uu.net!lnewspost00.lnd.ops.eu.uu.net!emea.u
u.net!not-for-mail
>From: e-solutions4u@ziplip.com(Free Cash Loop-hole - Hurry!)
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Subject: Send Yourself $1,000 Cash - Straight Away! Guaranteed!
>Message-ID: <0305240425041332@news.fish.co.uk>
>Date: Sat, 24 May 03 04:25:04 GMT
>MIME-Version: 1.0
>Content-Type: text/plain
>Lines: 55
>NNTP-Posting-Host: 1Cust74.tnt14.lnd1.gbr.da.uu.net
>X-Trace: 1053746830 news.dial.pipex.com 10626 62.188.4.74
>X-Complaints-To: abuse@uk.uu.net
>
>

1748. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 01:46:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baug2c$s84$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 67897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for operated
> > several base stations some with callsigns beginning in KAA. For many years
> > all the operators would sign off with "K Double A...". Then one day an FCC
> > rep cited one of the stations as being in violation for not properly giving the
> > callsign. So the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
> > Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the reverse- he said it
> > would be better to give the callsign as had originally been done! So the chief
> > of communications had to write a letter requesting clarification, and the
> > original method was approved.
> >
> > Right hand, left hand.
>
> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

Better ask someone with a little clout. I wouldn't want to guarantee you'd always
get by with it.

1749. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 02:09:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED2C91E.8050906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67899

Brian Kelly wrote:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030526135443.05591.00000376@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>
>>>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>>>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>>>Date: 5/26/2003 12:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>
>>
>>
>>
>>>How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
>>>K2 have such miniscule market shares? Amongst the hardcore dxers,
>>>contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy any
>>
>>radio out there?
>>
>> Two things...Marketing and availability. Unless Mr Deep Pockets is
>>looking for that "satisfaction" of building the kit, he's going to want to rip
>>the box open, hook the antenna up and talk.
>
>
> Which is exactly what Dave did when ripped his new Orion out of the
> box, hooked up an antenna and . .
>
>
>
>> It's the Burger King generation...they want it their way, right away, and
>>having to stop and put it togetehr is not in their game plan,.
>>
>> The artistis, craftsmen and the purists are building the K2's. They are a
>>dwindling few.....
>
>
> Aw c'mon Steve, the only "arts" involved in scrambling together a kit
> radio are a decent soldering technique and the ability to follow the
> assembly instructions correctly. The K2 is one replacement of sorts
> for the long-gone Heathkit rigs and nobody got any gee-whiz points for
> building any of those.
> Besides, one can buy an already-assembled K2 from any number of
> builders.
>
> So my question remains on the table.

My read is a number of things:

1. Compare the Gee-Whiz points you get from say an Elecraft K-2, and any of the other "hot rigs" out there. It's not something you buy to impress most people.

2. Compare features. It doesn't have as many, and some are different than any other radio, such as the diagnostic functions.

3. Build it yourself? You noted you don't think all that much of assembling a kit radio. Many other people feel the same way. I don't know how much the pre-assembled ones cost, but that would cause a further erosion on points 1 and 2 above.

There really aren't all that many people who want a rig under those constraints. Kind of like Mac users. They know that they don't have as much of an "installed user base", but they don't really care. They have a good computer and do fine work with them.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1750. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 02:28:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED2CD86.20808@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67900

N2EY wrote:
> In article <d22b54c3.0305260405.1c5d7116@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030526015140.25815.00000243@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>>
>>>In article <20030525200538.04207.00000257@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>
>>(N2EY)
>>
>>>writes:
>>
>
>>>>Before that, there was the FRC, and before the FRC was the Department of
>>>>Commerce. And before that, the Navy. All are/were "the Feds".
>>>
>>> Those old radio regulating agencies are GONE. Defunct.
>>
>>No the FRC is not defunct ya Putz, we're still here and still in
>>control. If you don't believe it check our scores.
>>
>>http://www.gofrc.org/
>>
>
> ohgawd that's funny......
>
> Also true.

Maybe Vipul would like to take that family Vacation/DXpedition to Antigua!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1751. USB vs LSB on 5mHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 02:33:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED2CEA7.1090901@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67901

As a point of consistency, it seems like the SSB bands on 5 mHz should have been Lower sideband.

Was there any rationale given for the choice of USB?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1752. Re: USB vs LSB on 5mHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 02:58:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bauk9b$5us$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 67902

Mike Coslo wrote:

> As a point of consistency, it seems like the SSB bands on 5 mHz should
> have been Lower sideband.
>
> Was there any rationale given for the choice of USB?
>
>

Yes- it's convention in all other services, and they wanted primary users to be able to copy and ID hams using the assigned channels. Since their HF gear is mostly capable of only USB operation it became necessary to limit us to that alsom if they were to be able to copy us hams.
Only ham radio uses LSB, and with us it's left over from the early days when it was simpler and less costly todo it that way due to equipment design. A single oscillator would allow coverage of LSB on 80 and 40 and USB on 20, 15 and 10 meters.
That was when we had only 5 HF bands. So it became convention in ham radio to use LSB on 80 and 40, USB on the higher bands, even though the original reason passed from the scene.

1753. Re: USB vs LSB on 5mHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 03:05:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED2D633.3090008@adelphia.net>
Source record: 67903

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>> As a point of consistency, it seems like the SSB bands on 5 mHz should
>>have been Lower sideband.
>>
>> Was there any rationale given for the choice of USB?
>>
>>
>
>
> Yes- it's convention in all other services, and they wanted primary users to be
> able to copy and ID hams using the assigned channels. Since their HF gear is
> mostly capable of only USB operation it became necessary to limit us to that alsom
> if they were to be able to copy us hams.
> Only ham radio uses LSB, and with us it's left over from the early days when it
> was simpler and less costly todo it that way due to equipment design. A single
> oscillator would allow coverage of LSB on 80 and 40 and USB on 20, 15 and 10
> meters.
> That was when we had only 5 HF bands. So it became convention in ham radio to use
> LSB on 80 and 40, USB on the higher bands, even though the original reason passed
> from the scene.

Got it. Thanks much, Dick.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1754. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 03:34:06 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ngm5dv0cn2fdfdvrnq4hted0t8pp859n9j@4ax.com>
Source record: 67904

And yet there are those of us who truly believe that meeting FCC spec means more than swearing on a stack of spec-sheets that the equipment meets the requirements. Those of us who absoLUTely believe that putting out stuff that doesn't meet (or marginally meets) spec are still in the ballgame.

Hey, it's a bitch to meet price point with something coming in off the boat on the QT that the FCC cannot and will not enforce the rules on because they just don't have enough people. That happens. We stay out of those markets. Understand, good buddy, 10-4?

Jim

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

-> And there's a whole array of stuff that formerly needed FCC ID
-> numbers issued on submitted specs which now only needs "Certification"
-> which is the manufacturer swearing on a stack of spec-sheets that
-> the device complies with FCC standards and all units produced
-> meet the manufacturer's specs and both the consumer and the FCC
-> takes that as The Revealed Truth. Just like measuring transformer
-> secondary voltage by reading the nameplate.
->
-> I prefer not to mix Faith and Science. I resolved those issues
-> as a college student.
-
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1755. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 03:42:12 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9387F120D4E30elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 67905
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org:

> On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>> > ...
>> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
>> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
>> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
>> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
>>
>> Except it should be 1.5!
>
> If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.
>
> Another candidate for "stereo-quality SSB?" :-)
>
> If we can't even agree on this, that is an indication of the problem
> right there.
>

Your reasoning is flawed. The necessary offset is **not** simply equal to half the bandwidth. A 'typical' baseband SSB audio spectrum is 0.3-2.7 kHz, a bandwidth of only 2.4 kHz, with a centre frequency of 1.5 kHz, because it doesn't extend down to zero Hz.

The bandwidth of the allocated channel is irrelevant to the above calculation, although, of course, our bandwidth must be less than 2.8 kHz, not more, but that is a separate issue. The offset is the nominal centre of the audio, not of the assigned channel. Of, course knowing that NATO specifies it as 1.5 kHz doesn't hurt.

The fact that there are hams who can't follow this does indeed prove that the FCC made an actual mistake in specifying it the way they did.

1756. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 04:21:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <baup4agbm0@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 67906
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alun Palmer wrote:

> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in
> news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0305222106020.2854@kd6lvw.ampr.org:
>
> > On Thu, 22 May 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> > ...
> >> > Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
> >> > emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
> >> > supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
> >> > (offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
> >>
> >> Except it should be 1.5!
> >
> > If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.
> >
> > Another candidate for "stereo-quality SSB?" :-)
> >
> > If we can't even agree on this, that is an indication of the problem
> > right there.
> >
>
> Your reasoning is flawed. The necessary offset is **not** simply equal to
> half the bandwidth. A 'typical' baseband SSB audio spectrum is 0.3-2.7
> kHz, a bandwidth of only 2.4 kHz, with a centre frequency of 1.5 kHz,
> because it doesn't extend down to zero Hz.
>
> The bandwidth of the allocated channel is irrelevant to the above
> calculation, although, of course, our bandwidth must be less than 2.8 kHz,
> not more, but that is a separate issue. The offset is the nominal centre
> of the audio, not of the assigned channel. Of, course knowing that NATO
> specifies it as 1.5 kHz doesn't hurt.
>
> The fact that there are hams who can't follow this does indeed prove that
> the FCC made an actual mistake in specifying it the way they did.

It appears to me that if FCC intended their specification to be strictly
followed they would have had to specify strictly the baseband audio
characteristics and even the xmtr SSB filter characteristics. Otherwise,
finding the center of the channel will be a bit elusive.

Looks like if one lands inside the 2.8 khz passband and doesn't wander too
far outside it on speech peaks it'll have to be OK.

1757. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 09:54:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030527055418.15462.00000252@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 67907

In article <20030526135443.05591.00000376@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 26 May 2003 17:54:43 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>>Date: 5/26/2003 12:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>
>
>>How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
>>K2 have such miniscule market shares? Amongst the hardcore dxers,
>>contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy any
>>radio out there?
>
> Two things...Marketing and availability. Unless Mr Deep Pockets is
>looking for that "satisfaction" of building the kit, he's going to want to
>rip the box open, hook the antenna up and talk.

Our licenses are for operating, not building.

>
> It's the Burger King generation...they want it their way, right away,
>and having to stop and put it togetehr is not in their game plan,.
>
I don't think that's the real problem, Steve.

Once upon a time there were several companies offering 'serious' kits for hams - Heath, EF Johnson and Eico come to mind. A ham could save serious $$ on a rig by assembling a kit - just compare the price of a kit Ranger vs. the assembled model.

These savings were largely due to the cost of hand assembly. PCBs, wave soldering and SMTs changed all that.

Where kits compete these days is in specialized areas where the cost of wave soldering and SMT automation aren't worth it. Hence the QRP rigs, culminating in the K2.

> The artistis, craftsmen and the purists are building the K2's.

Not just that. We're homebrewing from scratch, too.

>They are a dwindling few.....
>
Not really. There are thousands of us. More every day.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1758. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 12:24:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030527082455.23745.00000225@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67910

In article <bau3v5$4pu$1@208.206.142.98>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> There's a precedent for all this, y'know. How long has that special ~70
>meter
>> Alaska emergency frequency been authorized?
>
> The Alaska special emergency frequency isn't a general allocation, so I
>didn't
>consider it in the same vein.

It's a one-channel voice-only emergency-centric allocation. As I recall, it
exists to address vagaries of propagation

>Frankly I believe that the new 60 meter
>allocation
>is viewed about the same, though evidently we aren't restricted from using
>the
>new channels in other than emergencies. Be interesting to see what activity
>amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to "slide up" a
>few
>Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
>
Not a problem.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1759. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 12:24:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030527082456.23745.00000226@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67908

In article <d22b54c3.0305261409.392a16e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Unless Mr Deep Pockets is
>> looking for that "satisfaction" of building the kit, he's going to want to
>> rip the box open, hook the antenna up and talk.
>
>Which is exactly what Dave did when ripped his new Orion out of the
>box, hooked up an antenna and . .

Got on CW, I bet....

>> It's the Burger King generation...they want it their way, right away,
>> and having to stop and put it togetehr is not in their game plan,.
>>
>> The artistis, craftsmen and the purists are building the K2's. They
>> are a dwindling few.....
>
>Aw c'mon Steve, the only "arts" involved in scrambling together a kit
>radio are a decent soldering technique and the ability to follow the
>assembly instructions correctly.

There's a bunch of skills in that bag. Like being able to wind toroids according to the instructions. Alignment takes some skill and know-how. Spectrogram - what a tool!

>The K2 is one replacement of sorts
>for the long-gone Heathkit rigs and nobody got any gee-whiz points for
>building any of those.

One big difference is that the Heath stuff did not outperform the competition, except in price. An SB-301 is not a kit 75S-3. The K2 rx is up there with the best of 'em.

>Besides, one can buy an already-assembled K2 from any number of
>builders.

'zactly. There are even some who will do it for free if the buyer can't physically build it themselves.
>
>So my question remains on the table.
>
See other posts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1760. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 12:24:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030527082457.23745.00000227@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 67909

In article <d22b54c3.0305261431.39a53095@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >> I rarely if ever use AGC on CW. Better without it.
>> >
>> >Was marginally true in 1970.
>>
>> Why? In 1970 there were plenty of rigs with IF derived AGC.
>
>
>Because the AGC circuitry today is far more sophisticated and is much
>"smarter".

Not really.

>I believe in many instances including the Orion that the
>AGC action is fully programmable.

Programmable how? Obviously the release time is programmable. In the '70s that was done by changing timing capacitors.

Response curve is usually as flat as the technology allows.

I can't see any reason to make attack time programmable; you want it as fast as possible. Slow attack time gives pops and blasts, which is why audio-derived AGC isn't that good even in the best implementations. Which is a major limitation of direct conversion rx's, phasing, Gingell, Tayloe or whatever.

So all you got left is AGC threshold - the point at which the AGC starts to work. Which was controlled in the olde days by turning the RF gain down with the AGC on.

> That certainly was not the case in 1970.

Solder iron vs. menu.

>> >If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
>> >k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?
>>
>> I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.
>
>No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.

It ain't worse.
>
>> Do they have the RF gain all the way up when doing so?
>
>I can't speak for others on this one but when I used the 940 I seldom

>had the RF gain cranked all the way up.

Which means the AGC wasn't working full blast. Turning down the RF gain and turning up the AF gain effectively raises the AGC threshold. A sig has to be above a certain level before the AGC starts to work. Turn it down enough and the AGC is almost turned off.
>
>The urban mythology behind full QSK has gone by the wayside too.

Where?

>Most
>ops today prefer 8-12 mS switching delays rather than put up with the
>annoyances associated with very high speed QSK.

What annoyances?

At 20 wpm, a dit is 60 mS keydown followed by at least 60 mS keyup.
At 40 wpm, a dit is 30 mS keydown followed by at least 30 mS keyup.
At 60 wpm, a dit is 20 mS keydown followed by at least 20 mS keyup.

10 mS switching delay still lets you hear between dits at 60 wpm. That fast enough for ya?

--

The new rigs are great. The old rigs are great, too. We've got more choice than ever before.

The Orion is brand-new and at the top of the market. That will naturally limit its sales.

The K2 is a kit, tiny, and not primarily an SSB rig. The basic box is QRP. All of which will naturally limit its sales.

Both are made by relatively small companies with relatively small product lines. Heck, there are generations of US hams today for whom the ham rig market has always been dominated by JA-manufactured stuff.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

1761. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 12:36:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67911

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> >Interesting thread this. We have you obviously ass over tincups
> >married to TT and Jim likewise with Elecrafty.
>
> Naw, the only radio outfit I'm that close to is Southgate Radio

Then howcum ya bought a K2?

>
> I've owned and used TT stuff and have always rated it above Ikensu.

When was the last time you diddled the knobs on an Omni or an MP?

> >How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
> >K2 have such miniscule market shares?
>
> Depends what you mean by "miniscule market share"...

There is only one meaning and it don't take no MBA to understand it.

> Here are some reasons they're not as well known as Yaecomwood:
>
> 1) Much less advertising

I don't know any HFer who isn't fully aware of the K2 and I don't mean
just FRCers. Ditto Ten-tec.

> 2) Much smaller line of products

I don't understand how/why that can have much impact. Lotta very
narrowly targeted companies are very successful.

> 3) Designed for niches in the market (particularly Elecraft)

A 100w 160-10 cw/ssb K2 is hardly a niche xcvr.

> 4) Relative lack of rigs aimed at the raw newcomer - particularly VHF/UHF
> stuff.

Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome. We'ere not talking
newbies or nitwits here, we're talking seasoned HFers, contesters and
otherwise who are quite aware of the entire range of high-performance
xcvrs and can write the check for any of 'em.

> And in the case of Elecraft, the need to build it kills off a large part of the
> market.

Assembled K2s are everywhere in the market, as you well know there are guys building them just for the jollies they get outta the soldering exercises then they dump 'em for close to the cost of the kits.

> >Amongst the hardcore dxers,
> >contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy
> >any radio out there?
>
> How many of them exist, really?

What matters is their leverage in the market, not their gross numbers.

As far as the gross numbers are concerned tune the bands on dx contest weekends. The FRC active members list is 200 long plus the inactives and both PVRC and YCCC are larger. Plus all the rest of the heaps of contest clubs plus all the independents like Dave.

> For every one that buys an FT-1000, there's
> prolly a dozen FT-1000 buyers who got it just because it's the top-of-the-line
> Yaesu.

Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.

I'm not intentionally trying to stick pins in the K2 & Ten-tec balloons here just to be a pain in the ass, fact is that I'm quite baffled at the low acceptance rate these rigs have in the overall top end market. So I tossed a note to a couple of the heavy-duty dx conetsters and asked them point blank why they haven't gone with a K2-100 or an Omni.

I've only gotten one response back so far. That one sez that the K2 does not appear to be supported by the contest loggers and other third party contesting & rig control software & station accessories. It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image. Some of of the problems I have personally with the K2 are the lack of even a second VFO let alone a complete second rcvr on top of being a ham bands only rig. The K2 "display" is ridiculous by today's expectations. How do ya get on 60M with a K2?? The K2 is a minimalist's delight but it goes 'way too far in that direction for most folks taste including mine, the only fix Elecraft has for the K2 is a K3.

As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other lackings.

But we'll see. Famed One K3WW popped the coin for an Orion at the Dayton 'fest. There's a breakthrough and I'm gonna be all over it. Another one N3RD is on his way to an IC-7800. Both have been vocal MP

adherents. This is gonna be the shootout from hell, I'll letcha know .
.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1762. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 13:16:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305270516.6831ac12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67912

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3ED2C91E.8050906@adelphia.net>...

> >
> > Aw c'mon Steve, the only "arts" involved in scrambling together a kit
> > radio are a decent soldering technique and the ability to follow the
> > assembly instructions correctly. The K2 is one replacement of sorts
> > for the long-gone Heathkit rigs and nobody got any gee-whiz points for
> > building any of those.
> > Besides, one can buy an already-assembled K2 from any number of
> > builders.
> >
> > So my question remains on the table.
>
> My read is a number of things:
>
> 1. Compare the Gee-Whiz points you get from say an Elecraft K-2, and
> any of the other "hot rigs" out there. It's not something you buy to
> impress most people.

I absolutely agree with that.

> 2. Compare features. It doesn't have as many, and some are different
> than any other radio, such as the diagnostic functions.

The diagnostics are in the K2 to provide the instrumentation required
to test & align the radio during assembly. They would not be in the
rig if it was not a kit. But the diagnostics are still there after
assembly for later use if necessary which is a very nice feature.

> 3. Build it yourself? You noted you don't think all that much of
> assembling a kit radio. Many other people feel the same way. I don't
> know how much the pre-assembled ones cost, but that would cause a
> further erosion on points 1 and 2 above.

It doesn't take much poking around to find a well-done assembled K2
for the cost of the kit, or often for less. Kit rigs have always taken
depreciation beatings, they're all lousy investments from a CPA's
perspective.

> There really aren't all that many people who want a rig under those
> constraints. Kind of like Mac users. They know that they don't have as
> much of an "installed user base", but they don't really care. They have
> a good computer and do fine work with them.

Good analogy. The Mac O/S is well known to be more robust than any of
the iterations of Windoze. But the big problem with Macs, despite it's
"front end" superiority is it's lack of industrial-strength apps,

i.e., in the case of the K2 it's shortage of capabilities and
conveniences.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

1763. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 13:18:21 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <xAJAa.21185$fT5.2827@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 67913

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hff6qtz.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sat, 24 May 2003 15:50:14 -0400, Spectrum wrote:
>
> >Lets put it this way, I bet a dollar that Phil is no fan of Rush
> >Limbaugh.

Neither am I. ;-)

> You're damn right - and neither am I a fan of any so-called
> "liberal" commentator/talkshow clown either.
>
> A pox on both houses.

Lol!

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1764. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 13:50:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305270550.37f61cd6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67914

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hfibk6b.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 26 May 2003 20:25:02 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >And in the case of Elecraft, the need to build it kills off a
> >large part of the market.
>
> Had it been 30 years ago, I would have eagerly built a K2 -
> in those days I had been a prolific Heathkit builder and was
> ready to step up to something like the K2 of today. But with
> the monocular vision that I have now, a hot soldering iron is a
> dangerous weapon.

Time for another war story: I also have monocular vision. Looks like the difference between your's and mine is that I was born with the problem. In my case my brain apparently went to work at some very tender age and generated some kinda weird workarounds. When I took my two military physicals I drove the eye test guys nuts, the second one being a USAF light colonel and opthalmologist. I could not make a mistake in any of the depth perception tests. No matter how hard they tried to "undo" me.

Comments like "Uncle is NOT gonna deal with your weird vision Kelly, forget it." followed, so poof, out the gate and back on the bricks landed me.

While my arms aren't quite long enough these days I can nonetheless even handle diddling SMT thingeys with a soddering arn without breaking (much of) a sweat.

Sometimes it pays to be born screwed up.

>
> The one thing that I have a need for and would like to see in a
> kit or ready-made is a single-channel MF receiver with FSK
> decoder....I'd even settle for a FRG7700 or similar that has HF
> problems but works well around 500 kHz.

. . . would a software solution work . . ?

w3rv

1765. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 14:19:21 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <JtKAa.21196$fT5.8007@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 67915

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hff6jvy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 24 May 2003 11:53:39 -0700, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >> Those who are virulently anti-FCC don't care what the subject
> >> matter of the NPRMs or even the rulemaking process itself are
> >> all about. It's "the gov'mint" ruining their view of what they
> >> think this country is all about and where they fit into it that
> >> drives them.
> >
> >That's a mighty big blanket statement, Phil. Do you really believe
> >this applies to ALL who disagree with the FCC's way of "gettin' it
> >dun?"
>
> Anyone can agree or disagree with anything they want. The
> anti-FCC-ers that I have dealt with are, overwhelmingly,
> unaware of the process and how the agency works and what its
> good points and shortcomings are. All they see is "big
> government" and anyone who doesn;t agree with them is an
> "apologist".

I agree. Neither side should be taken to the extreme.

> In my book the Satchell Paige Criterion applies to them.

No comment.

> Maybe it's because I've been working the process, both "inside"
> and "outside" that leads me to the practical approach - "these"
> are the rules and "this" is how we get what you want working
> within the rules and "that" is how we get the rules changed if
> you can't get what you want. Calling the FCC or its
> protagonists or its antagonists or anyone else names or
> mounting ad hominem attacks on them will not get that done.

Calling anybody (Whether individually or collectively.) is
counter-productive and just plain wrong.

> >> Anyone who disagrees with the "final outcom" has a whole
> >> pack-full of remedies at hand: petition for reconsideration by
> >> the issuing Bureau and if turned down by the Commission en banc,
> >> and thence to the appellate courts if the objector can show that
> >> the action causes personal harm.

I can see and respect your POV, Phil...HOWEVER, there's not a whole heckuva
lot that'll convince me that:

1. NAL's that put the onus on the accused to prove their innocense or pay a kilobuck fine (Please don't compare this to the traffic ticket process, it's insulting.) -or-

2. Denying an RM proposal that the "commish" admits has the support of the majority of the affected constituency AND has minimal (If any.) affect on any other group other than said constituency.

...even remotely resembles what our forefathers envisioned in "checks & balances" wrt one government entity acting in all three capacities...legislative, executive, and judicial.

> >This would be a good thing if the "commish's" legislative process were
> >more...well, more...American. (Checks & balances?)
>
> Read what I posted. The "checks and balances" are there.
> The FCC does not have the final word - both the courts and The
> Congress can, and during the history of the FCC quite often did,
> overrule the FCC's decisions.

Read what I posted, Phil. I believe we both have good points. The truly just answer likely lies somewhere in between.

> What other "checks and balances" are you thinking of?

Legislative...Voters => Representative => Bill => Law
Executive...Law enforcement nabs those who've alledgedly broken the law.
Judicial...Innocent until proven guilty? (Er, that'd be before a "real" judge in a court of law as opposed to an "administrative" judge whose bread is not buttered by the same agency who wants a $ from a kilobuck NAL.)

I sincerely hope that you do not misunderstand my feelings as "ant-FCC," because I'm not. I just don't think ALL is doene "above-board" and could be improved. Conversely, I do not think you're an "apologist," nor do I think you're entirely objective.

> As Yogi Berra was supposed to have said, it's not over until
> it's over and even then it may not be over.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1766. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 15:46:13 UTC
From: Freddy the Freeloader <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <vu17dvgfn8a4resm1484c7n4rnrmtodl2b@4ax.com>
Source record: 67916

On 26 May 2003 16:32:07 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>>Date: 5/26/2003 10:21 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <02c4dvonk9k55pntf6g35ba4qffj74vtn7@4ax.com>
>
>>Nah, you don't need me to kiss your ass, Dumbass. Looks like you have
>>plenty of asskissers and toadies here already. Go soak your head.
>
> Lot's of profanity and insults meant to evoke a similar response...
>
> From a guy who professes to be a "patriot". Sorry to let you down.
>
> What a loser. The closest this liar ever got to being a "patriot " was
>watching Mel Gibson on HBO.
>
> Scumbag.
>
>Steve Robeson, LPN
>K4CAP

You're no better, stevie. You're just yapping insults now.

--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1767. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 15:48:10 UTC
From: Freddy the Freeloader <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <h227dvk3ue2hq0bg375m4j7o063tgrvm28@4ax.com>
Source record: 67917

On 26 May 2003 16:03:42 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>>Date: 5/26/2003 10:18 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <npb4dv49k8g4ptvur0jn1ln1cvbnr8l91o@4ax.com>
>
>>You and your friends here are too dumb to realize what a bigoted
>>asshole he is. He IS a Bad Ham. He hates anyone who isn't a brass
>>pounder.
>
> And if your head wasn't so far up your own, you'd see Larry has promoted
>OTHER modes than CW.
>
> But of course that would ruin your lying rant.
>
>>If he were a Good Ham, he'd never have started his hate
>>campaign in the first place, and he'd extend his friendship to all
>>radio enthusiasts, not just CW freaks like him.
>
> As I said...You haven't been paying attention.
>
>>The Patriot
>
> You are anything BUT a "patriot". Patriots stand for something, and put
>thier name and honor behind what they say.
>
> You're just a slithering snake of a scumbag, opinionated, hateful and
>cowardly.
>
>>America, Love it or leave it!
>
> Some would call THAT an act of bigotry.
>
>>If you're not with us, You're against us.
>
> Drawing that line in the sand? So who's going to be impressed, cowardly
>little shadowman?
>
>Steve Robeson, LPN
>K4CAP

Better get back on your prozac, stevie, before you have a stroke. Go
soak your head along with "dih-duh" roll.
--

The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1768. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 17:06:13 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305270906.7d433e4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67918

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3ED2C91E.8050906@adelphia.net>...
> > So my question remains on the table.
>
> My read is a number of things:
>
> 1. Compare the Gee-Whiz points you get from say an Elecraft K-2, and
> any of the other "hot rigs" out there. It's not something you buy to
> impress most people.

You've been reading too many Vipulposts, Mike. Buying or even building a rig to impress people is a waste of time. Particularly "preety fems".

Most folks buy/build because:

1) it's fun (to them, anyway)
2) they want to use the end result on the air
3) under some circumstances, it saves money
4) they cannot buy the whoozis ready-made

Of course there are exceptions, like the folks who want the latest or top-of-the-line whoozis simply because it IS latest or top-of-the-line whoozis.

Then there are the non-amateurs who will criticize you no matter what you decide to buy or build. ;-)

A lot depends on how you value your time, too. If you enjoy building, a kit is much fun and can "save" money. If you work a salaried job and there is not a big radio slush fund, that "saved" money can be a big deal.

But if you don't enjoy building and could spend those hours being paid overtime at a job, the result is just the opposite. If a kit takes 30 hours to build, test and align, and you could be making just $25 per hour after taxes, that kit price just jumped $750. OUCH!

> 2. Compare features. It doesn't have as many, and some are different
> than any other radio, such as the diagnostic functions.

The designers chose different tradeoffs. Both the Orion and the K2 are basically ham-bands-only boxes (Orion has general coverage in the sub-receiver only). This was done to maximize ham-band performance. Some folks accept the tradeoff, others don't. Somebody who spends a lot of time SWLing isn't going to be satisfied with a K2.

The main reason I homebrewed (that is, designed and built from scratch) most of my own HF rigs for the past 35+ years is that I could not get the performance/feature combo I wanted for the price I was willing/able to pay. The K2 changed all that. btw, the last non-homebrew HF rig I had as a "main station" was a TT Argosy. Nice little rig but the non-defeatable audio-derived AGC was poor, the tuning rate was too fast (18 kHz/turn) and it only put out 50 watts max. That was 1984. Things have come along a bit since then.....

> 3. Build it yourself? You noted you don't think all that much of
> assembling a kit radio. Many other people feel the same way. I don't
> know how much the pre-assembled ones cost, but that would cause a
> further erosion on points 1 and 2 above.

You can't buy a factory pre-assembled K2. But there are people who will build one for you, either for a price or for free. (See builders' list on their website).
>
>There really aren't all that many people who want a rig under those
> constraints.

HEY! ;-)

Actually, EVERY rig is full of tradeoffs. Many sacrifice performance in order to include more features or to reach a certain price level. Many if not most are not really user-serviceable unless you have a source of factory info and parts, and if the factory stops supporting your model, tough noogies. Styling and ergonomics are in the eye/hand of the beholder. Etc.

> Kind of like Mac users.

Now you're getting downright insulting! ;-)

> They know that they don't have as
> much of an "installed user base", but they don't really care. They have
> a good computer and do fine work with them.
>
Seriously, there's a big difference. Mac users pay higher prices for equivalent functionality, and sacrifice compatibility to get it. Different ham rigs don't have that problem unless you're in an SO2R-type situation.

And let's face it, not many Orion owners are going to put their rigs in a tent on Field Day and let any and all comers operate them...

The really cool thing is that we have so many choices.

--

btw, my main home PC was built from various scrounged parts. I think the modem and CD-ROM burner were the only things bought new - and those were both heavily discounted items. Spent less than $75 on the whole thing. Does the job.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1769. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 17:31:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305270931.7b46022d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67919

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305260834.386fccf1@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> > >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
> > > Guess that solves that.
> >
> > And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
> >
> >
> > Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
> >
> > 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
> >
> > 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
> >
> > 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
> >
> > 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
> >
> > 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
>
>
> Wasn't there a hassle here about not being allowed to work DX on 60M??
>
> w3rv

NPRM was for domestic use only. I haven't seen the R&O. Brian

1770. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 19:12:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305271112.47a67e2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67920

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030527082457.23745.00000227@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>
> >I believe in many instances including the Orion that the
> >AGC action is fully programmable.
>
> Programmable how?

Ask Dave, he has an Orion and programmed the AGC to suit his taste.

> >> >If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
> >> >k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?
> >>
> >> I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.
> >
> >No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.
>
> It ain't worse.

Isn't that a bit "circular"?

> >> Do they have the RF gain all the way up when doing so?
> >
> >I can't speak for others on this one but when I used the 940 I seldom
> >had the RF gain cranked all the way up.
>
> Which means the AGC wasn't working full blast. Turning down the RF gain and
> turning up the AF gain effectively raises the AGC threshold. A sig has to be
> above a certain level before the AGC starts to work. Turn it down enough and
> the AGC is almost turned off.

Right. The AGC is there when I need it keep from blasting the
headphones off me ears when I bump into a boomer. Which was not the
case in my Collins days. The AGC "pumped" something fierce on 80 & 40
particularly with the 75A4 even with the RF gain turned down.
Definitely not the case with the 940 and to a large extent the TS-50
is also better in this respect than the A4.

> >The urban mythology behind full QSK has gone by the wayside too.
>
> Where?

All over. See below.

> >Most
> >ops today prefer 8-12 mS switching delays rather than put up with the
> >annoyances associated with very high speed QSK.

>
> What annoyances?

Hearing everything out there between dits is annoying as hell. The
"quasi QSK" speed is adjustable even in my weenie TS-50 and I have it
set to some speed which allows me to hear not between dits but only
between characters at my usual 25-30 wpm.

I spent a full day at the N3RS multi-multi a couple weeks ago and he
runs QSK the same way I do but with big amps too. Like the $6k Acom
2000As they use. These amps do not have "QSK", but what they do have
today is vacuum relay PTT switching vs. the old open relays used in
days of yore. These relays are plenty fast enough to allow somebody to
break between characters but not fast enough to interrupt the
transmission of a character. In other words he lets the amp's PTT
relay speeds set the QSK speeds.

Much simpler and easier to deal with, a lot less fatiguing during the
long hauls in the contests and nobody misses a breakin. Which is all
that actualy matters. Both he and I have had high-speed QSK in the
past and both of us eventually and independently came to the
conclusion that it's not the smart way to go.

> 10 mS switching delay still lets you hear between dits at 60 wpm. That fast
> enough for ya?

Seems I slipped a decimal point. Bad Brian.

Hearing between dits at 60 WPM is exactly what no savvy op wants,
lotta headphone clutter which does nothin' for nobody.

> The Orion is brand-new and at the top of the market. That will naturally limit
> its sales.

Overall certainly but that's not the point. It won't be price limited
within it's market, it'll be performance, quality and acceptance
limited given the rigs it competes with in that market. This one will
be worth watching.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1771. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 20:39:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb0ief$ij0$0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 67921

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bau3v5$4pu$1@208.206.142.98>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >> There's a precedent for all this, y'know. How long has that special ~70
> >meter
> >> Alaska emergency frequency been authorized?
> >
> > The Alaska special emergency frequency isn't a general allocation, so I
> >didn't
> >consider it in the same vein.
>
> It's a one-channel voice-only emergency-centric allocation. As I recall, it
> exists to address vagaries of propagation
>
> >Frankly I believe that the new 60 meter
> >allocation
> >is viewed about the same, though evidently we aren't restricted from using
> >the
> >new channels in other than emergencies. Be interesting to see what activity
> >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to "slide up" a
> >few
> >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> >
> Not a problem.

We may see a new twist to "minimum power necessary to conduct the desired communicastion" rule. The "desired communication" can no longer be to put a 40db over S-9 signal into the other ham's receiver!

1772. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 21:18:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED3D60A.1030207@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67922

Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Be interesting to see what activity
>amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to "slide up" a few
>Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
>
>
>
Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its channelized
frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally unfamiliar. We'll
change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.

>
>

1773. Re: USB vs LSB on 5mHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 21:21:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED3D6E9.2000002@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67923

Mike Coslo wrote:

> As a point of consistency, it seems like the SSB bands on 5 mHz
> should have been Lower sideband.
>
> Was there any rationale given for the choice of USB?
>
Well, the primary users use USB. And they want to be able to copy
hams, and if there's an emergency needing it, talk with us.

1774. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 21:36:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 67924

Robert Casey wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > Be interesting to see what activity
> >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to "slide up" a few
> >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> >
> >
> >
> Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its channelized
> frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally unfamiliar. We'll
> change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.

Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding one vacant is pretty well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most likely all 5 will be.

1775. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 22:12:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030527181223.11621.00000041@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 67925

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>Date: 5/27/2003 10:48 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <h227dvk3ue2hq0bg375m4j7o063tgrvm28@4ax.com

>Better get back on your prozac, stevie, before you have a stroke. Go
>soak your head along with "dih-duh" roll.

You know you don't have to hide behind anonymous trolls to get your
jollies anymore, Scumbag Troller. Even at your age. Viagra's been out there
for quite a while now and I hear it's quite successful.

Steve

1776. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 22:38:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305271438.7b2c829c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67926

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0305270931.7b46022d@posting.google.com>...

> > >
> > >
> > > Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
> > >
> > > 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
> >
> >
> > Wasn't there a hassle here about not being allowed to work DX on 60M??
> >
> > w3rv
>
> NPRM was for domestic use only. I haven't seen the R&O. Brian

OK, something about needing an ITU blessing to make 60M a ham band
before international ops can be allowed . . ? Got past me. Dropped
outta RAM. Something.

w3rv

1777. Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 22:42:40 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3ED3E9E0.2749DA4E@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 67927
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for operated
> > several base stations some with callsigns beginning in KAA. For many years
> > all the operators would sign off with "K Double A...". Then one day an FCC
> > rep cited one of the stations as being in violation for not properly giving the
> > callsign. So the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
> > Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the reverse- he said it
> > would be better to give the callsign as had originally been done! So the chief
> > of communications had to write a letter requesting clarification, and the
> > original method was approved.
> >
> > Right hand, left hand.

If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

1778. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 23:07:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305271507.767f9e96@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67928

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030527082455.23745.00000225@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <bau3v5$4pu$1@208.206.142.98>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >> There's a precedent for all this, y'know. How long has that special ~70
> meter
> >> Alaska emergency frequency been authorized?
> >
> > The Alaska special emergency frequency isn't a general allocation, so I
> >didn't
> >consider it in the same vein.
>
> It's a one-channel voice-only emergency-centric allocation. As I recall, it
> exists to address vagaries of propagation

5167.5 Khz, an Alaska State Trooper's inter-service freq which is also
monitored by the Coast Guard, the FAA and the DoD military. It's
actually one of about ten SSB freqs around that channel, some channels
being for S&R purposes, others for commercial purposes by remote
hunting lodges, offshore fishing vessels, etc. They even have
completely packaged "Alaska Type Accepted" 40W rigs-to-go and conduct
daily day/nite net drills.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1779. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 23:36:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030527193640.25052.00000288@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67929

In article <d22b54c3.0305271112.47a67e2b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030527082457.23745.00000227@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>>
>> >I believe in many instances including the Orion that the
>> >AGC action is fully programmable.
>>
>> Programmable how?
>
>Ask Dave, he has an Orion and programmed the AGC to suit his taste.
>
Well, Dave?

>> >> >If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
>> >> >k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?
>> >>
>> >> I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.
>> >
>> >No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.
>>
>> It ain't worse.
>
>Isn't that a bit "circular"?

Not at all.

Heck, I was running full QSK more than 30 years ago with my homebrew stuff. And
it wasn't new then. Fast keying relay and an electronic TR switch. Cat's meow
for traffic handling or ragchewing.
>
>> >> Do they have the RF gain all the way up when doing so?
>> >
>> >I can't speak for others on this one but when I used the 940 I seldom
>> >had the RF gain cranked all the way up.
>>
>> Which means the AGC wasn't working full blast. Turning down the RF gain and
>> turning up the AF gain effectively raises the AGC threshold. A sig has to
>be
>> above a certain level before the AGC starts to work. Turn it down enough
>and
>> the AGC is almost turned off.
>
>Right. The AGC is there when I need it keep from blasting the

>headphones off me ears when I bump into a boomer. Which was not the
>case in my Collins days. The AGC "pumped" something fierce on 80 & 40
>particularly with the 75A4 even with the RF gain turned down.
>Definitely not the case with the 940 and to a large extent the TS-50
>is also better in this respect than the A4.

Well, there you have it.
>
>> >The urban mythology behind full QSK has gone by the wayside too.
>>
>> Where?
>
>All over. See below.

Not amongst those of us who like it.

>> >Most
>> >ops today prefer 8-12 mS switching delays rather than put up with the
>> >annoyances associated with very high speed QSK.
>>
>> What annoyances?
>
>Hearing everything out there between dits is annoying as hell.

To you and some others, maybe. Not to me.

>The
>"quasi QSK" speed is adjustable even in my weenie TS-50 and I have it
>set to some speed which allows me to hear not between dits but only
>between characters at my usual 25-30 wpm.
>
Important point is that we have a choice. Full QSK, semi QSK, manual TR,
whatever.

>I spent a full day at the N3RS multi-multi a couple weeks ago and he
>runs QSK the same way I do but with big amps too. Like the $6k Acom
>2000As they use. These amps do not have "QSK", but what they do have
>today is vacuum relay PTT switching vs. the old open relays used in
>days of yore. These relays are plenty fast enough to allow somebody to
>break between characters but not fast enough to interrupt the
>transmission of a character. In other words he lets the amp's PTT
>relay speeds set the QSK speeds.

The fast vacuum relays can switch as fast as a few mS. Trouble is, they are
only good for a few million operations. Lessee, at 30 wpm, one minute of
"PARIS" is 520 operations. A million operations takes less than 2000 hours of
transmitting at 30 wpm.
>
>Much simpler and easier to deal with, a lot less fatiguing during the
>long hauls in the contests and nobody misses a breakin. Which is all
>that actualy matters. Both he and I have had high-speed QSK in the
>past and both of us eventually and independently came to the

>conclusion that it's not the smart way to go.
>
With relay QSK I tend to agree.

>> 10 mS switching delay still lets you hear between dits at 60 wpm. That fast
>> enough for ya?
>
>Seems I slipped a decimal point. Bad Brian.
>
>Hearing between dits at 60 WPM is exactly what no savvy op wants,
>lotta headphone clutter which does nothin' for nobody.

Depends on what you are doing. In traffic handling and ragchewing it's neat to
just touch the key when a letter is missed and the other guy stops right away,
you get the fill, and off ya go. For the pileups and contests its a different
game, particularly if you're holding a freq.
>
>> The Orion is brand-new and at the top of the market. That will naturally
>> limit its sales.
>
>Overall certainly but that's not the point. It won't be price limited
>within it's market, it'll be performance, quality and acceptance
>limited given the rigs it competes with in that market. This one will
>be worth watching.

Yup. Dave'll give us the straight story, too. If we can tear him away from it
long enough to talk about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1780. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 23:36:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030527193642.25052.00000289@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 67930

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfia1sa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 26 May 2003 12:24:59 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>> Here's another bit of RR trivia: What does the letter F mean
>> when painted on multiple-unit cars and locomotives like the GG-1,
>> P-5 and AEM-7?
>
> You'll find it on diesel-electrics as well.

Yes, but it's rarely needed on those locos.
>
>>> Or is everyone supposed to gabble about railroading in a RADIO
>>> newsgroup? [anagramists could assemble "radio" from "rail-
>>> roading" but that is stretching credulity... :-)]
>>
>>Nobody has to "gabble" about anyhting if they're not interested.
>>You've gone on at length about non-amateur-radio subjects.
>
> And some of us do use amateur radio to enhance our other
> non-amateur-radio interests. Our local rail photography group
> has enough hams that we can and do use 2-m to coordinate rail
> photo shoots and chases.

RR's use radio for a number of purposes, too.
>
> I'm sure that other hobbies have similar uses for amateur
> radio communications.
>
Amateur rocketry has serious potential for amateur radio cross-over.

> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> PNW MP 754 - Tillamook Dist.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

MP 14 - former PRR Main Line

which reminds me of a story....

'bout 15 years ago, the Strasburg RR got permission to do a doublehead steam
fantrip from Lancaster to Phila and back on a summer Sunday, via the Main Line.
Which line is also used by modern electric stainless-steel SEPTA commuter
trains. I had a couple of young relatives at the time who wanted to see the
steam train, so we trooped over to the local commuter station about 3 pm and

waited on the platform for the special to go by. The two old steamers would be working hard because it's uphill all the way from Philly to Paoli and they had about 14 coaches to pull. And those coaches were full!

Just as we reach the station, I hear the whistle blow off to the east. Wind was from the west that day, so it wasn't far off. Commuter trains have horns, not whistles, so I knew we'd gotten there just in time.

While we're waiting on the platform, a very proper lady arrives, looks down the track, and asks when the next train will be along. I tell her about two minutes, but it won't stop at this station.

"Hmpf!" she says. "Young man, don't you know all trains on this line are locals on Sunday? It will stop!"

I figured it was useless to argue, so I said no more. A few minutes later, a headlight appears on the outbound local track.

"There, young man!" says the lady. "Here's my train!"

And here came the special with the throttle to the roof, belching steam and smoke and going at least 60 mph. Roared right by in a flash of steam, fire, varnish and hot exhaust. Engineer showed us he really knew how to use the whistle, too.

The little ones were suitably impressed. I don't know what the lady thought, but her expression was priceless.

Next time I'll bring a camera.

1781. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-27 23:50:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb0tq3$gu2$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67931

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
>
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to "slide
up" a few
> > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > >
> > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its
channelized
> > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally unfamiliar.
We'll
> > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
>
> Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding one vacant
is pretty
> well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most likely
all 5 will
> be.

But if the need is for an emergency, that should
take priority of any other comms.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1782. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 01:01:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfk0loc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67932

On Mon, 26 May 2003 20:13:28 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> Tell that to my son who started his "non-existant Bell System"
>> career with ATT about 10 years ago as a bench repair tech.
>
>Where? As part of the AT&T corporate we only had central
>depot type of "bench repairs" going on as far back as 1980s.

ATT Regional HQ, San Francisco. Most of the stuff that they repaired, though, were peripherals and laptops used by RHQ personnel. Then they moved to San Ramon, where I used to have lunch with him when I visited PacBell Mobile who rented one floor of the ATT RHQ building. He progressed to doing IT cabling, hardware, and software upgrades, which he is now doing back in SF with SBC as a crew chief.

Not bad for a kid who was born dyslexic and suffered brain damage (destruction of areas which control short term memory) in a traffic accident when he was a teenager. His "side business" is repairing and restoring bicycles - check out his "Lee" ads in "Bicycletrader".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1783. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 01:01:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfk1did.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67933
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 26 May 2003 22:20:15 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for
>operated several base stations some with callsigns beginning in
>KAA. For many years all the operators would sign off with "K
>Double A...". Then one day an FCC rep cited one of the stations
>as being in violation for not properly giving the callsign. So
>the signoff was changed to "K A A...."

> Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the
>reverse- he said it would be better to give the callsign as had
>originally been done! So the chief of communications had to write
>a letter requesting clarification, and the original method was
>approved.

Approved by _whom_? Must have been someone who didn't bother
to check the Monitoring Procedure Manual on what acceptable
call sign format is, as I had to do when the exact same
situation came up in California.

> Right hand, left hand.

And much cattle.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1784. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 01:01:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hfk2tie.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67934

On Tue, 27 May 2003 14:19:21 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>> In my book the Satchell Paige Criterion applies to them.
>
>No comment.

You -DO- know what I am talking about, right?

>I can see and respect your POV, Phil...HOWEVER, there's not a whole heckuva
>lot that'll convince me that:
>
>1. NAL's that put the onus on the accused to prove their innocense or pay a
>kilobuck fine (Please don't compare this to the traffic ticket process, it's
>insulting.) -or-

OR - not pay anything and force the FCC take it to the Justice
Department for collection, which requires the Government to
file suit in U S District Court. You get a _trial de novo_
which means that the Government has to start from zero and prove
each and every element of the violation. You get your day in
the kind of court that you describe. The FCC and the Justice
Department are not going to go through that process unless the
case is air-tight. That was a large part my job in latter
years - to make sure that those cases which were passed on were
air-tight on evidence or we wouldn't pass them on.

>2. Denying an RM proposal that the "commish" admits has the support of the
>majority of the affected constituency AND has minimal (If any.) affect on
>any other group other than said constituency.

That's within the discretion of the Commission but anyone who
doesn't like it can take one of several appeal routes. The
non-amateur-radio services do that quite often.

>> What other "checks and balances" are you thinking of?
>
>Legislative...Voters => Representative => Bill => Law

The FCC can only issue regulations and take actions that
conform to the powers that the legislative has granted it
and that the judiciary has allowed the agency to exercise. That
is the basis of administrative law.

The Congress does not want to be bothered by lawmaking and
regulation of that sort, and therefore delegated it to the
regulatory agencies such as the FCC. You had better bet,
though, that when it comes to major policy issues such as

broadcast ownership or wireless and telephone networking
issues, The Congress is right there putting its head in where
it doesn't fit.

>Executive...Law enforcement nabs those who've alledgedly broken the law.
>Judicial...Innocent until proven guilty? (Er, that'd be before a "real"
>judge in a court of law as opposed to an "administrative" judge whose bread
>is not buttered by the same agency who wants a $ from a kilobuck NAL.)

First of all, the FCC does not get to keep one cent of any
funds collected through the Forfeiture, spectrum auction, or
license fee processes. It all goes directly into the Treasury.
The FCC never even gets its hands on it - it is sent directly
to a Treasury bank lockbox operation even though the mail
address says "FCC".

Secondly, I have prepared many cases for submuittal to, and
appeared in some before, Administrative Law Judges and if you
think that the ALJs are biased toward the Commission's actions
or personnel, I have a bridge that I would like to sell you.
It feels like the Commission, rather than the licensee, is on
trial most of the time.

They are a harder sell than those which you refer to as "real
judges" and they want to avoid any appearance of bias because
their decisions are appealable to the full Commission and thence
to the U S Court of Appeals and no judge wants to be reversed on
appeal because of "bias".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1785. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 01:51:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED415CC.410135D7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67935

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0305261409.392a16e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Unless Mr Deep Pockets is
> >> looking for that "satisfaction" of building the kit, he's going to want to
> >> rip the box open, hook the antenna up and talk.
> > >
> > >Which is exactly what Dave did when ripped his new Orion out of the
> > >box, hooked up an antenna and . .
> >
> > Got on CW, I bet....

You guys got it wrong. I ripped the Orion out of the box, hooked up an antenna, connected the amplifier, turned it on and read the manual. Then I sat for two evenings listening only and marveling at the new rig's capabilities. On the third evening, I made a couple of CW QSOs and the following night, I put the Orion on SSB for the first time.

To Brian's question about the Ten-Tec and Elecraft markets in comparison to Japan's big three: I ran a C-line when others were using TS-820's and FT-102's. I ran a TR-7 when others were using TS-930's and FT-1's. I ran a Paragon when others were running TS-940's and FT-1000D's. I ran an Omni VI when others were running TS-950's and FT-1000MP's. Now I run an Orion when others are running IC-756 Pro II's and FT-1000MP Fields. I require my rigs to have good receivers. I looked at the specs of the Orion and I looked at the specs of its Japanese competition. Based on the specs, there was only one logical choice. The question which begs asking at the moment is: What are the others guys thinking when they choose a Japanese rig with lots of chrome and nuttin' under the hood?

Lest you think my choice is coloring my view of the Orion, here are a few recent quotes from the Ten-Tec reflector:

From Tom W7QF (Orion in WPX 'test):

"I operated some in the contest also. Wow what a receiver! I was able to completely eliminate a 40 over 9 signal 600 hz away by using the 250 hz roofing filter, DSP set to 100 Hz and the notch and copy with ease an S3 signal. No pumping of AGC or anything in the background. Just nice clean single signal copy!"

"I was also able to completely eliminate an S8 to S9 signal 100 Hz away from and S3 signal. Never been able to do that before. I was shocked

when I tuned down a few Hz and all of a sudden the other signal was there."

"Never heard any IMD or any "junk" in the background on a clear frequency with the band full of 30 and 40 over 9 signals."

From Carl N4PY (Orion in the WPX 'test):

"I was also doing some Orion experimenting during the contest on the bottom of 40 meters. Between 7.000 and 7.006 there must have been 3 or 4 s9+20 signals. What I was trying to do was find a very small hole amoung these signals where I could use a tight filter and see how well the Orion would perform. What I found was to me truely amazing. I was using a DSP filter of 170 hertz and the tentec 219 250 hertz filter. There is a 12 db insertion loss on the 250 filter, so when I engaged the 250 I also turned on the preamp to make up for the difference. First of all, I was easily able to hear and copy some S3 signals in this zone. The Orion has the ability to knock out the unwanted signals and produce a clear, quiet, zone in between. Anyway, I could not find any noticeable difference of adding the 250 filter to the 170 DSP. I was surprised at this and tried to be very careful to see if I could tell. But adding the preamp to make up for the insertion loss made the background noise sound identical to not having the roofing filter. There may be cases where the roofing filter helps over having the 1 K standard but I haven't found one yet."

From Earl K6SE (Orion in the WPX 'test):

"Curious to see how the receiver would perform in a crowded band with a lot of strong signals, I forced the widest roofing filter (20kHz) to be active no matter what the DSP bandwidth was set to. I was surprised that stations 500Hz apart were easily separated when using a DSP BW of 300Hz. Switching to the 500Hz roofing filter seem to make no difference in that respect. At no time did I ever hear any of the chirps and birdies that you hear on other radios with poorer IMDDR3, even with the roofing filter set to 20kHz. All of my listening was done with the preamp turned on."

Whet your interest any? You might want to take a look at Doug Smith's article on the programmable AGC at http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm

What I'm trying to get across to you is that you should sell the car, take a second mortgage on the house, tell the kids that they'll have to work their way through college but order an Orion.

Dave K8MN

1786. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 01:57:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED41767.69ABFC4D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67936

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0305261431.39a53095@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> >> I rarely if ever use AGC on CW. Better without it.
> >> >
> >> >Was marginally true in 1970.
> >>
> >> Why? In 1970 there were plenty of rigs with IF derived AGC.
> >
> >
> > >Because the AGC circuitry today is far more sophisticated and is much
> > >"smarter".
>
> Not really.

Really. If you didn't read my other post with the Doug Smith article,
have a look at: http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm

Pay special attention to the part outlining the level at which Orion's
AGC actually kicks in.

> >I believe in many instances including the Orion that the
> >AGC action is fully programmable.
>
> Programmable how? Obviously the release time is programmable. In the '70s that
> was done by changing timing capacitors.
>
> Response curve is usually as flat as the technology allows.
>
> I can't see any reason to make attack time programmable; you want it as fast as
> possible.

Absolutely correct.

> Slow attack time gives pops and blasts, which is why audio-derived
> AGC isn't that good even in the best implementations. Which is a major
> limitation of direct conversion rx's, phasing, Gingell, Tayloe or whatever.
>
> So all you got left is AGC threshold - the point at which the AGC starts to
> work. Which was controlled in the olde days by turning the RF gain down with
> the AGC on.

You've got the threshold but also hang and decay. In the Orion, they're
all programmable.

> > That certainly was not the case in 1970.
>
> Solder iron vs. menu.
>
> >> >If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
> >> >k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?
> >>
> >> I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.

My personal preference is to retain what hearing I still have.

> >No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.
>
> It ain't worse.

...but it is now better.

Dave K8MN

1787. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 02:08:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED419D3.B626DD68@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67939

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:

> Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy
> especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their
> needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.

I'm not sure I agree. I see a few big guns choosing a rig and a bunch
of yes men taking the word of the few. It's the old, "K1AR has an
FT-1000MP Mk V and he does really well. If I buy the same rig, I can do
really well" syndrome. A professional photographer might use a Rolli to
take his great shots. I might buy the same camera and take terrible
photos.

> I'm not intentionally trying to stick pins in the K2 & Ten-tec
> balloons here just to be a pain in the ass, fact is that I'm quite
> baffled at the low acceptance rate these rigs have in the overall top
> end market. So I tossed a note to a couple of the heavy-duty dx
> conetsters and asked them point blank why they haven't gone with a
> K2-100 or an Omni.
>
> I've only gotten one response back so far. That one sez that the K2
> does not appear to be supported by the contest loggers and other third
> party contesting & rig control software & station accessories.

Not supported by contest loggers? Third party contesting and rig control
software? This guy has to be breathing pure oxygen.

> As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> lackings.

Orion has no shabby mechanicals, no lousy calibration (20 Hz?) and no
audible birdies. How many JA manufacturers make a rig with no audible
birdies?

> But we'll see. Famed One K3WW popped the coin for an Orion at the
> Dayton 'fest. There's a breakthrough and I'm gonna be all over it.
> Another one N3RD is on his way to an IC-7800. Both have been vocal MP
> adherents. This is gonna be the shootout from hell, I'll letcha know .

I'll be interested to see the IC-7800 full specs and even more
interested to see who buys one.

Dave K8MN

1788. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 02:08:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030527220852.04207.00000287@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 67937

In article <3ED3E9E0.2749DA4E@yahoo.bomb>, Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
writes:

>
> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

Interesting question. A few years ago, I had a "problem" with a repeater
user who was signing "[prefix]3Triple-A." My assumption was that his
call sign was [prefix]3TA, since he was using the phonetic word "triple"
instead just saying the letter 'T'. However, he clarified that his call sign
was, in fact, [prefix]3AAA, but he was just shortening it to "Triple A."
Well, you can imagine what went on from there. Since he didn't live in
my county, I took no action. I did inform the ARRL Official Observer
in his area, but I never learned what became of it.

It is my assumption that in voice modes, the call sign must be given in
a plain, clear manner which would not create any confusion. Therefore,
I'd say that "KA1K Double Q" or " [prefix]3TripleA" would not be legal
identifications, due to the possible confusion if the substituted words
"Double" or "Triple" were taken literally as meaning "D" or "T." If I
ever heard a call sign like "KB3TripleZulu," I'd assume that his call sign
was KB3TZ, NOT KB3ZZZ. Phonetics are intended to be words that
are substituted for letters, in order to eliminate confusion. Using a
word to enumerate repeated letters would only create confusion.
Therefore, I would consider this to be illegal identification, and that it
was possibly being done to deliberately obfuscate the identity of the
station.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1789. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 02:10:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305271810.3591b24c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67938

> Some of of the problems I have
> personally with the K2 are the lack of even a second VFO let alone....

Errata: Does have two VFOs but ya can't see both freqs in the display.

>
> w3rv

w3rv

1790. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 02:48:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb181u$v5f$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 67940

Brian Kelly wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030527082455.23745.00000225@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> > In article <bau3v5$4pu$1@208.206.142.98>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> There's a precedent for all this, y'know. How long has that special ~70
> > meter
> > >> Alaska emergency frequency been authorized?
> > >
> > > The Alaska special emergency frequency isn't a general allocation, so I
> > >didn't
> > >consider it in the same vein.
> >
> > It's a one-channel voice-only emergency-centric allocation. As I recall, it
> > exists to address vagaries of propagation
>
> 5167.5 Khz, an Alaska State Trooper's inter-service freq which is also
> monitored by the Coast Guard, the FAA and the DoD military. It's
> actually one of about ten SSB freqs around that channel, some channels
> being for S&R purposes, others for commercial purposes by remote
> hunting lodges, offshore fishing vessels, etc. They even have
> completely packaged "Alaska Type Accepted" 40W rigs-to-go and conduct
> daily day/nite net drills.
>

Yep, I was acquainted with a ham who had been a communications tech for
Alaska State Troopers, and guess what they used for HF antennas- homemade T^2FD's! To top
that
off, when we were discussing all that I asked him what they used for non-inductive load
resistors, and he said he learned from trial and error that the inductive Radio Shack
potted
jobs
worked best!

w0ex

1791. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 03:11:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb19d7$236$0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 67941

N2EY wrote:

> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hfia1sa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On 26 May 2003 12:24:59 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> Here's another bit of RR trivia: What does the letter F mean
> >> when painted on multiple-unit cars and locomotives like the GG-1,
> >> P-5 and AEM-7?
> >
> > You'll find it on diesel-electrics as well.
>
> Yes, but it's rarely needed on those locos.
> >
> >>> Or is everyone supposed to gabble about railroading in a RADIO
> >>> newsgroup? [anagramists could assemble "radio" from "rail-
> >>> roading" but that is stretching credulity... :-)]
> >>
> >>Nobody has to "gabble" about anyhting if they're not interested.
> >>You've gone on at length about non-amateur-radio subjects.
> >
> > And some of us do use amateur radio to enhance our other
> > non-amateur-radio interests. Our local rail photography group
> > has enough hams that we can and do use 2-m to coordinate rail
> > photo shoots and chases.
>
> RR's use radio for a number of purposes, too.
> >
> > I'm sure that other hobbies have similar uses for amateur
> > radio communications.
> >
> Amateur rocketry has serious potential for amateur radio cross-over.
>
> > 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> > PNW MP 754 - Tillamook Dist.
> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> MP 14 - former PRR Main Line
>
> which reminds me of a story....
>
> 'bout 15 years ago, the Strasburg RR got permission to do a doublehead steam

> fantrip from Lancaster to Phila and back on a summer Sunday, via the Main Line.
> Which line is also used by modern electric stainless-steel SEPTA commuter
> trains. I had a couple of young relatives at the time who wanted to see the
> steam train, so we trooped over to the local commuter station about 3 pm and
> waited on the platform for the special to go by. The two old steamers would be
> working hard because it's uphill all the way from Philly to Paoli and they had
> about 14 coaches to pull. And those coaches were full!
>
> Just as we reach the station, I hear the whistle blow off to the east. Wind was
> from the west that day, so it wasn't far off. Commuter trains have horns, not
> whistles, so I knew we'd gotten there just in time.
>
> While we're waiting on the platform, a very proper lady arrives, looks down the
> track, and asks when the next train will be along. I tell her about two
> minutes, but it won't stop at this station.
>
> "Hmpf!" she says. "Young man, don't you know all trains on this line are locals
> on Sunday? It will stop!"
>
> I figured it was useless to argue, so I said no more. A few minutes later, a
> headlight appears on the outbound local track.
>
> "There, young man!" says the lady. "Here's my train!"
>
> And here came the special with the throttle to the roof, belching steam and
> smoke and going at least 60 mph. Roared right by in a flash of steam, fire,
> varnish and hot exhaust. Engineer showed us he really knew how to use the
> whistle, too.
>
> The little ones were suitably impressed. I don't know what the lady thought,
> but her expression was priceless.
>
> Next time I'll bring a camera.

In '94 the xyl and I had the opportunity to take a railfan excursion on the BN mainline riding Southern Railway coaches pulled by Frisco 1522, a 4-6-4 steamer owned by the Museum of Transportation in St Louis which had been taken out of retirement and refurbished for excursion use.
(it has since been re-retired due to escalating insurance and maintnance costs).
Twas a very memorable ride. I took along an 8mm camcorder and got lots of great footage. They even stopped in a rural area, let passengers who wanted photos disembark, backed the train out of sight, then did a photo run-by.
Very neat.

BTW, one of the memories etched into my brain as a child is of watching the daily Current River Branch Line trsin of the Frisco steam across a small trestle (looked huge to a 6 year old) as I walked the two miles to school each morning.

And if you ever get to Cheyenne, Wyoming, drop off I-80 onto Lincolnway and drive by the city park. It's where the lone remaining example of Union Pacific's Big Boy is set up on display. That's the huge 4-8-8-4 specially built to cross the Rockies

between Cheyenne and Ogden, Utah. It's 132 feet long.
Of only 25 built, it's the only one left in existance.
I got some great digital photos.

My neat xyl's birthday present to me this year was a set of steam train videos. By pure coincidence, the first train shown was pulled by a Big Boy!
And I had thought I'd never get to see one in action!

Dick

1792. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 03:17:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb19om$2o8$0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 67942

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
> >
> >
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > >
> > > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to "slide
> up" a few
> > > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > > >
> > > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its
> channelized
> > > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally unfamiliar.
> We'll
> > > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
> >
> > Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding one vacant
> is pretty
> > well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most likely
> all 5 will
> > be.
>
> But if the need is for an emergency, that should
> take priority of any other comms.

Sure. But one of the strengths of ham radio has always been the ability to set up wherever one can find a clear frequency, and move to find one when necessary. Even though emergencies do take precedence that doesn't assure that any of the 5 channels will be available for emergency use at any given time. Early in an emergency before the word gets out they are likely to be overeloaded with routine use and thus too cluttered to use.

1793. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 03:19:36 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb19s8$2o8$1@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 67943
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 26 May 2003 22:20:15 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for
> >operated several base stations some with callsigns beginning in
> >KAA. For many years all the operators would sign off with "K
> >Double A...". Then one day an FCC rep cited one of the stations
> >as being in violation for not properly giving the callsign. So
> >the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
>
> > Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the
> >reverse- he said it would be better to give the callsign as had
> >originally been done! So the chief of communications had to write
> >a letter requesting clarification, and the original method was
> >approved.
>
> Approved by _whom_? Must have been someone who didn't bother
> to check the Monitoring Procedure Manual on what acceptable
> call sign format is, as I had to do when the exact same
> situation came up in California.
>
> > Right hand, left hand.
>
> And much cattle.

And as many possible rulings as there are district directors!

1794. Are All Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 03:36:57 UTC
From: Ur Five Nine OM <59OM@TallTalesOM.com>
Message-ID: <bb1ask$4ro$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 67944

Are all hams legends in their own minds or just the old white
males who frequent this NG, desperately trying to impress
each other with yarns of how important they were at one time?

Teller of TALL Tales of Yesteryear

1795. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 04:04:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305272004.49d0418b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67945

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030527082456.23745.00000226@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0305261409.392a16e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Unless Mr Deep Pockets is
> >> looking for that "satisfaction" of building the kit, he's going to want to
> >> rip the box open, hook the antenna up and talk.
> > >
> > >Which is exactly what Dave did when ripped his new Orion out of the
> > >box, hooked up an antenna and . .
> >
> > Got on CW, I bet....

WTF, you know he's silently looming over this whole thrash, ASK him!

> > >Aw c'mon Steve, the only "arts" involved in scrambling together a kit
> > >radio are a decent soldering technique and the ability to follow the
> > >assembly instructions correctly.
> >
> > There's a bunch of skills in that bag. Like being able to wind toroids
> > according to the instructions.

BZZZT! If winding toroids is such a big deal you know as well as I do
that ya can buy the toroids already wound.

> > lignment takes some skill and know-how.
> > Spectrogram - what a tool!

And in the end all ya gotta do is follow the yellow brick road right?

> > >The K2 is one replacement of sorts
> > >for the long-gone Heathkit rigs and nobody got any gee-whiz points for
> > >building any of those.
> >
> > One big difference is that the Heath stuff did not outperform the competition,
> > except in price. An SB-301 is not a kit 75S-3.

??!

> > The K2 rx is up there with the
> > best of 'em.

Yup. Within it's rather severe limitations.

The K1-4 makes a helluva lot more sense than a K2 when ya get right
down to it and I just might.

> >
> >So my question remains on the table.
> >
> See other posts.

I did. See other posts.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1796. Re: Are All Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 04:12:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED4363E.825BA06C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67946

Ur Five Nine OM wrote:
>
> Are all hams legends in their own minds or just the old white
> males who frequent this NG, desperately trying to impress
> each other with yarns of how important they were at one time?
>
> Teller of TALL Tales of Yesteryear

You must be mistaken, cloaked man of mystery. I'm much taller than 5'9".

Does it seem to you that the denizens of this newsgroup are legends in their own minds because they've had a variety of life experiences? Why, you must have some sort of inferiority complex or you might really be inferior. After all, you aren't even assertive enough to post your own name.

Now scuttle back under your bed like a good chap.

Dave K8MN

1797. Hey, Phil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 04:18:31 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3ED43897.8A23E16A@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 67947
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 26 May 2003 22:20:15 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for
> >operated several base stations some with callsigns beginning in
> >KAA. For many years all the operators would sign off with "K
> >Double A...". Then one day an FCC rep cited one of the stations
> >as being in violation for not properly giving the callsign. So
> >the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
>
> > Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the
> >reverse- he said it would be better to give the callsign as had
> >originally been done! So the chief of communications had to write
> >a letter requesting clarification, and the original method was
> >approved.
>
> Approved by _whom_? Must have been someone who didn't bother
> to check the Monitoring Procedure Manual on what acceptable
> call sign format is, as I had to do when the exact same
> situation came up in California.

If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, say KA1KQQ, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

1798. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 05:10:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bb314p$53pei$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 67960

What about "Sec. 97.401 Operation during a disaster" or "Sec. 97.403
Safety of life and protection of property" or "Sec. 97.405 Station in
distress" as possible variants to use morse code on those frequencies???
One of them has gotta apply in some case or another....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:batp4gdlq0@208.207.71.143...
>
>
> David Robbins wrote:
>
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> > > >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > > >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
> > >
> > > > Guess that solves that.
> > >
> > > And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
> > >
> > >
> > > Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
> > >
> > > 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
> > >
> > > 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
> > >
> > and dont' forget... USB voice only... no cw, no rtty, no sstv, no throb
or
> > psk or any of that other stuff, just USB voice.
>

> Did you notice the reason for that? So the primary users can ID hams
operating
> there if needed. Never mind that any digital mode should work much better
than
> voice in emergencies. But FCC could grant us instant authority to use them
if
> needed, I presume.
>

1799. Re: Are All Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 12:28:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb2a1q$j8f$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 67949

Ur Five Nine OM wrote:

> Are all hams legends in their own minds or just the old white
> males who frequent this NG, desperately trying to impress
> each other with yarns of how important they were at one time?
>
> Teller of TALL Tales of Yesteryear

Geez, 5x9, ur buried in QRN hr. If u don't find condx to ur liking hr
then pse qsy over to visit with AveryFineDip. He'll appreciate ur stuff.

1800. Re: Hey, Phil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 12:32:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb2a97joe0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 67950
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > On 26 May 2003 22:20:15 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > >With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for
> > >operated several base stations some with callsigns beginning in
> > >KAA. For many years all the operators would sign off with "K
> > >Double A...". Then one day an FCC rep cited one of the stations
> > >as being in violation for not properly giving the callsign. So
> > >the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
> >
> > > Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the
> > >reverse- he said it would be better to give the callsign as had
> > >originally been done! So the chief of communications had to write
> > >a letter requesting clarification, and the original method was
> > >approved.
> >
> > Approved by _whom_? Must have been someone who didn't bother
> > to check the Monitoring Procedure Manual on what acceptable
> > call sign format is, as I had to do when the exact same
> > situation came up in California.
>
> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, say KA1KQQ, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

Sure. And you'd probnably get by with it indefinitely, 'specially since Phil is
retired!

1801. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 12:49:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0305280449.2cd15938@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67951
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb> wrote in message news:<3ED3E9E0.2749DA4E@yahoo.bomb>...
> Scott wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > > With Uncle Charlie ya never know. Outfit I used to work for operated
> > > several base stations some with callsigns beginning in KAA. For many years
> > > all the operators would sign off with "K Double A...". Then one day an FCC
> > > rep cited one of the stations as being in violation for not properly giving the
> > > callsign. So the signoff was changed to "K A A...."
> > > Then a few years later a different FCC rep did just the reverse- he said it
> > > would be better to give the callsign as had originally been done! So the chief
> > > of communications had to write a letter requesting clarification, and the
> > > original method was approved.
> > >
> > > Right hand, left hand.
>
>
>
> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

I would inadvertantly copy the above call signs as: KDA..., and
KA1KDQ.

If it were customary to insert the word "single" prior to the single
use of a letter, then the confusion of "double" would go away, except
in programming where "single" is single precision - a number.

Life would be simpler if people just said it as it appears on their
license.

Is that too hard?

1802. Re: Are All Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 13:20:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030528092018.06840.00000322@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 67952

>Subject: Are All Hams?
>From: "Ur Five Nine OM" 59OM@TallTalesOM.com
>Date: 5/27/03 10:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bb1ask$4ro$0@pita.alt.net>
>
> Are all hams legends in their own minds or just the old white
>males who frequent this NG, desperately trying to impress
>each other with yarns of how important they were at one time?

Why do you ask, Lennie?

1803. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 13:32:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305280532.33909d61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67953

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED419D3.B626DD68@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy
> > especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their
> > needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.
>
> I'm not sure I agree. I see a few big guns choosing a rig and a bunch
> of yes men taking the word of the few. It's the old, "K1AR has an
> FT-1000MP Mk V and he does really well. If I buy the same rig, I can do
> really well" syndrome. A professional photographer might use a Rolli to
> take his great shots. I might buy the same camera and take terrible
> photos.

That's undoubtedly true in some cases. But the guys I listen to are
the long-time EEs in this bunch and are the big guns who set the pace.
They're not technical slouches as their career successes clearly
indicate, when prodded they'll take technical discussions right down
to the chip level in a wink. They're also grouchy as hell and as far
as they're concerned there is no such thing as a "best" rcvr and
they'll punch holes in any of ï¿½em at will.

Then they'll switch modes and come off with "Hey, to hell with the
long-winded discussions about frigging BDRs and intercept point
details, all of ï¿½em work good enough." I tend to agree with the prior
mindset for the most part. There are common sense limits to how much
time I'll spend diddling the ins & outs of technical trivia when it's
the operator and antennas which have the far greater impact on contest
performance.

> > I've only gotten one response back so far. That one sez that the K2
> > does not appear to be supported by the contest loggers and other third
> > party contesting & rig control software & station accessories.
>
> Not supported by contest loggers? Third party contesting and rig control
> software? This guy has to be breathing pure oxygen.

Ya gotta take into account the environment, the framework in which
contest club members work. We do not operate in splendid isolation
from atop a mountain in West Nirvana. It's a matter of standardization

and mutual support in a very complex sort of network which involves logging, rig control, packet and Spider spots and other issues. There are big advantages in using "club standard" software. Historically FRCers have run CT but are slowly migrating to Writelog. Writelog does not support K2s, end of the probabability of FRCers taking a K2 into the dx contests on this basis alone. No doubt Jim will find this appalling but that's the way it is.

> > As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> > mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> > lackings.
>
> Orion has no shabby mechanicals, no lousy calibration (20 Hz?) and no
> audible birdies. How many JA manufacturers make a rig with no audible
> birdies?

Beats me but viva la Orion. I venture to guess that TT has listened to the bitching about it's previous offerings and taken 'em to heart.

> I'll be interested to see the IC-7800 full specs and even more
> interested to see who buys one.

You betchum, the next year gotta be interesting. I'll have both an Orion and a 7800 less than a hour's drive from here. You bet I will.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1804. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 14:20:39 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <XA3Ba.25525$fT5.5213@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 67954

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hfk2tie.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 27 May 2003 14:19:21 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >> In my book the Satchell Paige Criterion applies to them.
> > >
> > >No comment.
> >
> > You -DO- know what I am talking about, right?

Not really, Phil, hence my "no comment." What I do know of Satchel Page is that he was an outstanding pitcher who got his start in the old Negro League back in the 30's.(?) He eventually became a Cleveland Indian and helped them win the pennant. A quick google search yielded the followin quote by Mr. Paige below. He wa also somewhat of a showboat; the Muhammad Ali of basesball, you might say.

"Never let your head hang down. Never give up and sit down and grieve. Find another way. And don't pray when it rains if you don't pray when the sun shines."
-Satchel Paige

Please expand upon your reference. I didn't/don't want to infer the wrong message.

> > >I can see and respect your POV, Phil...HOWEVER, there's not a whole
> heckuva
> > >lot that'll convince me that:
> > >
> > >1. NAL's that put the onus on the accused to prove their innocense or pay
> a
> > >kilobuck fine (Please don't compare this to the traffic ticket process,
> it's
> > >insulting.) -or-
> >
> > OR - not pay anything and force the FCC take it to the Justice
> > Department for collection, which requires the Government to
> > file suit in U S District Court. You get a _trial de novo_
> > which means that the Government has to start from zero and prove
> > each and every element of the violation. You get your day in
> > the kind of court that you describe. The FCC and the Justice
> > Department are not going to go through that process unless the
> > case is air-tight. That was a large part my job in latter
> > years - to make sure that those cases which were passed on were
> > air-tight on evidence or we wouldn't pass them on.

>
> >2. Denying an RM proposal that the "commish" admits has the support of
the
> >majority of the affected constituency AND has minimal (If any.) affect on
> >any other group other than said constituency.
>
> That's within the discretion of the Commission but anyone who
> doesn't like it can take one of several appeal routes. The
> non-amateur-radio services do that quite often.
>
> >> What other "checks and balances" are you thinking of?
> >
> >Legislative...Voters => Representative => Bill => Law
>
> The FCC can only issue regulations and take actions that
> conform to the powers that the legislative has granted it
> and that the judiciary has allowed the agency to exercise. That
> is the basis of administrative law.
>
> The Congress does not want to be bothered by lawmaking and
> regulation of that sort, and therefore delegated it to the
> regulatory agencies such as the FCC. You had better bet,
> though, that when it comes to major policy issues such as
> broadcast ownership or wireless and telephone networking
> issues, The Congress is right there putting its head in where
> it doesn't fit.
>
> >Executive...Law enforcement nabs those who've alledgedly broken the law.
> >Judicial...Innocent until proven guilty? (Er, that'd be before a "real"
> >judge in a court of law as opposed to an "administrative" judge whose
bread
> >is not buttered by the same agency who wants a $ from a kilobuck NAL.)
>
> First of all, the FCC does not get to keep one cent of any
> funds collected through the Forfeiture, spectrum auction, or
> license fee processes. It all goes directly into the Treasury.
> The FCC never even gets its hands on it - it is sent directly
> to a Treasury bank lockbox operation even though the mail
> address says "FCC".
>
> Secondly, I have prepared many cases for submuittal to, and
> appeared in some before, Administrative Law Judges and if you
> think that the ALJs are biased toward the Commission's actions
> or personnel, I have a bridge that I would like to sell you.
> It feels like the Commission, rather than the licensee, is on
> trial most of the time.
>
> They are a harder sell than those which you refer to as "real
> judges" and they want to avoid any appearance of bias because
> their decisions are appealable to the full Commission and thence

> to the U S Court of Appeals and no judge wants to be reversed on
> appeal because of "bias".
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

Points all well taken, Phil. I assure you.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"We do not believe any group of men adequate enough or wise enough to
operate without scrutiny or without criticism."
-J. Robert Oppenheimer

1805. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 14:25:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67955

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED419D3.B626DD68@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> > >
> > > > Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy
> > > > especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their
> > > > needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.
> > >
> > I'm not sure I agree. I see a few big guns choosing a rig and a bunch
> > of yes men taking the word of the few. It's the old, "K1AR has an
> > FT-1000MP Mk V and he does really well. If I buy the same rig, I can do
> > really well" syndrome. A professional photographer might use a Rolli to
> > take his great shots. I might buy the same camera and take terrible
> > photos.
>
> That's undoubtedly true in some cases. But the guys I listen to are
> the long-time EEs in this bunch and are the big guns who set the pace.
> They're not technical slouches as their career successes clearly
> indicate, when prodded they'll take technical discussions right down
> to the chip level in a wink.

...and those are the right guys to listen to--the folks who actually
operate under crowded band, big signal conditions.

> They're also grouchy as hell and as far
> as they're concerned there is no such thing as a "best" rcvr and
> they'll punch holes in any of ï¿½em at will.

There is always a best receiver...of the moment. That crown may only be
worn until the next "best receiver" hits the market.

> Then they'll switch modes and come off with "Hey, to hell with the
> long-winded discussions about frigging BDRs and intercept point
> details, all of ï¿½em work good enough." I tend to agree with the prior
> mindset for the most part. There are common sense limits to how much
> time I'll spend diddling the ins & outs of technical trivia when it's
> the operator and antennas which have the far greater impact on contest
> performance.

Nothing is quite so frustrating as finding yourself "equipment limited",
all other things being nearly equal. I wouldn't want to be the TS-50
guy in a world of TS-940's.

>
> > > I've only gotten one response back so far. That one sez that the K2
> > > does not appear to be supported by the contest loggers and other third
> > > party contesting & rig control software & station accessories.
> >
> > Not supported by contest loggers? Third party contesting and rig control
> > software? This guy has to be breathing pure oxygen.
>
> Ya gotta take into account the environment, the framework in which
> contest club members work. We do not operate in splendid isolation
> from atop a mountain in West Nirvana.

It's a dirty job, but someone has to do it :)

> It's a matter of standardization
> and mutual support in a very complex sort of network which involves
> logging, rig control, packet and Spider spots and other issues. There
> are big advantages in using "club standard" software.

Most of my multi-multi experience runs back to the paper logging,
sneaker net days of N9MM (from the W9ZRX QTH). At OH2HE (OH2E, OH2U), a
CT network was run but nobody gave a rat's patootie about rig control as
long as accurate logs could be viewed by all and we had communications
between the various operating positions.

> Historically
> FRCers have run CT but are slowly migrating to Writelog. Writelog does
> not support K2s, end of the probabability of FRCers taking a K2 into
> the dx contests on this basis alone. No doubt Jim will find this
> appalling but that's the way it is.

The Finns are rather evenly split between CT and TR. I have both but
tend to rely on CT. To the issue of transceiver control software, I'd
lean on the logging software author to include support for my radio
rather than buying a radio based on compatibility with software.

> > > As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> > > mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> > > lackings.
> >
> > Orion has no shabby mechanicals, no lousy calibration (20 Hz?) and no
> > audible birdies. How many JA manufacturers make a rig with no audible
> > birdies?
>
> Beats me but viva la Orion. I venture to guess that TT has listened to
> the bitching about it's previous offerings and taken 'em to heart.

From the Orion specifications sheet:

"SSB sensitivity: <0.18 ï¿½V for 10 dB SINAD at 2.4 kHz BW, pre-amp on typical"

"Internal birdies: None stronger than specified sensitivity."

If they're lying about the specs, I haven't yet found one of the birdies.

> > I'll be interested to see the IC-7800 full specs and even more
> > interested to see who buys one.
>
> You betchum, the next year gotta be interesting. I'll have both an
> Orion and a 7800 less than a hour's drive from here. You bet I will.

You now have two good reasons for road trips. My guess? That you won't find nearly $7,000 of difference between the two.

Dave K8MN

1806. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 15:22:05 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED4D41D.9B3B682F@crosslink.net>
Source record: 67948
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott wrote:
>
> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

Dunno about that but last Field Day we were 2A Virginia but had one dude reporting "2 Alpha Victor Alpha". <sigh> and we fault CBrs for jargon ... (c:

73, K3DWW ... oops make that Killerwatt 3 Double Double Doubleyew

1807. Re: Hey, Phil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 16:05:44 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3ED4DE58.82427144@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 67956
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, say KA1KQQ, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>
> Sure. And you'd probnably get by with it indefinitely, 'specially since Phil is
> retired!

One of the new local hams got a pair of Q's. He's just wondering,
he doesn't have internet access. He's in the Dark Ages! <:

1808. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 16:15:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305280815.6174bdbb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67957

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030527193640.25052.00000288@mb-m11.aol.com>...

> >> >> >If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
> >> >> >k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?
> >> >>
> >> >> I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.
> >> >
> >> >No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.
> >>
> >> It ain't worse.
> >
> >Isn't that a bit "circular"?
>
> Not at all.

Definitively resolved: AGC today ain't what it was in 1970 so AGC = ON
when running CW has become SOP.

Dead sacred cow #1.

> Heck, I was running full QSK more than 30 years ago with my homebrew stuff. And
> it wasn't new then. Fast keying relay and an electronic TR switch. Cat's meow
> for traffic handling or ragchewing.

Yeah . . so . . OK . . I wuz running QSK 40 years ago and with an amp
to boot and in the dx bashes, not into lame exercises like NTS and
shooting the breeze. Do I get post points for that? Din think so.

> >Hearing everything out there between dits is annoying as hell.
>
> To you and some others, maybe.

If you poke around you'll probably find that yer "some others" is
probably 95% of us these days.

> The fast vacuum relays can switch as fast as a few mS. Trouble is, they are
> only good for a few million operations. Lessee, at 30 wpm, one minute of
> "PARIS" is 520 operations. A million operations takes less than 2000 hours of
> transmitting at 30 wpm.

You can't be serious with this one, you did this tongue-in-cheek
right?!

2000 hours, pounding brass for 40 hours per week for an entire year??
Even it was ever done on the ham bands what's the big deal about
swapping out a couple relays once a year?

> >Hearing between dits at 60 WPM is exactly what no savvy op wants,
> >lotta headphone clutter which does nothin' for nobody.
>
> Depends on what you are doing. In traffic handling and ragchewing it's neat to
> just touch the key when a letter is missed and the other guy stops right away,
> you get the fill, and off ya go.

Really? Ya learn something new every day around here . . (?!)

> For the pileups and contests its a different
> game, particularly if you're holding a freq.

I dunno how ya came up with this one but there is no difference
whatsoever, the QSK speed selected by the op is the speed he/she is
comfortable with and applies across the board. Unless you know
somebody who jiggles the speed when moving from shooting the breeze to
NTS or contesting for instance.

My point is and has been that over time the former quest for very high
QSK has lost favor because it's downsides exceed the value of what
little if any advantage it has.

Dead sacred cow #2.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1809. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 16:27:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305280827.221f5aeb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67958

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED419D3.B626DD68@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy
> > especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their
> > needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.
>
> I'm not sure I agree. I see a few big guns choosing a rig and a bunch
> of yes men taking the word of the few. It's the old, "K1AR has an
> FT-1000MP Mk V and he does really well. If I buy the same rig, I can do
> really well" syndrome. A professional photographer might use a Rolli to
> take his great shots. I might buy the same camera and take terrible
> photos.

That's undoubtedly true in many cases. Lotta good contest ops are not
techos. But the guys I listen to are the long-time EEs in this bunch
and are the big guns who set the pace. They're not technical slouches
as their career successes clearly indicate, when prodded they'll take
technical discussions right down to the chip level in a wink. They're
also grouchy as hell and as far as they're concerned there is no such
thing as a "best" rcvr, they'll punch holes in any of ï¿½em at will.

Then they'll switch modes and come off with "Hey, to hell with the
long-winded discussions about frigging BDRs and intercept point
details, all of ï¿½em work good enough." I tend to agree with the prior
mindset for the most part. There are common sense limits on how much
time anybody should spend diddling the ins & outs of technical trivia
when it's the operator and antennas which have the far greater impact
on contest performance.

> > I've only gotten one response back so far. That one sez that the K2
> > does not appear to be supported by the contest loggers and other third
> > party contesting & rig control software & station accessories.
>
> Not supported by contest loggers? Third party contesting and rig control
> software? This guy has to be breathing pure oxygen.

Ya gotta take into account the environment, the framework in which
contest club members work. We do not operate in splendid isolation
from atop a mountain in West Nirvana. It's a matter of standardization

and mutual support in a very complex sort of network which involves logging, rig control, packet and Spider spots and other issues. There are big advantages in using "club standard" software. Historically FRCers have run CT but are slowly migrating to Writelog. Neither CT or Writelog support K2s, end of the likelihood of FRCers taking a K2 into the dx contests on this basis alone. No doubt Jim will find this appalling but that's the way it is.

> > As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> > mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> > lackings.
>
> Orion has no shabby mechanicals, no lousy calibration (20 Hz?) and no
> audible birdies. How many JA manufacturers make a rig with no audible
> birdies?

Beats me but viva la Orion. I venture to guess that TT has listened to the bitching about it's previous offerings and taken 'em to heart. Can only be good. BTW it's not unusual for small companies to crank out an occasional "Monday morning (whatever)", quality control is more difficult in these cases.

> I'll be interested to see the IC-7800 full specs and even more
> interested to see who buys one.

You betchum, the next year gotta be interesting. I'll have both an Orion and a 7800 less than a hour's drive from here. You bet I will.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1810. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 17:20:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305280920.2502a07e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67959

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED415CC.410135D7@earthlink.net>...
>

>
> To Brian's question about the Ten-Tec and Elecraft markets in comparison
> to Japan's big three: I ran a C-line when others were using TS-820's
> and FT-102's. I ran a TR-7 when others were using TS-930's and FT-1's.
> I ran a Paragon when others were running TS-940's and FT-1000D's. I
> ran an Omni VI when others were running TS-950's and FT-1000MP's. Now I
> run an Orion when others are running IC-756 Pro II's and FT-1000MP
> Fields.

Uh-oh. Flag.

> I require my rigs to have good receivers. I looked at the
> specs of the Orion and I looked at the specs of its Japanese
> competition. Based on the specs, there was only one logical choice.
> The question which begs asking at the moment is: What are the others
> guys thinking when they choose a Japanese rig with lots of chrome and
> nuttin' under the hood?

Isn't that sorta like the guys who have only ever owned Fords sitting
around the bar beasting on Chebbys?

Nuttin' under the hood eh? Not-so-hypothetical scenario: One guy has
say an Omni6+. 'Nother guy in the same neighborhood has the same
antennas and same set of operating skills and an MP. Both jump into a
dx contest and go at it. Come the end of the contest the guy with the
Omni obviously has to have have beaten the guy with the MP,
absolutely has to be, yes?

> Lest you think my choice is coloring my view of the Orion, here are a
> few recent quotes from the Ten-Tec reflector:
>
> From Tom W7QF (Orion in WPX 'test):

Hmmmm . . Beyond the useful tech support reflectors provide they offer
a lotta humor content for those of us don't marry our radios or their
brands. The reflectors are goofy lovefests. A gazillion guys patting
each other's backs and congratulating each other for being brilliant
enough to have some offscale can't-be-touched beats-all radio or
another. "Wow guys, lookit what I did last nite with my Belchfire Pro
III after I retuned the flam baffles!" Or better yet "Who could
possibly be stupid enough to buy anthing but a Belchfire?"

I've logged in silently, gotten my giggles, logged out. The K2
reflector is *really* bad in this respect. The huggy-kissy content is

enought to make ya wanna puke.

The reflectors are the worst places on the planet to find the warts
which are the first things I look for in a radio. You'll have to
excuse my dim view of the things as far as being a source for unbiased
opinions.

> Whet your interest any? You might want to take a look at Doug Smith's
> article on the programmable AGC at
> http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm

Puts the AGC discussion solidly to bed.

> What I'm trying to get across to you is that you should sell the car,
> take a second mortgage on the house, tell the kids that they'll have to
> work their way through college but order an Orion.

Welp, the last of my three brats graduated from collitch seven years
ago. They owe me. Maybe it's time I "collected" . . ? (As if . . !)

All joshing & jousting aside best of luck with Baby.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1811. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 19:22:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb32fgngn1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67961

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bb19om$2o8$0@208.207.71.135...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
> > >
> > >
> > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > > > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to
"slide
> > up" a few
> > > > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > > > >
> > > > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its
> > channelized
> > > > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally unfamiliar.
> > We'll
> > > > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
> > >
> > > Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding one
vacant
> > is pretty
> > > well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most
likely
> > all 5 will
> > > be.
> >
> > But if the need is for an emergency, that should
> > take priority of any other comms.
>
> Sure. But one of the strengths of ham radio has always been the ability
to set
> up wherever one can find a clear frequency, and move to find one when
necessary.
> Even though emergencies do take precedence that doesn't assure that any of
the 5
> channels will be available for emergency use at any given time. Early in

an
> emergency before the word gets out they are likely to be overeloaded with
> routine use and thus too cluttered to use.

Dick,
I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
current "routine" use.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1812. RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 19:27:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030528152735.09503.00000447@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 67962

Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the members in contesting, how about a challenge?

No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place at one time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?

How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to single op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call it the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?

Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1813. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 19:53:21 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <A96cnZmNE7YvjkijXTWcrg@crocker.com>
Source record: 67963

what about k1-triple-t??? i have seen some contest ubn reports that showed the other station had logged k1tt instead of k1ttt, but they were all on cw, so i guess it doesn't make too much confusion on ssb.

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20030527220852.04207.00000287@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <3ED3E9E0.2749DA4E@yahoo.bomb>, Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
> writes:
>
> >
> > If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>
> Interesting question. A few years ago, I had a "problem" with a repeater
> user who was signing "[prefix]3Triple-A." My assumption was that his
> call sign was [prefix]3TA, since he was using the phonetic word "triple"
> instead just saying the letter 'T'. However, he clarified that his call sign
> was, in fact, [prefix]3AAA, but he was just shortening it to "Triple A."
> Well, you can imagine what went on from there. Since he didn't live in
> my county, I took no action. I did inform the ARRL Official Observer
> in his area, but I never learned what became of it.
>
> It is my assumption that in voice modes, the call sign must be given in
> a plain, clear manner which would not create any confusion. Therefore,
> I'd say that "KA1K Double Q" or " [prefix]3TripleA" would not be legal
> identifications, due to the possible confusion if the substituted words
> "Double" or "Triple" were taken literally as meaning "D" or "T." If I
> ever heard a call sign like "KB3TripleZulu," I'd assume that his call sign
> was KB3TZ, NOT KB3ZZZ. Phonetics are intended to be words that
> are substituted for letters, in order to eliminate confusion. Using a
> word to enumerate repeated letters would only create confusion.
> Therefore, I would consider this to be illegal identification, and that it
> was possibly being done to deliberately obfuscate the identity of the
> station.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1814. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 19:58:02 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <NdGdnX9aaaZKiUijXTWcog@crocker.com>
Source record: 67964
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3ED4D41D.9B3B682F@crosslink.net...
> Scott wrote:
> >
> > If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>
> Dunno about that but last Field Day we were 2A Virginia but had one dude
> reporting "2 Alpha Victor Alpha". <sigh> and we fault CBrs for jargon
> ... (c:
>
> 73, K3DWW ... oops make that Killerwatt 3 Double Double Doubleyew

in some cases it is faster to say the phonetics than the section name.
"Western Massachusettes" is harder than saying w-m-a, and whiskey-mike-alfa
is probably about the same as the whole name... and for some sections its
better to spell it out than let the other guy guess at the abbreviation for
the log. you would be amazed at how many people don't know that 'me' is
maine and 'ma' is massachusetts, let alone sort out the valleys in
california!

1815. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 20:00:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED51563.2000702@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 67965

>
>
>Dick,
>I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
>overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
>MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
>Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
>accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
>current "routine" use.
>
>
>
Being "overloaded" would mean that there would be users close to the
station in distress, and be able to hear him well enough to cut thru the
QRM. And soon the other hams further away will realize that there's
an emergency happening, and stop transmitting but stay listening in
case someone is in a position to help in some way.

1816. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 21:24:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb39cg$66o$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67966

I would think that in a 'real event' any method of maintaining commo to/from
an area would not be a problem.

I know I'll use whatever means are available to me to maintain commo. If
its cw, or digital...matters not. Just get the job done.

Then worry about the 'consequences'.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bb314p$53pei$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> What about "Sec. 97.401 Operation during a disaster" or "Sec. 97.403
> Safety of life and protection of property" or "Sec. 97.405 Station in
> distress" as possible variants to use morse code on those frequencies???
> One of them has gotta apply in some case or another....
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:batp4gdlq0@208.207.71.143...
> >
> >
> > David Robbins wrote:
> >
> > > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > > >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> > > > >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > > > >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > > >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
> > > >
> > > > > Guess that solves that.
> > > >
> > > > And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
> > > >
> > > > 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
> > > >

> > > > 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
> > > >
> > > > 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
> > > >
> > > > 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
> > > >
> > > > 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
> > > >
> > > and dont' forget... USB voice only... no cw, no rtty, no sstv, no
throb
> or
> > > psk or any of that other stuff, just USB voice.
> >
> > Did you notice the reason for that? So the primary users can ID hams
> operating
> > there if needed. Never mind that any digital mode should work much
better
> than
> > voice in emergencies. But FCC could grant us instant authority to use
them
> if
> > needed, I presume.
> >
>
>

1817. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 21:26:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb39hj$o4r$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67967

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bb32fgngn1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bb19om$2o8$0@208.207.71.135...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > > > > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to
> "slide
> > > up" a few
> > > > > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its
> > > channelized
> > > > > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally
unfamiliar.
> > > We'll
> > > > > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
> > > > >
> > > > Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding one
> vacant
> > > is pretty
> > > > well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most
> likely
> > > all 5 will
> > > > be.
> > >
> > > But if the need is for an emergency, that should
> > > take priority of any other comms.
> >
> > Sure. But one of the strengths of ham radio has always been the ability
> to set
> > up wherever one can find a clear frequency, and move to find one when

> necessary.
> > Even though emergencies do take precedence that doesn't assure that any
of
> the 5
> > channels will be available for emergency use at any given time. Early in
> an
> > emergency before the word gets out they are likely to be overeloaded
with
> > routine use and thus too cluttered to use.
>
> Dick,
> I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
> overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
> MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
> Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
> accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
> current "routine" use.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

I hope your right Bill. I had a incident where the FCC declaired a specific frequency for emergency comm in tornado situation. I asked a station to give us some room (2 kc up). He then proceeded to jump right on top of the net and call me and everyone there a liar.

Takes all kinds.

Dan/W4NTI

1818. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 21:28:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb39kn$8a2$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67968

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030528152735.09503.00000447@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the
members
> in contesting, how about a challenge?
>
> No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place
at one
> time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?
>
> How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to
single
> op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call
it
> the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
>
> Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

Sounds good to me...go for it.

Dan/W4NTI

1819. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 21:32:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305281332.3fb63c96@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67969

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:

> > >Interesting thread this. We have you obviously ass over tincups
> > >married to TT and Jim likewise with Elecrafty.
> >
> > Naw, the only radio outfit I'm that close to is Southgate Radio
>
> Then howcum ya bought a K2?

Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:

"Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."

And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
spending decisions. Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
SINGCARS units around.

The clueless can lecture us forever about what hams should be doing,
how our technology should "progress", how the "professionals" do it,
yada, yada, yada ad infinitum, and in the end we'll go out and buy,
build and/or assemble our stations based on what we want and how much
we can afford.

> > I've owned and used TT stuff and have always rated it above Ikensu.
>
> When was the last time you diddled the knobs on an Omni or an MP?

Some time past. Do you rate the FT-1000 (any flavor) over the Orion?
>
> > >How then do you explain the fact that in both cases TT xcvrs and the
> > >K2 have such miniscule market shares?
> >
> > Depends what you mean by "miniscule market share"...
>
> There is only one meaning and it don't take no MBA to understand it.

How many FT-1000s have been sold in the past 3 years? There are over
3500 K2s out there.

> > Here are some reasons they're not as well known as Yaecomwood:
> >
> > 1) Much less advertising

>
> I don't know any HFer who isn't fully aware of the K2 and I don't mean
> just FRCers. Ditto Ten-tec.

"Aware" is not the same as "thinking about buying". Not only does
Ikensu do lots of advertising in the ham rags, they have lots of
dealers plugging their stuff. Thumb through the various ham mags,
visit a dealer or a dealer website and see what is front and center.
TT and Elecraft don't have anything like that saturation.
>
> > 2) Much smaller line of products
>
> I don't understand how/why that can have much impact. Lotta very
> narrowly targeted companies are very successful.

The main market in HF rigs is the 100 watt SSB/CW xcvr. Elecraft makes
one model that fits that description (K2/100). TT makes three models
(Jupiter, Pegasus, Orion). I've lost track of how many models each of
the Big Three makes.

> > 3) Designed for niches in the market (particularly Elecraft)
>
> A 100w 160-10 cw/ssb K2 is hardly a niche xcvr.

Sure it is. How many hams will spend the time and money to build one?

> > 4) Relative lack of rigs aimed at the raw newcomer - particularly VHF/UHF
> > stuff.

> Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome. We'ere not talking
> newbies or nitwits here, we're talking seasoned HFers, contesters and
> otherwise who are quite aware of the entire range of high-performance
> xcvrs and can write the check for any of 'em.

Not as many of those folks as you might think, compared to the great
unwashed masses of us who do not have huge antenna farms and the
resources to buy, say, an FT-1000.

Used gear, you say? How much do you have in that '940, and how much is
it worth now in its present condition?
>
> > And in the case of Elecraft, the need to build it kills off a large part of > > the
market.
>
> Assembled K2s are everywhere in the market, as you well know there are
> guys building them just for the jollies they get outta the soldering
> exercises then they dump 'em for close to the cost of the kits.

The market isn't flooded with used ones, and they tend to go for close
to the new price. There's a QRP one on eBay right now, bid is at $599.
With the listed options it cost the builder maybe $750. It's got a low
S/N but looks good. I would not be surprised if it went quite a bit
higher.

>
> > >Amongst the hardcore dxers,
> > >contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy
> > >any radio out there?
> >
> > How many of them exist, really?
>
> What matters is their leverage in the market, not their gross
> numbers.

First ya talk market numbers, then leverage.
>
> As far as the gross numbers are concerned tune the bands on dx contest
> weekends. The FRC active members list is 200 long plus the inactives
> and both PVRC and YCCC are larger. Plus all the rest of the heaps of
> contest clubs plus all the independents like Dave.

Most of whom are not running monster stations.
>
> > For every one that buys an FT-1000, there's
> > prolly a dozen FT-1000 buyers who got it just because it's the top-of-the-line
> > Yaesu.
>
> Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy
> especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their
> needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.

Been that way forever. Which is one way that the DX/contest crowd
justifies its existence in a big way. It wasn't the ragchewers who
pushed the dynamic range numbers up.
>
> I'm not intentionally trying to stick pins in the K2 & Ten-tec
> balloons here just to be a pain in the ass, fact is that I'm quite
> baffled at the low acceptance rate these rigs have in the overall top
> end market.

As good as the K2 is, do you really think many of the big guns are
going to hook an under-$1k rig to their big antenna systems for CQWW
or ARRL DX?

W4BP was the op at NP2B. He used a pair of K2/100s in SO2R last SS.
Came in second place in the class. But SS is a weenie contest, some
say....

> So I tossed a note to a couple of the heavy-duty dx
> conetsters and asked them point blank why they haven't gone with a
> K2-100 or an Omni.
>
> I've only gotten one response back so far. That one sez that the K2
> does not appear to be supported by the contest loggers and other third
> party contesting & rig control software & station accessories.

That's not right. K2s have been used with various softwares including Writelog since at least 2000. They use the Kenwood command set. K2 can be almost completely PC controlled.

Of course some folks want the screen to say what the rig really is, not what it's emulating.

> It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.

And you say "Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome."? "QRP image" is just another term for it.

> Some of of the problems I have
> personally with the K2 are the lack of even a second VFO let alone a
> complete second rcvr on top of being a ham bands only rig.

As you noted elsewhere, it has two VFOs and memories.

Second receiver? Just buy a second K2 and run SO2R. General coverage? You gonna listen to BBC during the contest?

> The K2
> "display" is ridiculous by today's expectations.

Do you really expect a little rig that cost $600 in its basic form to have all the bells and whistles of rigs costing 2-3 times that much, AND the rx performance that beats 99% of the market? Get real!

> How do ya get on 60M with a K2??

There's an accessory for that (K60XV) on the way. How many contests are there on 60? We got 5 channels, fer goshsakes.

> The K2 is a minimalist's delight but it goes 'way too far
> in that direction for most folks taste including mine, the only fix
> Elecraft has for the K2 is a K3.

The whole point of the K2 and K1 is to be different. No way a little CA outfit is gonna beat Yaecomwood at their own game, so they found a part of the market that Yaecomwood was ignoring. Just like Southgate Radio did many years ago.
>
> As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> lackings.

....ze barracuda firszt confuzes and distracts ze ozer feesh with clevaire antics, zo zey weel tell heem what he wantz to know.....
>
> But we'll see. Famed One K3WW popped the coin for an Orion at the
> Dayton 'fest. There's a breakthrough and I'm gonna be all over it.

Like I said...

> Another one N3RD is on his way to an IC-7800. Both have been vocal MP
> adherents. This is gonna be the shootout from hell, I'll letcha know .

And in the end, in that arena where cost isn't even a secondary consideration, one criterion will decide: Which rig made the most points? To the really big guns, that's the bottom line.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1820. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 21:51:14 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bb3b0iqpd1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 67970

>It's clear that NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs.
>NTIA is concerned about interference from amateurs. Otherwise they would
>not have objected to the NPRM the way they did.

What's interesting to note is that the NTIA was the first agency to
suggest a 5 MHz ham band; I believe that was back in 1997.

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1821. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 22:05:32 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bb3brc$r9j$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 67971

(Len Over 21) writes:
> NO OOK CW! :-) USB only, VOICE!

Here's why:

"Additionally, the FCC has restricted operation to USB only, with a maximum effective radiated power (ERP) of 50 W. The USB-only requirement stemmed from NTIA interoperability concerns. The NTIA wanted to make sure that federal government users could copy and, if necessary, identify any amateur station using one of the 60-meter channels. As a result, the 60-meter frequencies will become the only ones available to the general amateur community that do not permit CW operation."

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1822. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 22:10:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305281410.4c9299c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67972

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...

If I'm double-posting kindly excuse me. Something is screwed up with
either Windoze or Google today and I'm having a bad time of it.

> > They're also grouchy as hell and as far
> > as they're concerned there is no such thing as a "best" rcvr and
> > they'll punch holes in any of 'em at will.
>
> There is always a best receiver...of the moment. That crown may only be
> worn until the next "best receiver" hits the market.

These guys don't churn radios at all. Not the top guns. The two I'm
closest to bought 940s when they were new on the scene in the early
80s then after beating the crap out those for years bought MPs. Around
ten years per xcvr. They get their money's worth and then some. It's
far more important to them to have rigs which have been completely
debugged and which they can operate by reflex / on autopilot than it
is to have the latest and greatest. Since they crank out tens of
thousands of contacts per year and consistently make the boxes with
their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
ï¿½em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.

> Nothing is quite so frustrating as finding yourself "equipment limited",
> all other things being nearly equal. I wouldn't want to be the TS-50
> guy in a world of TS-940's.

Not if you have what I call a "balanced station". I'll take myself as
an example. For the present the only antennas I can put up is some low
dipoles. I am not gonna go out and buy an Omni or an MP or any other
xcvr in that category and waste the resources ya gotta put into a rig
like those when all I have is TS-50 level antennas. Would be like
buying a Corvette to go grocery shopping twice a week. Thus I've
bought into being a TS-50 station in a world of 940s and I'm
comfortable with the limitations. But come the day when I get some
beams up and 80 & 160 antennas I'll be all over some high-end xcvr.

>
> Most of my multi-multi experience runs back to the paper logging,
> sneaker net days of N9MM (from the W9ZRX QTH).

Long gone daze!

> At OH2HE (OH2E, OH2U), a
> CT network was run but nobody gave a rat's patootie about rig control as
> long as accurate logs could be viewed by all and we had communications
> between the various operating positions.

That changes a bunch when the spots come into play. In this situation all club stations are on the same overhead network and the need for software rig contol becomes a gotta-have. The only shot I have at a half-decent score is to play the search & pounce game so even I'll have Writelog rig control running here as a lame single op with the 847.

> The Finns are rather evenly split between CT and TR. I have both but
> tend to rely on CT. To the issue of transceiver control software, I'd
> lean on the logging software author to include support for my radio
> rather than buying a radio based on compatibility with software.

Absolutely, not even a discussion. Dunno much abt TR or NA but CT and Writelog both support TT xcvrs along with all the JA gear. TT is not oblivious to the fact that it's in their best interest to provide the tech info to the software writers so Omni support is probably already in both or is close. It's up to Elecraft and the K2 owners to do the leaning if they wanna join the parade.

> From the Orion specifications sheet:
>
> "SSB sensitivity: <0.18 ï¿½V for 10 dB SINAD at 2.4 kHz BW, pre-amp on
> typical"
>
> "Internal birdies: None stronger than specified sensitivity."
>
> If they're lying about the specs, I haven't yet found one of the
> birdies.

Yeah, they listened.

> > > I'll be interested to see the IC-7800 full specs and even more
> > > interested to see who buys one.
> >
> > You betchum, the next year gotta be interesting. I'll have both an
> > Orion and a 7800 less than a hour's drive from here. You bet I will.
>
> You now have two good reasons for road trips. My guess? That you won't
> find nearly $7,000 of difference between the two.

I can't believe they expect to get that kinda money for a ham xcvr, that's idiotic. No you bet there won't be a $7k difference in performance. Reminds me of the Signal One debacle. The far more interesting subject will be K3WW's Omni. If he kicks butt in the battle of the boxes with a TT rig like he has been doing with his Brand X rigs it's gonna attract a *lot* of attention.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1823. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 22:20:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED53692.205DCA11@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67973

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED415CC.410135D7@earthlink.net>...
> >
>
> >
> > To Brian's question about the Ten-Tec and Elecraft markets in comparison
> > to Japan's big three: I ran a C-line when others were using TS-820's
> > and FT-102's. I ran a TR-7 when others were using TS-930's and FT-1's.
> > I ran a Paragon when others were running TS-940's and FT-1000D's. I
> > ran an Omni VI when others were running TS-950's and FT-1000MP's. Now I
> > run an Orion when others are running IC-756 Pro II's and FT-1000MP
> > Fields.
>
> Uh-oh. Flag.
>
> > I require my rigs to have good receivers. I looked at the
> > specs of the Orion and I looked at the specs of its Japanese
> > competition. Based on the specs, there was only one logical choice.
> > The question which begs asking at the moment is: What are the others
> > guys thinking when they choose a Japanese rig with lots of chrome and
> > nuttin' under the hood?
>
> Isn't that sorta like the guys who have only ever owned Fords sitting
> around the bar beasting on Chebbys?

Not at all. I've owned other than Fords. I beat on Chevrolet because
they once sold me a '73 Vega.

> Nuttin' under the hood eh? Not-so-hypothetical scenario: One guy has
> say an Omni6+. 'Nother guy in the same neighborhood has the same
> antennas and same set of operating skills and an MP. Both jump into a
> dx contest and go at it. Come the end of the contest the guy with the
> Omni obviously has to have have beaten the guy with the MP,
> absolutetly has to be, yes?

I don't think you're being fair to yourself in setting your
hyptothetical even though we know that two ops aren't really going to
have the same operating skills. One guy might be a whiz at handling
rapid fire QSOs but he might be on the wrong band. The other guy might
be a propagation whiz. To make your scenario slightly better, the guy
with the MP would have his rig rise about a foot-and-a-half off the
table with keying from the nearby Omni VI+ when the receiver of the MP
folded up. Things might even out though: The guy with the Omni would

have to deal with the key clicks from the MP :)

>
> > Lest you think my choice is coloring my view of the Orion, here are a
> > few recent quotes from the Ten-Tec reflector:
> >
> > From Tom W7QF (Orion in WPX 'test):
>
> Hmmmm . . Beyond the useful tech support reflectors provide they offer
> a lotta humor content for those of us don't marry our radios or their
> brands. The reflectors are goofy lovefests. A gazillion guys patting
> each other's backs and congratulating each other for being brilliant
> enough to have some offscale can't-be-touched beats-all radio or
> another. "Wow guys, lookit what I did last nite with my Belchfire Pro
> III after I retuned the flam baffles!" Or better yet "Who could
> possibly be stupid enough to buy anthing but a Belchfire?"
>
> I've logged in silently, gotten my giggles, logged out. The K2
> reflector is *really* bad in this respect. The huggy-kissy content is
> enought to make ya wanna puke.

The Ten-Tec reflector is just as bad. There are a number of technically
astute fellows whose opinions I value. When they comment, I read
thoroughly. Scott W4PA from TT often responds to comments. The
huggy-kissy content is balanced by several of those characters
complaining about knob eccentricity and font style/size.

> The reflectors are the worst places on the planet to find the warts
> which are the first things I look for in a radio. You'll have to
> excuse my dim view of the things as far as being a source for unbiased
> opinions.

You'll have to remember that a certain K2 made some rather blunt
criticism of the Orion's software and vowed to return the rig. His
"pal" forwarded the note to the reflector and yours truly e-mailed
Ten-Tec and bought the to-be-returned rig. Of course the K2's gripes
were addressed in the next firmware release. :)

>
> > Whet your interest any? You might want to take a look at Doug Smith's
> > article on the programmable AGC at
> > http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm
>
> Puts the AGC discussion solidly to bed.

I'm interested in what Jim has to say about it.

>
> > What I'm trying to get across to you is that you should sell the car,
> > take a second mortgage on the house, tell the kids that they'll have to
> > work their way through college but order an Orion.
>

> Welp, the last of my three brats graduated from collitch seven years
> ago. They owe me. Maybe it's time I "collected" . . ? (As if . . !)

Well, you don't really need a car. Don't they have good public transit
in your area?

> All joshing & jousting aside best of luck with Baby.

I don't make reflector exchanges patting myself on the back for my
choice. I'm simply enjoying the use of the best rig I've ever owned.

Go have a listen to K3WW's at first opportunity!

Dave K8MN

1824. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 22:22:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED5371D.65C7D642@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67974

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the members
> in contesting, how about a challenge?
>
> No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place at one
> time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?
>
> How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to single
> op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call it
> the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
>
> Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.

432 megs in the ARRL June VHF? :)

Dave K8MN

1825. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 23:07:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hflrggk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67976

On 28 May 2003 03:11:35 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> And if you ever get to Cheyenne, Wyoming, drop off I-80 onto
> Lincolnway and drive by the city park. It's where the lone
> remaining example of Union Pacific's Big Boy is set up on
> display. That's the huge 4-8-8-4 specially built to cross the
> Rockies between Cheyenne and Ogden, Utah. It's 132 feet long. Of
> only 25 built, it's the only one left in existance. I got some
> great digital photos.

Didn't the You Pee revive one for Steve Lee to drive? I
confuse the 3945 and the 8444 (now the 844). Or was that the
Challenger?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County), Oregon

(Almost) home of the SP 4449 and SP&S 700

1826. Re: Hey, Phil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 23:07:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hflr6aj.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67977
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 28 May 2003 00:18:31 -0400, Scott wrote:

>If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, say KA1KQQ, could you say KA1K Double Q ?

You could say whatever you want, but each letter has to be
separate when it's "legal ID" time and the phonetics, if used,
must be such that the letter is readily identifiable in the
English language. At least that was what the book said when I
checked it last.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1827. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 23:07:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hflrn6l.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67975
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 28 May 2003 08:22:05 -0700, Vito wrote:

>Dunno about that but last Field Day we were 2A Virginia but had one dude
>reporting "2 Alpha Victor Alpha". <sigh> and we fault CBrs for jargon

If s/he was a REAL traffic handler it would have been reported
as "Mixed Group Figure 2 Letters Alfa, Victor, Alfa".. <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
Not a real traffic handler lately

1828. Re: Bait and Switch?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 23:07:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hflrxkm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 67978

On Wed, 28 May 2003 14:20:39 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>> >> In my book the Satchell Paige Criterion applies to them.

>> You -DO- know what I am talking about, right?
>
>Not really, Phil, hence my "no comment." What I do know of Satchel Page is
>that he was an outstanding pitcher who got his start in the old Negro League
>back in the 30's.(?) He eventually became a Cleveland Indian and helped them
>win the pennant. A quick google search yielded the followin quote by Mr.
>Paige below. He wa also somewhat of a showboat; the Muhammad Ali of
>basesball, you might say.
>
>"Never let your head hang down. Never give up and sit down and grieve. Find
>another way. And don't pray when it rains if you don't pray when the sun
>shines."
>-Satchel Paige

The one that I always prefer is "Don't look back because you
may find that the alligator is gainin' on you."

Of course that could be an UrbanLegend (tm) but I -do- like
it.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1829. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-28 23:57:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <32cBa.154730$rt6.45571@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 67979

Hello there Larry .... I have to add this to the list of :

Why I operate CW ....no such difficulty exits within this astral plane.

73 God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue PA.

>
> Interesting question. A few years ago, I had a "problem" with a repeater
> user who was signing "[prefix]3Triple-A." My assumption was that his
> call sign was [prefix]3TA, since he was using the phonetic word "triple"
> instead just saying the letter 'T'. However, he clarified that his call
sign
> was, in fact, [prefix]3AAA, but he was just shortening it to "Triple A."
> Well, you can imagine what went on from there. Since he didn't live in
> my county, I took no action. I did inform the ARRL Official Observer
> in his area, but I never learned what became of it.
>
> It is my assumption that in voice modes, the call sign must be given in
> a plain, clear manner which would not create any confusion. Therefore,
> I'd say that "KA1K Double Q" or " [prefix]3TripleA" would not be legal
> identifications, due to the possible confusion if the substituted words
> "Double" or "Triple" were taken literally as meaning "D" or "T." If I
> ever heard a call sign like "KB3TripleZulu," I'd assume that his call sign
> was KB3TZ, NOT KB3ZZZ. Phonetics are intended to be words that
> are substituted for letters, in order to eliminate confusion. Using a
> word to enumerate repeated letters would only create confusion.
> Therefore, I would consider this to be illegal identification, and that it
> was possibly being done to deliberately obfuscate the identity of the
> station.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1830. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 00:08:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <8ccBa.1985$aW1.45@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67980

Steve,

I dunno .... are there any points for how many cases of beer one consumes in a 24 hour period? :)

Kind regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA - just had my 56th. Old F*rt.
(down to 30 or so WPM CW (um, maybe a bit more), down to 60 WPM on the keyboard (um, maybe a bit more), and down to ... sheesh ... gimme a break ... a little Winblows, Unix (Linux), ... gotta get a little enthusiasm here ... oops, wrong group :)

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030528152735.09503.00000447@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the members
> in contesting, how about a challenge?
>
> No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place at one
> time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?
>
> How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to single
> op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call it
> the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
>
> Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1831. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 00:17:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb3jno$b9h$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 67981

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bb39hj$o4r$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bb32fg$ngn$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bb19om$2o8$0@208.207.71.135...
> > >
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > > > > > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to
> > "slide
> > > > > up" a few
> > > > > > > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its
> > > > channelized
> > > > > > > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally
> unfamiliar.
> > > > We'll
> > > > > > > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding
one
> > vacant
> > > > > is pretty
> > > > > > well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most
> > likely
> > > > > all 5 will
> > > > > > be.
> > > > >
> > > > But if the need is for an emergency, that should
> > > > take priority of any other comms.
```

> > >
> > > Sure. But one of the strengths of ham radio has always been the
ability
> > > to set up wherever one can find a clear frequency, and move to find
> > > one when necessary.
> > > Even though emergencies do take precedence that doesn't assure that
any
> > > of the 5
> > > channels will be available for emergency use at any given time. Early
in
> > > an emergency before the word gets out they are likely to be
> > > overloaded with routine use and thus too cluttered to use.
> >
> > Dick,
> > I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
> > overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
> > MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
> > Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
> > accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
> > current "routine" use.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> I hope your right Bill. I had a incident where the FCC declaired a
specific
> frequency for emergency comm in tornado situation. I asked a station to
> give us some room (2 kc up). He then proceeded to jump right on top of
the
> net and call me and everyone there a liar.
>
> Takes all kinds.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I hope you made a complaint report to the FCC on the guy...assuming
you knew his call sign anyway.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1832. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 00:31:25 UTC
From: eric@elecraft.com
Message-ID: <ad8a96ee.0305281631.29c1da77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67982

Hi,

I have a few corrections to this posting regarding the K2.

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f>.

> I'm not intentionally trying to stick pins in the K2 & Ten-tec
> balloons here just to be a pain in the ass, fact is that I'm quite
> baffled at the low acceptance rate these rigs have in the overall top
> end market. So I tossed a note to a couple of the heavy-duty dx
> conetsters and asked them point blank why they haven't gone with a
> K2-100 or an Omni.
>
> I've only gotten one response back so far. That one sez that the K2
> does not appear to be supported by the contest loggers and other third
> party contesting & rig control software & station accessories.

The K2 is supported by virtually ALL contesting and regular logging programs, either directly or via our Kenwood command set compatibility. CT, NA, TR, DXBase and almost all other logging programs work well with the K2. Tree, of TR fame, uses a K2 along with Trey - N6KO, James - 9V1YC, Rick - N6XI and Kenny - K2KW, who has used K2s with Team Vertical at 6Y2A to set several world records the past two years.

>It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.

The K2/100 has been out for over a year and has sold thousands. I guess we'll have to work harder on publicizing this! ;^)

> Some of of the problems I have
> personally with the K2 are the lack of even a second VFO let alone a
> complete second rcvr on top of being a ham bands only rig.

The K2 does have two VFOs and can easily run split, along with memories. The impressive receive numbers of the K2 are a direct result of its ham band optimized receiver. (Actually it does overlap to 80% or more of the SW bands on RX.) A general coverage receiver has a difficult time getting good receive specs at a reasonable price.

> How do ya get on 60M with a K2??

Easily. We have already designed a simple add in option for the K2 that adds 60M. We were only waiting for the FCC to announce the actual frequencies to release it. Note also that many radios that appear to offer general coverage transmit will not meet FCC harmonic specifications when operated on transmit outside of the current ham

bands, including 60M, due to the requirement for close in low pass filters.

For an excellent contester's review from the last NCJ see:
http://www.elecraft.com/TechNotes/ncjk2100.pdf

For a DXer's perspective from QEX magazine see:
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/020910qex036.pdf

And the recent CQ magazine review:
http://www.elecraft.com/TechNotes/CQ_K2_100_Review.pdf

And the original QST review and advanced test report:
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/0003069.pdf
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/k2.pdf

For additional reviews and customer comments see:
http://www.elecraft.com/K2__Ham_Comments.htm

And a good RX comparison table of ARRL lab numbers is at:
http://www.elecraft.com/K2_perf.htm

We're always looking for ways to improve the K2. We're flattered to be compared to $3,500 - $4,000 radios like the Orion and $10,000 radios like the ICOM 7800. Not bad company to be in! ;^)

73, Eric WA6HHQ
Elecraft
http://www.elecraft.com

1833. Re: Are All Hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 00:47:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030528204742.21428.00000222@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 67983

In article <bb1ask$4ro$0@pita.alt.net>, "Ur Five Nine OM"
<59OM@TallTalesOM.com> writes:

>Are all hams legends in their own minds or just the old white
>males who frequent this NG, desperately trying to impress
>each other with yarns of how important they were at one time?

Not all hams are legends in their own minds, but I am certainly
a legend in my own time!

And, BTW...I'm WAY more important than you'll ever be!

BTW2: I'm 599, OM -- which is a far superior signal report than any
stinkin' little piddly-assed sissy-phone 59!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1834. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 02:24:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030528222400.17796.00000298@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67984

In article <3ED41767.69ABFC4D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <d22b54c3.0305261431.39a53095@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >> >> I rarely if ever use AGC on CW. Better without it.
>> >> >
>> >> >Was marginally true in 1970.
>> >>
>> >> Why? In 1970 there were plenty of rigs with IF derived AGC.

>> >Because the AGC circuitry today is far more sophisticated and is much
>> >"smarter".

>> Not really.

>Really. If you didn't read my other post with the Doug Smith article,
>have a look at: http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm

Good reading. Of course there are probably similar accolades written for almost
any current rig.

The really important question is: do YOU like it? In the K8MN case, the answer
is obvious.
>
>Pay special attention to the part outlining the level at which Orion's
>AGC actually kicks in.

That's "AGC threshold", right? The Ancient Ones set that with the RF gain
control.
>
>> >I believe in many instances including the Orion that the
>> >AGC action is fully programmable.
>>
>> Programmable how? Obviously the release time is programmable. In the '70s
>>that
>> was done by changing timing capacitors.
>>
>> Response curve is usually as flat as the technology allows.
>>
>> I can't see any reason to make attack time programmable; you want it as
>>fast as

>> possible.
>
>Absolutely correct.

'zactly.
>
>> Slow attack time gives pops and blasts, which is why audio-derived
>> AGC isn't that good even in the best implementations. Which is a major
>> limitation of direct conversion rx's, phasing, Gingell, Tayloe or whatever.

Which is a big reason why you won't see direct conversion transceivers or even
receivers taking on superhet ones anytime soon.
>>
>> So all you got left is AGC threshold - the point at which the AGC starts to
>> work. Which was controlled in the olde days by turning the RF gain down
>> with the AGC on.
>
>You've got the threshold but also hang and decay. In the Orion, they're
>all programmable.

Agreed. Easier than switching/soldering capacitors.
>
>> > That certainly was not the case in 1970.
>>
>> Solder iron vs. menu.
>>
>> >> >If so in 2003 then why do folk like n3rs,
>> >> >k3ww, n3rd, k8mn and w3rv run CW with the AGC engaged?
>> >>
>> >> I dunno. Personal preference, maybe.
>
>My personal preference is to retain what hearing I still have.
>
>> >No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.
>>
>> It ain't worse.
>
>...but it is now better.
>
Perhaps we should ask a PROFESSIONAL IN RADIO what the best HF ham rig on the
market is.......

Nah!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1835. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 02:24:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030528222401.17796.00000299@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 67985

In article <8ccBa.1985$aW1.45@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Steve,
>
>I dunno .... are there any points for how many cases of beer one consumes in
>a 24 hour period? :)

Does Genny Cream Ale count?
>
>Kind regards from Rochester, NY

Home of the Dinosaur BBQ.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1836. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 02:29:46 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.193f80f1ae7301849896b9@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 67986

In article <20030528222401.17796.00000299@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
says...
> In article <8ccBa.1985$aW1.45@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Steve,
> >
> >I dunno .... are there any points for how many cases of beer one consumes in
> >a 24 hour period? :)
>
> Does Genny Cream Ale count?
> >
> >Kind regards from Rochester, NY
>
> Home of the Dinosaur BBQ.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I thought that was in downtown Syracuse?

Rochester does have 2 Krispy Kreme Doughnut stores though

1837. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 02:42:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305281842.6ca4b46f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 67987

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED5371D.65C7D642@earthlink.net>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >
> > Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the members
> > in contesting, how about a challenge?
> >
> > No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place at one
> > time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?
> >
> > How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to single
> > op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call it
> > the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
> >
> > Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.
>
> 432 megs in the ARRL June VHF? :)

CW or SSB? Doan laugh, I can do bofum on 432.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1838. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 02:51:56 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030528225156.14509.00000407@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67988

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>I dunno .... are there any points for how many cases of beer one consumes in
>>a 24 hour period? :)

Some Hams I met a few weeks ago could do very well in a food eating contest.

I saw an eating contest on television. They had different contests for certain
foods - butter, eggs, hot dogs, other foods. Each food's special eating
challenges were discussed. Not surprisingly, many of the people that entered
were fat. Surprisingly, one skinny person won a few of the events.

Did you know it takes more energy to heat a room when there is a greater volume
of people (in other words, more fat people) in the room? I was told this by an
Engineer'g. Prof.

1839. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 03:04:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030528230428.14509.00000409@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 67989

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

How about a contest for setup and/or takedown time of a station with certain capabilities? Should require generator power. Also should have strong wind stability.

1840. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:00:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED5862F.AAD34CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67990

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED5371D.65C7D642@earthlink.net>...
> > Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> > >
> > > Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the members
> > > in contesting, how about a challenge?
> > >
> > > No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place at one
> > > time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?
> > >
> > > How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to single
> > > op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call it
> > > the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
> > >
> > > Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.
> >
> > 432 megs in the ARRL June VHF? :)
>
> CW or SSB? Doan laugh, I can do bofum on 432.

Why, both of course!

Shhhh! I'm trying to sucker Steve and am rushing to complete the power supply for the pair of 8930's. No fancy stacked or H-framed yagis here though--just a single boomer at about 55 feet.

You could actually do pretty well from there even with lower power and smaller antennas given the amount of activity right there in the East Coast VHF/UHF corridor. We have the easy pickin's in Cincinnati, Columbus, Cleveland, Pittsburgh and the couple of big boys to the SE of me here in the Mountain State. For everything else, I have to work.

Dave K8MN

1841. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:03:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED5871D.8A7E710B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67991

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>
> How about a contest for setup and/or takedown time of a station with certain
> capabilities? Should require generator power. Also should have strong wind
> stability.

Go ahead and start one. If you're the only entrant, you'll win!

Alternatively, you can just partcipate in Field Day in about a month.
It has most of what you're looking for.

Dave K8MN

1842. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:12:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED5891E.7699F7C5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67993

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3ED41767.69ABFC4D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0305261431.39a53095@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >> >Because the AGC circuitry today is far more sophisticated and is much
> >> >"smarter".
>
> >> Not really.
>
> >Really. If you didn't read my other post with the Doug Smith article,
> >have a look at: http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm
>
> Good reading. Of course there are probably similar accolades written > for almost any
current rig.

He designed the Orion.

> The really important question is: do YOU like it? In the K8MN case, the answer
> is obvious.

I like having a choice of Slow, Medium, Fast, Off and with the
programmable feature, any point in between.

> >Pay special attention to the part outlining the level at which Orion's
> >AGC actually kicks in.
>
> That's "AGC threshold", right? The Ancient Ones set that with the RF gain
> control.

That's correct but the Orion, it isn't necessary to reduce the RF gain
at all for great AGC action.

> >> So all you got left is AGC threshold - the point at which the AGC starts to
> >> work. Which was controlled in the olde days by turning the RF gain down
> >> with the AGC on.
> >
> >You've got the threshold but also hang and decay. In the Orion, they're
> >all programmable.
>

> Agreed. Easier than switching/soldering capacitors.

...and almost instantly adjustable to suit mode and conditions.

> >> >No, it's because AGC ain't what it usta be.
> >>
> >> It ain't worse.
> >
> >...but it is now better.
> >
> Perhaps we should ask a PROFESSIONAL IN RADIO what the best HF ham rig on the
> market is.......
>
> Nah!

I've already given you the Doug Smith article URL so I've saved the
PROFESSIONAL the trouble of looking it up and doing a cut and paste.

I was glad, by the way, to see the post from Eric of Elecraft here. The
company has to be proud of the performance they've managed to pack in a
small and reasonably priced box.

73,

Dave K8MN

1843. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:13:43 UTC
From: The Patriot <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <fh1bdvs28701onbropnpmuq8vdrgmhigdo@4ax.com>
Source record: 67992

On 27 May 2003 22:12:23 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>>Date: 5/27/2003 10:48 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <h227dvk3ue2hq0bg375m4j7o063tgrvm28@4ax.com
>
>
>>Better get back on your prozac, stevie, before you have a stroke. Go
>>soak your head along with "dih-duh" roll.
>
> You know you don't have to hide behind anonymous trolls to get your
>jollies anymore, Scumbag Troller. Even at your age. Viagra's been out there
>for quite a while now and I hear it's quite successful.
>
>Steve
>
And you (and others) are idiots for publishing your names, and
especially your calls on these looney-toon forums. Why, suppose you
said the wrong thing to some REALLY CRAZY PERSON? He/she could just
look you up on QRZ, come right to your door, ring your bell, and when
you come to the door, BLAM!! Blow your head clean off. This would
probably ruin your whole day. :-)
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1844. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:21:53 UTC
From: The Patriot <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <1g2bdvgkvqjb6rj0275jt84e3hp9a12nah@4ax.com>
Source record: 67994

On 28 May 2003 02:08:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3ED3E9E0.2749DA4E@yahoo.bomb>, Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
>writes:
>
>>
>> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>
>Interesting question. A few years ago, I had a "problem" with a repeater
>user who was signing "[prefix]3Triple-A." My assumption was that his
>call sign was [prefix]3TA, since he was using the phonetic word "triple"
>instead just saying the letter 'T'. However, he clarified that his call sign
>was, in fact, [prefix]3AAA, but he was just shortening it to "Triple A."
>Well, you can imagine what went on from there. Since he didn't live in
>my county, I took no action. I did inform the ARRL Official Observer
>in his area, but I never learned what became of it.

What a pompous ass you are, roll, and a squealer too.

>It is my assumption that in voice modes, the call sign must be given in
>a plain, clear manner which would not create any confusion. Therefore,
>I'd say that "KA1K Double Q" or " [prefix]3TripleA" would not be legal
>identifications, due to the possible confusion if the substituted words
>"Double" or "Triple" were taken literally as meaning "D" or "T." If I
>ever heard a call sign like "KB3TripleZulu," I'd assume that his call sign
>was KB3TZ, NOT KB3ZZZ. Phonetics are intended to be words that
>are substituted for letters, in order to eliminate confusion. Using a
>word to enumerate repeated letters would only create confusion.
>Therefore, I would consider this to be illegal identification, and that it
>was possibly being done to deliberately obfuscate the identity of the
>station.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Maybe you ought to look at the phonetic alphabet again, T is Tango,
not Triple. D is Delta, not Double. Jeez, what a moron.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1845. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:37:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED58F0D.7E0C4032@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67995

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
>
> If I'm double-posting kindly excuse me. Something is screwed up with
> either Windoze or Google today and I'm having a bad time of it.

No problem. Just pull an Anderson and tell me that it was a cleverly
laid trap and that we fell into it.

> > > They're also grouchy as hell and as far
> > > as they're concerned there is no such thing as a "best" rcvr and
> > > they'll punch holes in any of 'em at will.
> >
> > There is always a best receiver...of the moment. That crown may only be
> > worn until the next "best receiver" hits the market.
>
> These guys don't churn radios at all. Not the top guns. The two I'm
> closest to bought 940s when they were new on the scene in the early
> 80s then after beating the crap out those for years bought MPs. Around
> ten years per xcvr. They get their money's worth and then some. It's
> far more important to them to have rigs which have been completely
> debugged and which they can operate by reflex / on autopilot than it
> is to have the latest and greatest. Since they crank out tens of
> thousands of contacts per year and consistently make the boxes with
> their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
> ï¿½em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.

I'm not going to make any manufacturer rich either. I owned the Paragon
for six years before buying the Omni VI and I owned the Omni VI for a
full ten years. Goose, W8AV up in Ohio Amish country to my northwest
has a shack full of TS-940's for his multi-multi setup.

> > Nothing is quite so frustrating as finding yourself "equipment limited",
> > all other things being nearly equal. I wouldn't want to be the TS-50
> > guy in a world of TS-940's.
>
> Not if you have what I call a "balanced station". I'll take myself as
> an example. For the present the only antennas I can put up is some low
> dipoles. I am not gonna go out and buy an Omni or an MP or any other
> xcvr in that category and waste the resources ya gotta put into a rig
> like those when all I have is TS-50 level antennas. Would be like
> buying a Corvette to go grocery shopping twice a week.

But, oh baby, that'd be shopping in style.

> Thus I've
> bought into being a TS-50 station in a world of 940s and I'm
> comfortable with the limitations. But come the day when I get some
> beams up and 80 & 160 antennas I'll be all over some high-end xcvr.

That was my dream and I'm happy that we found a place where I could make it come true on a modest scale. My antenna farm would have been considered super in the 1960's and 1970's. Nowadays it seems pretty commonplace. It got scaled back a few notches when I realized that I'd be moving into the age group where maintaining three 70 to 100 foot towers with stacked monobanders would become impractical. Thus the trapless tribander, nothing with gain on 80m and the modest Cushcraft "shorty forty" on the two towers. One tower has the Hazer and the other cranks down and tilts over. I can work on that stuff for years yet.

> >
> > Most of my multi-multi experience runs back to the paper logging,
> > sneaker net days of N9MM (from the W9ZRX QTH).
>
> Long gone daze!
>
> > At OH2HE (OH2E, OH2U), a
> > CT network was run but nobody gave a rat's patootie about rig control as
> > long as accurate logs could be viewed by all and we had communications
> > between the various operating positions.
>
> That changes a bunch when the spots come into play. In this situation
> all club stations are on the same overhead network and the need for
> software rig contol becomes a gotta-have.

I'll have to make a pilgrimage one of these days to one of the big PVRC or FRC multi-multis. One famed OH2 I know visited a large East Coast (non-FRC) multi-multi one year while I was living in Finland and came away with the idea that the operation was a total goat rope.

> The only shot I have at a
> half-decent score is to play the search & pounce game so even I'll
> have Writelog rig control running here as a lame single op with the
> 847.

I don't connect to the Pittsburgh cluster if I'm going for score.

> >
> > The Finns are rather evenly split between CT and TR. I have both but
> > tend to rely on CT. To the issue of transceiver control software, I'd
> > lean on the logging software author to include support for my radio
> > rather than buying a radio based on compatibility with software.
>
> Absolutely, not even a discussion. Dunno much abt TR or NA but CT and
> Writelog both support TT xcvrs along with all the JA gear. TT is not
> oblivious to the fact that it's in their best interest to provide the
> tech info to the software writers so Omni support is probably already
> in both or is close. It's up to Elecraft and the K2 owners to do the

> leaning if they wanna join the parade.

If it is compatible with the Kenwood driver, should be no problem. The
Paragon used to work with the Icom IC-735 drivers for logging programs.

> > From the Orion specifications sheet:
> >
> > "SSB sensitivity: <0.18 ï¿½V for 10 dB SINAD at 2.4 kHz BW, pre-amp on
> > typical"
> >
> > "Internal birdies: None stronger than specified sensitivity."
> >
> > If they're lying about the specs, I haven't yet found one of the
> > birdies.
>
> Yeah, they listened.

It helps that they have Doug Smith designing and Scott W4PA, an active
contester, providing his input and that of others.

> >
> > > > I'll be interested to see the IC-7800 full specs and even more
> > > > interested to see who buys one.
> > >
> > > You betchum, the next year gotta be interesting. I'll have both an
> > > Orion and a 7800 less than a hour's drive from here. You bet I will.
> > >
> > You now have two good reasons for road trips. My guess? That you won't
> > find nearly $7,000 of difference between the two.
>
> I can't believe they expect to get that kinda money for a ham xcvr,
> that's idiotic. No you bet there won't be a $7k difference in
> performance. Reminds me of the Signal One debacle. The far more
> interesting subject will be K3WW's Omni. If he kicks butt in the
> battle of the boxes with a TT rig like he has been doing with his
> Brand X rigs it's gonna attract a *lot* of attention.

Earlier reports of that price may have been incorrect. The latest TT
reflector scuttlebutt mentions something about $7k list and $6k street
price. If true, that makes it only about twice as expensive as an
Orion. By the way, would you have been more tempted to buy if they
called it, as one wag suggested, the O'Ryan?

Dave K8MN

1846. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:39:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bb5sri$6b9re$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68068

I agree also. Just a different thought to add to the thread, that is all
the intent of the post....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bb39cg$66o$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> I would think that in a 'real event' any method of maintaining commo
to/from
> an area would not be a problem.
>
> I know I'll use whatever means are available to me to maintain commo. If
> its cw, or digital...matters not. Just get the job done.
>
> Then worry about the 'consequences'.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bb314p$53pei$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > What about "Sec. 97.401 Operation during a disaster" or "Sec. 97.403
> > Safety of life and protection of property" or "Sec. 97.405 Station in
> > distress" as possible variants to use morse code on those frequencies???
> > One of them has gotta apply in some case or another....
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:batp4gdlq0@208.207.71.143...
> > >
> > >
> > > David Robbins wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20030525192145.15743.00000312@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > > > >Subject: "Uncle says..."
> > > > > >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> > > > > >Date: 5/25/2003 6:15 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > > > >Message-id: <20030525191534.15922.00000385@mb-m28.aol.com>
> > > > >
> > > > > > Guess that solves that.
> > > > >
> > > > > And if anyone needed it to be any simpler...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Channel Center Frequency Amateur Tuning Frequency
> > > > >
> > > > > 5332 kHz 5330.5 kHz
> > > > >
> > > > > 5348 kHz 5346.5 kHz
> > > > >
> > > > > 5368 kHz 5366.5 kHz
> > > > >
> > > > > 5373 kHz 5371.5 kHz
> > > > >
> > > > > 5405 kHz Common US/UK 5403.5 kHz
> > > > >
> > > > and dont' forget... USB voice only... no cw, no rtty, no sstv, no
> throb
> > or
> > > > psk or any of that other stuff, just USB voice.
> > >
> > > Did you notice the reason for that? So the primary users can ID hams
> > operating
> > > there if needed. Never mind that any digital mode should work much
> better
> > than
> > > voice in emergencies. But FCC could grant us instant authority to use
> them
> > if
> > > needed, I presume.
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

1847. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 04:58:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED593CA.CB4C9D43@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67996

N2EY wrote:
>
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > > >Interesting thread this. We have you obviously ass over tincups
> > > >married to TT and Jim likewise with Elecrafty.
> > >
> > > Naw, the only radio outfit I'm that close to is Southgate Radio
> >
> > Then howcum ya bought a K2?
>
> Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:
>
> "Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."
>
> And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
> spending decisions.

I think you've driven that nail home.

> Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
> SINGCARS units around.

ALE doesn't seem to have taken the amateur radio world by storm.

> The clueless can lecture us forever about what hams should be doing,
> how our technology should "progress", how the "professionals" do it,
> yada, yada, yada ad infinitum, and in the end we'll go out and buy,
> build and/or assemble our stations based on what we want and how much
> we can afford.

Afterward, we can operate the stuff on the bands and modes of our choice
in whatever portion of the numerous interests available in amateur
radio.

>
> > Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome. We'ere not talking
> > newbies or nitwits here, we're talking seasoned HFers, contesters and
> > otherwise who are quite aware of the entire range of high-performance
> > xcvrs and can write the check for any of 'em.
>

> Not as many of those folks as you might think, compared to the great
> unwashed masses of us who do not have huge antenna farms and the
> resources to buy, say, an FT-1000.

I can remember a time about 25 years or a little more back in time when
I was already a seasoned contester and DXer. I bought used gear and had
some wires and a small tribander on a pushup mast because it is what I
could afford.

> > > For every one that buys an FT-1000, there's
> > > prolly a dozen FT-1000 buyers who got it just because it's the top-of-the-line
> > > Yaesu.
> >
> > Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy
> > especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their
> > needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.
>
> Been that way forever. Which is one way that the DX/contest crowd
> justifies its existence in a big way. It wasn't the ragchewers who
> pushed the dynamic range numbers up.

Agreed. I don't think that many of the ragchewers can tell difference
between nor do I think that many of 'em use anywhere near all the
capabilities of that a high end rig offers. Internet surfers and word
processor users don't drive increases in computer processor and graphics
speed and sound card capabilities. Gamers do.

> > It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.
>
> And you say "Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome."? "QRP
> image" is just another term for it.

The K-2 should drive an amp as well as anything else :)

> > As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> > mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> > lackings.
>
> ....ze barracuda firszt confuzes and distracts ze ozer feesh with
> clevaire antics, zo zey weel tell heem what he wantz to know.....

I'll give it a test drive in one of the fall events if I can keep the
knobs from falling off. Sure hope I can hear some DX through the
birdies.

Dave K8MN

1848. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 05:05:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED5956B.76F41C4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 67997

The Patriot wrote:
>
> On 27 May 2003 22:12:23 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
> >>Subject: Re: What's worse?
> >>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
> >>Date: 5/27/2003 10:48 AM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <h227dvk3ue2hq0bg375m4j7o063tgrvm28@4ax.com
> > >
> > >
> >>Better get back on your prozac, stevie, before you have a stroke. Go
> >>soak your head along with "dih-duh" roll.
> > >
> > > You know you don't have to hide behind anonymous trolls to get your
> > >jollies anymore, Scumbag Troller. Even at your age. Viagra's been out there
> > >for quite a while now and I hear it's quite successful.
> > >
> > >Steve
> > >
> > And you (and others) are idiots for publishing your names, and
> > especially your calls on these looney-toon forums. Why, suppose you
> > said the wrong thing to some REALLY CRAZY PERSON? He/she could just
> > look you up on QRZ, come right to your door, ring your bell, and when
> > you come to the door, BLAM!! Blow your head clean off. This would
> > probably ruin your whole day. :-)

I dunno. You seem as if you could be a really crazy anonymous-type
person. I'm not too worried about you coming to my door, ringing my
bell or BLAM!!, blowing my head clean off. My name and address are
listed numerous places including the telephone book.
I use my call on the air. Maybe I should use someone else's call lest
some really crazy person come to my door.

> The Patriot

You surely do write like that really crazy Lloyd person.

Dave K8MN

1849. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 05:20:56 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <YMgBa.2187$Wg7.217@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 67998

Genny Cream Ale counts *big* time if you are within 500 feet of the
imbiber - especially if you're downwind! :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030528222401.17796.00000299@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <8ccBa.1985$aW1.45@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim
Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Steve,
> >
> >I dunno .... are there any points for how many cases of beer one consumes
in
> >a 24 hour period? :)
>
> Does Genny Cream Ale count?
> >
> >Kind regards from Rochester, NY
>
> Home of the Dinosaur BBQ.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/03

1850. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 05:37:57 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb46bl$2bn$0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 67999

Robert Casey wrote:

> >
> >
> >Dick,
> >I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
> >overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
> >MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
> >Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
> >accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
> >current "routine" use.
> >
> >
> >
> Being "overloaded" would mean that there would be users close to the
> station in distress, and be able to hear him well enough to cut thru the
> QRM. And soon the other hams further away will realize that there's
> an emergency happening, and stop transmitting but stay listening in
> case someone is in a position to help in some way.

IF yuo assume that all users are involved in, or at least aware of, te emergency. I think we can assume from experience that such won't be the case and many will yak on.

1851. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 05:53:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529015317.04190.00000069@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68051

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) kf2ti@arrl.net
>Date: 5/28/03 9:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <MPG.193f80f1ae7301849896b9@news.mindspring.com>

>
>Rochester does have 2 Krispy Kreme Doughnut stores though

Throw in a White Castle and I'm there!

Steve, K4CAP

1852. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 05:53:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb479f$69s$0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 68000

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 28 May 2003 03:11:35 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > And if you ever get to Cheyenne, Wyoming, drop off I-80 onto
> > Lincolnway and drive by the city park. It's where the lone
> > remaining example of Union Pacific's Big Boy is set up on
> > display. That's the huge 4-8-8-4 specially built to cross the
> > Rockies between Cheyenne and Ogden, Utah. It's 132 feet long. Of
> > only 25 built, it's the only one left in existance. I got some
> > great digital photos.
>
> Didn't the You Pee revive one for Steve Lee to drive?

I'm unfamiliar with that, but the local blurb says that the Cheyenne
display is the last remaining Big Boy.

> I
> confuse the 3945 and the 8444 (now the 844). Or was that the
> Challenger?

The Cheyenne engine is #4004.

1853. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 05:55:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529015517.04190.00000070@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68052

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/28/03 9:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030528225156.14509.00000407@mb-m02.aol.com>

>Some Hams I met a few weeks ago could do very well in a food eating contest.

But no cow, I imagine. I want a LOT of dead cow there!

>Did you know it takes more energy to heat a room when there is a greater
>volume
>of people (in other words, more fat people) in the room? I was told this by
>an
>Engineer'g. Prof.

Your "enginer'g prof" was an idiot.

Steve, K4CAP

1854. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 05:57:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529015701.04190.00000071@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68053

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/28/03 10:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030528230428.14509.00000409@mb-m02.aol.com>

>How about a contest for setup and/or takedown time of a station with certain
>capabilities? Should require generator power. Also should have strong wind
>stability.

You go right ahead, Vippy. When you're done, let us know and post your
"results" against like-qualified teams and we'll score accordingly.

Steve, K4CAP

1855. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 06:00:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529020039.04190.00000072@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68054

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/28/03 11:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED5862F.AAD34CD@earthlink.net>

>Shhhh! I'm trying to sucker Steve...(SNIP)

I'll have to acknowldege defeat before we even get to the gate on that one...My contesting ability stops just above 144.3Mhz SSB ! ! !

Now...If I was living back up on Cagle Mtn, I'd dig to get the 432 gear cooking! A 2100ft QTH goes a long way, even here in SE Tennessee.

73

Steve, K4CAP

1856. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 06:06:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529020644.04190.00000073@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68055

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: The Patriot bogus@fake.com
>Date: 5/28/03 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <fh1bdvs28701onbropnpmuq8vdrgmhigdo@4ax.com>

>And you (and others) are idiots for publishing your names, and
>especially your calls on these looney-toon forums.

I think you should ask Vipul Shah how much good it did him to remain "anonymous", Your Supreme Putziness.

>He/she could just
>look you up on QRZ, come right to your door, ring your bell, and when
>you come to the door, BLAM!! Blow your head clean off.

Perhaps you need a tutorial on my qualifications on squad-level weapons and my proficiency therewith? And my temerity to use them.

>This would probably ruin your whole day.

Only trying to get the neighbors to step over the stains until I can get them bleached out of the concrete. Maybe a day or two.

>The Patriot

"Patriot"'s don't threaten other Americans...Unless of course you consider yourself a "patriot" for a different flag, Scummy One.

You're still just a coward with nothing much to say except to harass and antagonize for jollies sake.

Steve, K4CAP

1857. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 09:00:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305290100.21ea5367@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68056

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030528152735.09503.00000447@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the members
> in contesting, how about a challenge?
>
> No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place at one
> time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?
>
> How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to single
> op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call it
> the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?

Boy you invited yourself into a real bag of worms. There would be a
huge problem with the scoring.

Lemmee give you an example: Take two contests, Field Day (assuming you
consider FD a real contest) and either of the CQ Worldwide DX
contests. Assume ya really hump and ya make 750 CW contacts running
100W. The score would be 750 times 2 points for CW contacts times 2
points for operating in the under 150W class. Not counting any bonus
points the total score would be 3,000 points.

Now take the CQ WW. Say ya work 50 dx stations in an hour or so which
is no biggie. Of those 50 ya only worked 10 countries in 6 WAZ zones.
That's 3,000 points already and ya haven't even gotten warmed up.

That ain't gonna work . . .

>
> Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.

Sit on yer "pretty day" Robeson, I'm still trying to get the mud off
my shoes . . OK GOD, KNOCK OFF THE DAMNED RAIN WIILYA?!!

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

w3rv

1858. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 10:36:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529063614.10617.00000169@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68057

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 5/29/03 4:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305290100.21ea5367@posting.google.com>

>Boy you invited yourself into a real bag of worms. There would be a
>huge problem with the scoring.

You're completely correct, of course. Trying to develop a handicap that
would level the playing field would be horrendous.

I was just trying to stimulate some activitiy on the air by RRAP'ers.
It's been a while since i've had a chance to work anyone from the NG and
thought a bit of playful challenge might get some folks moving.

On a more serious note, I >>AM<< considering a trip to VO-land for
sweepstakes this year, altho I don't know if I want to go for CW or fone
weekend.

>> Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.
>
>Sit on yer "pretty day" Robeson, I'm still trying to get the mud off
>my shoes . . OK GOD, KNOCK OFF THE DAMNED RAIN WIILYA?!!

Glad to hear the rainy season moved on. I wasn't so concerned about
seeing the Coast Guard patrolling down town, but the Old Guy with the boat and
animals was starting to get on my nerves!

73

Steve, K4CAP

1859. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 16:05:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305290805.70422921@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68058

Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<MPG.193f80f1ae7301849896b9@news.mindspring.com>...
> In article <20030528222401.17796.00000299@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> says...
> > In article <8ccBa.1985$aW1.45@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
> > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
> >
> > >Kind regards from Rochester, NY
> >
> > Home of the Dinosaur BBQ.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I thought that was in downtown Syracuse?

There are two of them.

246 West Willow St in Syracuse

99 Court Street in Rochester

http://www.dinosaurbarbque.com
>
> Rochester does have 2 Krispy Kreme Doughnut stores though

And Mr. Z's

73 de Jim, N2EY

1860. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 16:15:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305290815.77381526@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68059

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED593CA.CB4C9D43@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > > > >Interesting thread this. We have you obviously ass over tincups
> > > > >married to TT and Jim likewise with Elecrafty.
> > > >
> > > > Naw, the only radio outfit I'm that close to is Southgate Radio
> > >
> > > Then howcum ya bought a K2?
> >
> > Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:
> >
> > "Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."
> >
> > And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
> > spending decisions.
>
> I think you've driven that nail home.

Yet there are some who don't understand that plain, simple fact at
all. Remember when ol' Gary and Carl lectured us on how contests could
be simulated on a network?
>
> > Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
> > SINGCARS units around.
>
> ALE doesn't seem to have taken the amateur radio world by storm.

Imagine CQ WW handled that way....
>
> > The clueless can lecture us forever about what hams should be doing,
> > how our technology should "progress", how the "professionals" do it,
> > yada, yada, yada ad infinitum, and in the end we'll go out and buy,
> > build and/or assemble our stations based on what we want and how much
> > we can afford.
>
> Afterward, we can operate the stuff on the bands and modes of our choice
> in whatever portion of the numerous interests available in amateur

> radio.

Which is what really bugs some folks.

> > > Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome. We'ere not talking
> > > newbies or nitwits here, we're talking seasoned HFers, contesters and
> > > otherwise who are quite aware of the entire range of high-performance
> > > xcvrs and can write the check for any of 'em.
> >
> > Not as many of those folks as you might think, compared to the great
> > unwashed masses of us who do not have huge antenna farms and the
> > resources to buy, say, an FT-1000.
>
> I can remember a time about 25 years or a little more back in time when
> I was already a seasoned contester and DXer. I bought used gear and had
> some wires and a small tribander on a pushup mast because it is what I
> could afford.

I'm not sure what your point is, Dave. I was simply saying that
top-end rigs like the Orion are not a realistic option for the vast
majority of hams. 'RV's talking about the folks who are not only
interested but who can write the check. I'm not one of 'em - yet.

> > > > For every one that buys an FT-1000, there's
> > > > prolly a dozen FT-1000 buyers who got it just because it's the top-of-the-line
> > > > Yaesu.
> > >
> > > Agreed, but the contesters are well known to be extremely fussy
> > > especially about rcvrs and the JAs bend over backward to meet their
> > > needs because they have a strong influence in the high-end market.
> >
> > Been that way forever. Which is one way that the DX/contest crowd
> > justifies its existence in a big way. It wasn't the ragchewers who
> > pushed the dynamic range numbers up.
>
> Agreed. I don't think that many of the ragchewers can tell difference
> between nor do I think that many of 'em use anywhere near all the
> capabilities of that a high end rig offers.

Agreed. Many of the features are contest/DX specific anyway. Heck, for
ragchewing a 2-B and Ranger setup is just about ideal. Or an HW-101.
Add a Courier amp/SB-200 for some wattage.

> Internet surfers and word
> processor users don't drive increases in computer processor and graphics
> speed and sound card capabilities. Gamers do.

bwaahaahhaaa

> > > It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.
> >
> > And you say "Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome."? "QRP
> > image" is just another term for it.

>
> The K-2 should drive an amp as well as anything else :)

Not any amp you can buy. Base model only puts out 10-15 watts. btw,
its QSK time is programmable so those who don't want to hear between
dits at 60 per don't have to.

> > > As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> > > mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> > > lackings.
> >
> > ....ze barracuda firszt confuzes and distracts ze ozer feesh with
> > clevaire antics, zo zey weel tell heem what he wantz to know.....
>
> I'll give it a test drive in one of the fall events if I can keep the
> knobs from falling off. Sure hope I can hear some DX through the
> birdies.

HAW!!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1861. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 16:30:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305290830.1b9717c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68060

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030529063614.10617.00000169@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 5/29/03 4:00 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0305290100.21ea5367@posting.google.com>
>
>
> >Boy you invited yourself into a real bag of worms. There would be a
> >huge problem with the scoring.
>
> You're completely correct, of course. Trying to develop a handicap that
> would level the playing field would be horrendous.

Naw, some ideas:

1) Compare points earned in a given contest only

2) Compare percentile rank in the class of entry, regardless of
contest.

3) Make up a cumulative score based on the above. Enter more contests
and score more percentile points.
>
> I was just trying to stimulate some activitiy on the air by RRAP'ers.

See ya on 7037 CW.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1862. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 16:45:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305290845.4590bb37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68061

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030528230428.14509.00000409@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>
> How about a contest for setup and/or takedown time of a station with certain
> capabilities?

We have that already. It's called Field Day. Also the VHF contests
where mountaintopping is popular.

FD rules require that all setup must take place no earlier than 24
hours before the start of the contest. Which means that in EDST you
can't begin setup until 2 PM Friday.

The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities. How do you
know what a station's capabilities are unless it is actually used on
the air?

For several years I ran FD single-handed. Class 1B-1. With my homebrew
100 watt station, tent, generator, mast, the whole works. Site was an
open field with no facilities other than grass, which I had to mow in
order to have a place for the tent, generator and 44 foot homebrew
mast. No usable trees or buildings. Put it all up myself in a few
hours and took it all down again afterward. Site was 73 miles from
home and had to bring everything to the site and back in a 15 year old
VW Rabbit. Setup took about 5 hours and takedown about half that.

Best score I ever did was 2980 points - 629 CW and 11 phone QSOs. The
'phone QSOs were on 2m simplex. That year it drizzled rain almost the
whole time (no lightning, thank heaven). Had a LOT of fun that year.
Burned up a lot of calories, too.

Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.

> Should require generator power.

Why? Most generators are noisy, heavy and require lots of fuel, and
they don't promote energy conservation. Battery/solar will do the job
- why not use the best technology?

If you insist on genset power, though, I know the unit I'd use. Takes
about a minute to set up.

> Also should have strong wind stability.

Sounds like hot air to me.

1863. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 17:02:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305290902.4de75428@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68062

eric@elecraft.com (Eric WA6HHQ) wrote in message
news:<ad8a96ee.0305281631.29c1da77@posting.google.com>...

Well lookee who popped into the thread, The Eric Hisself. I smell the
fine hand of N2EY in this one, the Chief K2 Cheerleader. Fortunately
most cheerleaders have better looking bods than he has. MUCH better
looking . . .

> Hi,

Hi Rick and welcome to the bilge of ham radio. You'll love this
neighborhood.

> I have a few corrections to this posting regarding the K2.
>
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f>.
>
. . . . .

> The K2 is supported by virtually ALL contesting and regular logging
> programs, either directly or via our Kenwood command set
> compatibility. CT, NA, TR, DXBase and almost all other logging
> programs work well with the K2. Tree, of TR fame, uses a K2 along with
> Trey - N6KO, James - 9V1YC, Rick - N6XI and Kenny - K2KW, who has used
> K2s with Team Vertical at 6Y2A to set several world records the past
> two years.

That's good news and corrects a misimpression on the part of a buddy
of mine. I understand that the Kenwood command set is the most robust
& stable of the bunch. Is that info in yer website? Where is that info
in the Writelog site? Why not?

> >It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.
>
> The K2/100 has been out for over a year and has sold thousands. I
> guess we'll have to work harder on publicizing this! ;^)

I think he meant "QRP image" in a broader sense, as in "It's a cute
little thing BUT . . " My take is that all kit rigs power output
aside have historically had that problem and they deserved it. You've
broken that mold with the K2 but it's still lumped in into that
category. Yeah, more missionary work is indicated. HRO has worked the
big contest clubs for the JA stuff. It works.

> > Some of of the problems I have
> > personally with the K2 are the lack of even a second VFO let alone a
> > complete second rcvr on top of being a ham bands only rig.

>
> The K2 does have two VFOs and can easily run split, along with
> memories.

I blew that one.

> The impressive receive numbers of the K2 are a direct
> result of its ham band optimized receiver. (Actually it does overlap
> to 80% or more of the SW bands on RX.) A general coverage receiver has
> a difficult time getting good receive specs at a reasonable price.

Thoroughly understood. Ten-tec follows the same design philosophy and
both you and Ten-tec are technically correct. The problem with the
approach is that the prospective buyer has to make tradeoffs based on
what matters most to him/her. Incrementally better performance within
the ham bands or SWL and other bells & whistles? I'll spare you my
usual diatribe on this subject but I'll pit my $600 admittedly lame
100w TS-50 underdash HF rig with it's DC to 30Mhz rcvr against a
K2/100 in any cw dx contest any time given the same antennas. The guy
with the K2 is not gonna make many if any contacts I can't make
because he has a rcvr with a better front end. The effects of rcvr
circuit differences will be buried in all the rest of the variables
which come into play.

> > How do ya get on 60M with a K2??
>
> Easily. We have already designed a simple add in option for the K2
> that adds 60M. We were only waiting for the FCC to announce the actual
> frequencies to release it. Note also that many radios that appear to
> offer general coverage transmit will not meet FCC harmonic
> specifications when operated on transmit outside of the current ham
> bands, including 60M, due to the requirement for close in low pass
> filters.

It's even worse than that. You can toast the PA in many xcvrs if they
are operated in certain portions of the HF spectrum. In any event
you've addressed the 60M problem and answered the question.

> For an excellent contester's review from the last NCJ see:
> http://www.elecraft.com/TechNotes/ncjk2100.pdf
>
> For a DXer's perspective from QEX magazine see:
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/020910qex036.pdf
>
> And the recent CQ magazine review:
> http://www.elecraft.com/TechNotes/CQ_K2_100_Review.pdf
>
> And the original QST review and advanced test report:
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/0003069.pdf
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/k2.pdf
>
> For additional reviews and customer comments see:

> http://www.elecraft.com/K2__Ham_Comments.htm
>
> And a good RX comparison table of ARRL lab numbers is at:
> http://www.elecraft.com/K2_perf.htm

Tnx, I've already been through a number of them and I'll chase down
the rest.

>
> We're always looking for ways to improve the K2. We're flattered to be
> compared to $3,500 - $4,000 radios like the Orion and $10,000 radios
> like the ICOM 7800. Not bad company to be in! ;^)

Heh. The brawl never ends. Actually though an Orion can be had for
under $3,500 and watch for HRO to be selling 7800s for around $6k.
Before the coupons appear. I can't imagine where they get their MBAs,
they're nuts.

I'm actually much more interested in your plans for the future than I
am the K2. Ten-tec started out pretty much like you did, a couple
smart designers, a few inexpansive QRP kits, direct marketing, the
whole nine yards. Typical U.S. entrepreneurial founding of dynasties
we have everywhere today. How far are you gonna take it?

And how are ya doing with the K3 ?

>
> 73, Eric WA6HHQ
> Elecraft
> http://www.elecraft.com

Brian w3rv

1864. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 20:07:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ED6687B.7000104@psu.edu>
Source record: 68064

The Patriot wrote:
> On 27 May 2003 22:12:23 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
>
>>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>>From: Freddy the Freeloader bogus@fake.com
>>>Date: 5/27/2003 10:48 AM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <h227dvk3ue2hq0bg375m4j7o063tgrvm28@4ax.com
>>
>>
>>>Better get back on your prozac, stevie, before you have a stroke. Go
>>>soak your head along with "dih-duh" roll.
>>
>> You know you don't have to hide behind anonymous trolls to get your
>>jollies anymore, Scumbag Troller. Even at your age. Viagra's been out there
>>for quite a while now and I hear it's quite successful.
>>
>>Steve
>>
>
> And you (and others) are idiots for publishing your names, and
> especially your calls on these looney-toon forums. Why, suppose you
> said the wrong thing to some REALLY CRAZY PERSON? He/she could just
> look you up on QRZ, come right to your door, ring your bell, and when
> you come to the door, BLAM!! Blow your head clean off. This would
> probably ruin your whole day. :-)

The same thing could happen if I met a REALLY CRAZY PERSON walking from the parking lot to my work. Or anything else, anywhere else.

FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the morning - much less in fact.

The only part of your post I would agree to is that yes, it would be possible to offend an unbalanced individual to the point of contemplating harm. Best idea is that we use the manners our folks taught us and don't be so impolite.

Also, don't make the mistake of thinking that using a handle grants anonymity.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1865. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 20:12:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305291212.490d676a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68063

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED5862F.AAD34CD@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED5371D.65C7D642@earthlink.net>...

> > > > the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
> > > >
> > > > Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.
> > >
> > > 432 megs in the ARRL June VHF? :)
> >
> > CW or SSB? Doan laugh, I can do bofum on 432.
>
> Why, both of course!
>
> Shhhh! I'm trying to sucker Steve and am rushing to complete the power
> supply for the pair of 8930's. No fancy stacked or H-framed yagis here
> though--just a single boomer at about 55 feet.
>
> You could actually do pretty well from there even with lower power and
> smaller antennas given the amount of activity right there in the East
> Coast VHF/UHF corridor.

Lotta activity north & south but we hit the wall east-wall, you live
on the other side of the wall. The little FT-847 operates on 6/2/432
all modes, 100/50/50W out. I bought a Diamond nine-foot triband glass
stick antenna for it along with some 9913 and a vent pipe mount. I
need to dredge up a ladder and get it up and running. Oughta get me at
least started. If I like what I hear on cw & ssb I'll move on to small
beams.

> We have the easy pickin's in Cincinnati,
> Columbus, Cleveland, Pittsburgh and the couple of big boys to the SE of
> me here in the Mountain State. For everything else, I have to work.

Yeah but I'll bet it's quiet.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1866. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 20:18:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305291218.3a4a60c9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68065

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305290100.21ea5367@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030528152735.09503.00000447@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > Since there seems to be a bit of interest amongst several of the members
> > in contesting, how about a challenge?
> >
> > No prizes or plaques since it's unlikely we'll ever be in one place at one
> > time...just bragging rights until the next 'test?
> >
> > How about we pick two or three different tests and then limit it to single
> > op/single tx, and then we let the scores in CQ/QST be the milestone? Call it
> > the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
>
> Boy you invited yourself into a real bag of worms. There would be a
> huge problem with the scoring.

> is no biggie. Of those 50 ya only worked 10 countries in 6 WAZ zones.
> That's 3,000 points already and ya haven't even gotten warmed up.
>
> That ain't gonna work . . .

On second thought maybe it can work. Completely ignore all the
multipliers and just add up the number of contacts. That'll level the
field quick.

> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4CAP
>
> w3rv

w3rv

1867. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 20:40:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529164040.18763.00000392@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68066

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 5/29/03 3:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED6687B.7000104@psu.edu>

>Also, don't make the mistake of thinking that using a handle grants
>anonymity.

Like I said...Ask Vipul!

Steve, K4CAP

1868. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 20:49:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305291249.11378566@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68067

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED53692.205DCA11@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >

> > Isn't that sorta like the guys who have only ever owned Fords sitting
> > around the bar beasting on Chebbys?
>
> Not at all. I've owned other than Fords. I beat on Chevrolet because
> they once sold me a '73 Vega.

You didn't buy it, they sold it to you. I see.

Ask Jim about his beloved diesel Rabbit.

> > Nuttin' under the hood eh? Not-so-hypothetical scenario: One guy has
> > say an Omni6+. 'Nother guy in the same neighborhood has the same
> > antennas and same set of operating skills and an MP. Both jump into a
> > dx contest and go at it. Come the end of the contest the guy with the
> > Omni obviously has to have have beaten the guy with the MP,
> > absolutetly has to be, yes?
>
> I don't think you're being fair to yourself in setting your
> hyptothetical even though we know that two ops aren't really going to
> have the same operating skills. One guy might be a whiz at handling
> rapid fire QSOs but he might be on the wrong band.

Yew are absolutely right there. I'll tellya how bad that can get.
Within the club there are well-known differences amongst the guest ops
who run in the multi-multis. You'll find "classified ads" in the
reflector like "W3ABC needs two runners for the CQ phone." Runners &
pouncers, different critters.

> To make your scenario slightly better, the guy
> with the MP would have his rig rise about a foot-and-a-half off the
> table with keying from the nearby Omni VI+ when the receiver of the MP
> folded up. Things might even out though: The guy with the Omni would
> have to deal with the key clicks from the MP :)

I doubt it. Copied-pasted from from another e-mailed missive I
recieved:

w3rv: "The Ten-Tec Omni 6+ supposedly has a rcvr which noticeably
better than any of the FT-1000 series and any of the big Icoms."

Response from MP owner: "I'm not convinced of this claim. My
neighbor, K3WU has one of these rigs and his signal is all over the
place! Lot's of harmonics and very hard keying. He hears less well

than I do, much less better."

. . . so there . . !

> The Ten-Tec reflector is just as bad. There are a number of technically
> astute fellows whose opinions I value. When they comment, I read
> thoroughly. Scott W4PA from TT often responds to comments. The
> huggy-kissy content is balanced by several of those characters
> complaining about knob eccentricity and font style/size.

Heee! It's those idiots who make us look good.

> > > Whet your interest any? You might want to take a look at Doug Smith's
> > > article on the programmable AGC at
> > > http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm
> >
> > Puts the AGC discussion solidly to bed.
>
> I'm interested in what Jim has to say about it.

Doan matter, he could never bring hisself to use the AGC on cw. No
matter what.

> > > What I'm trying to get across to you is that you should sell the car,
> > > take a second mortgage on the house, tell the kids that they'll have to
> > > work their way through college but order an Orion.
> >
> > Welp, the last of my three brats graduated from collitch seven years
> > ago. They owe me. Maybe it's time I "collected" . . ? (As if . . !)
>
> Well, you don't really need a car. Don't they have good public transit
> in your area?

Yeah, we still even have trolley cars here by golly. Unfortunately
taking public transit to Lew Turk's takes an hour and a half one way
but only ten minutes by driving. Ya can die of thirst in an hour and a
half.

> > All joshing & jousting aside best of luck with Baby.
>
> I don't make reflector exchanges patting myself on the back for my
> choice. I'm simply enjoying the use of the best rig I've ever owned.

I don't doubt that for a second. Enjoy.

> Go have a listen to K3WW's at first opportunity!

Put that in the bank!

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1869. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 23:24:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529192427.18497.00000308@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 68069

In article <YMgBa.2187$Wg7.217@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Genny Cream Ale counts *big* time if you are within 500 feet of the
>imbiber - especially if you're downwind! :)
>
And here I thought I heard thunder in the distance......

What I wouldn't do for a decent beef on a weck, some real wings, and some red
hots/white hots. Down here in hoagieland things are barely civilized.

But we do have scrapple.

73 de Jim, N2EY

House of Guitars?

1870. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-29 23:25:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305291525.6ed2f347@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68070

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0305281332.3fb63c96@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...

> > >
> > > Naw, the only radio outfit I'm that close to is Southgate Radio
> >
> > Then howcum ya bought a K2?
>
> Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:
>
> "Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."

Ya shoulda peddled more five-pin tube sockets and waited until ya had
a bigger wad before ya leaped on the K2. Can't tell you how often I've
refused to settle for a lesser rig and bided my time until I could
afford the rig I wanted.

> And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
> spending decisions. Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
> SINGCARS units around.

Who could be bothered with one of those kluges??

> > When was the last time you diddled the knobs on an Omni or an MP?
>
> Some time past. Do you rate the FT-1000 (any flavor) over the Orion?

Got plenty of time with straight MPs, I'll letcha know after I check
out k3ww's Onion.

> > There is only one meaning and it don't take no MBA to understand it.
>
> How many FT-1000s have been sold in the past 3 years? There are over
> 3500 K2s out there.

Nobody knows because those stats are closely held. But I'd bet the
farm on my guess that over the years FT-1000s have outsold the K2 by
at least one order of magnitude, probably more. There are thousnads of
'em in Japan and Europe alone. I'll also bet that the K2 will hit
saturation and die and/or be replaced long before it catches up with
the FT-1000s.

> > I don't know any HFer who isn't fully aware of the K2 and I don't mean
> > just FRCers. Ditto Ten-tec.
>

> "Aware" is not the same as "thinking about buying". Not only does
> Ikensu do lots of advertising in the ham rags, they have lots of
> dealers plugging their stuff. Thumb through the various ham mags,
> visit a dealer or a dealer website and see what is front and center.
> TT and Elecraft don't have anything like that saturation.

I think you're giving the advertising too much credit and not giving
hams in general enough credit for being able to tear and compare.
Particularly when it comes to experienced HFers.

> > A 100w 160-10 cw/ssb K2 is hardly a niche xcvr.
>
> Sure it is. How many hams will spend the time and money to build one?

I would if it wasn't so bloody Spartan.

>
> Used gear, you say? How much do you have in that '940, and how much is
> it worth now in its present condition?

$1,400 a number of years ago. It's toast for the moment. What's any of
it have to do with anything in this thread?

> The market isn't flooded with used ones, and they tend to go for close
> to the new price. There's a QRP one on eBay right now, bid is at $599.
> With the listed options it cost the builder maybe $750. It's got a low
> S/N but looks good. I would not be surprised if it went quite a bit
> higher.

Gimmee a week to poke around and I'll have a K2 any time I want one.
And I'll be able to pick it up.

> > > >Amongst the hardcore dxers,
> > > >contesters and other weak signal wonks with deep enough pockets to buy
> > > >any radio out there?
> > >
> > > How many of them exist, really?
> >
> > What matters is their leverage in the market, not their gross
> > numbers.
>
> First ya talk market numbers, then leverage.

Right, because it's obviously a combination of both.

> As good as the K2 is, do you really think many of the big guns are
> going to hook an under-$1k rig to their big antenna systems for CQWW
> or ARRL DX?

NO, which is the point I've been trying to make.

> That's not right. K2s have been used with various softwares including
> Writelog since at least 2000. They use the Kenwood command set. K2 can
> be almost completely PC controlled.

Right again and I straightened it out with them.

> > It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.
>
> And you say "Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome."? "QRP
> image" is just another term for it.

It ain't that simple, see my response to Eric for both the above.

> Second receiver? Just buy a second K2 and run SO2R.

I ain't about to do the first one let alone a second one.

> General coverage?
> You gonna listen to BBC during the contest?

Rumors to the contrary I do a helluva lot more with my gear than just
go contesting with it. Yes I do listen to the BBC and I expect to be
able to do that without having to have multiple HF radios and I'm
willing to pay for that capability.

> > The K2
> > "display" is ridiculous by today's expectations.
>
> Do you really expect a little rig that cost $600 in its basic form to
> have all the bells and whistles of rigs costing 2-3 times that much,
> AND the rx performance that beats 99% of the market? Get real!

Yes I certainly do expect a decent display in a $600 xcvr. Can't have
a decent display because they cost too much you say? Baloney. The
TS-50 display shows the operating freq, RIT offset, s-meter, agc
speed, mode and other parameters. All shown simultaneously. More to
the point my FT-1500M 2m mobile rig also displays all it's operating
parameters simultaneously AND the display is programmable, I can
jiggle it to show that the .195 machine is in Newtown Square for
instance. All for a lousy $139.95 new. Your turn to get real.

> The whole point of the K2 and K1 is to be different. No way a little
> CA outfit is gonna beat Yaecomwood at their own game, so they found a
> part of the market that Yaecomwood was ignoring. Just like Southgate
> Radio did many years ago.

I'm biting my tongue . . !

> > As far as Orions go they have a lost a lotta points for shabby
> > mechanicals, instabilities, lousy calibration, birdies and some other
> > lackings.
>
> ....ze barracuda firszt confuzes and distracts ze ozer feesh with
> clevaire antics, zo zey weel tell heem what he wantz to know.....

I simply reguritated statements made by knowledgable others, period.

>
> And in the end, in that arena where cost isn't even a secondary

> consideration, one criterion will decide: Which rig made the most
> points? To the really big guns, that's the bottom line.

Damn, you do think in straight lines. Life ain't a straight line and neither are the routes hams follow to come to purchase decisions. The big guns (and most of the rest of us) make their purchase decisions based on a whole slew of considerations. Rigs don't make points, dx contest operators make the points and given any of a number of possible choices of upscale rigs their scores will be so close together that any differences in the scores from rig to rig will be in the noise level.

Field Day. Antennas. Ah'm gone Good Buddy, ten fowah?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1871. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 00:25:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305291625.3b89002e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68071

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0305290845.4590bb37@posting.google.com>...
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030528230428.14509.00000409@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
> >
> > How about a contest for setup and/or takedown time of a station with certain
> > capabilities?
>
> We have that already. It's called Field Day. Also the VHF contests
> where mountaintopping is popular.
>
> FD rules require that all setup must take place no earlier than 24
> hours before the start of the contest. Which means that in EDST you
> can't begin setup until 2 PM Friday.
>
> The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities. How do you
> know what a station's capabilities are unless it is actually used on
> the air?
>
> For several years I ran FD single-handed. Class 1B-1. With my homebrew
> 100 watt station, tent, generator, mast, the whole works. Site was an
> open field with no facilities other than grass, which I had to mow in
> order to have a place for the tent, generator and 44 foot homebrew
> mast. No usable trees or buildings. Put it all up myself in a few
> hours and took it all down again afterward. Site was 73 miles from
> home and had to bring everything to the site and back in a 15 year old
> VW Rabbit. Setup took about 5 hours and takedown about half that.
>
> Best score I ever did was 2980 points - 629 CW and 11 phone QSOs. The
> 'phone QSOs were on 2m simplex. That year it drizzled rain almost the
> whole time (no lightning, thank heaven). Had a LOT of fun that year.
> Burned up a lot of calories, too.
>
> Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
> foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
>
> > Should require generator power.
>
> Why? Most generators are noisy, heavy and require lots of fuel, and
> they don't promote energy conservation. Battery/solar will do the job
> - why not use the best technology?
>
> If you insist on genset power, though, I know the unit I'd use. Takes

> about a minute to set up.
>
> > Also should have strong wind stability.
>
> Sounds like hot air to me.

This clown increasingly comes off as the Putz in drag.

1872. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 02:34:43 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3ED6C343.8070302@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 68082

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> I hope your right Bill. I had a incident where the FCC declaired a specific
> frequency for emergency comm in tornado situation. I asked a station to
> give us some room (2 kc up). He then proceeded to jump right on top of the
> net and call me and everyone there a liar.
>
> Takes all kinds.

Nope, doesn't take all kinds, we just happen to have all kinds.

1873. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 02:59:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68072

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
>
> If I'm double-posting kindly excuse me. Something is screwed up with
> either Windoze or Google today and I'm having a bad time of it.
>
>
>
>>>They're also grouchy as hell and as far
>>>as they're concerned there is no such thing as a "best" rcvr and
>>>they'll punch holes in any of 'em at will.
>>
>>There is always a best receiver...of the moment. That crown may only be
>>worn until the next "best receiver" hits the market.
>
>
> These guys don't churn radios at all. Not the top guns. The two I'm
> closest to bought 940s when they were new on the scene in the early
> 80s then after beating the crap out those for years bought MPs. Around
> ten years per xcvr. They get their money's worth and then some. It's
> far more important to them to have rigs which have been completely
> debugged and which they can operate by reflex / on autopilot than it
> is to have the latest and greatest. Since they crank out tens of
> thousands of contacts per year and consistently make the boxes with
> their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
> ï¿½em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.

Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
operator than there is to the rig, huh?

- Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......

1874. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 03:07:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED6CB22.1090402@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68073

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 5/29/03 3:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3ED6687B.7000104@psu.edu>
>
>
>>Also, don't make the mistake of thinking that using a handle grants
>>anonymity.
>
>
> Like I said...Ask Vipul!

And thereby providing the group with hours of fun!!! WE are in your debt Steve. 8^)

You know something like this could be a good hobby. Outing the anonymii...

- Mike KB3EIA -

1875. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 03:26:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb6j0nln0@208.207.71.154>
Source record: 68074

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bb32fgngn1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bb19om$2o8$0@208.207.71.135...
> > >
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > > > > > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough to
> > "slide
> > > > up" a few
> > > > > > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with its
> > > channelized
> > > > > > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally
> unfamiliar.
> > > > We'll
> > > > > > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding one
> > vacant
> > > > is pretty
> > > > > well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most
> > likely
> > > > all 5 will
> > > > > be.
> > > > >
> > > > But if the need is for an emergency, that should
> > > > take priority of any other comms.
> > >
> > > Sure. But one of the strengths of ham radio has always been the ability

> > to set
> > > up wherever one can find a clear frequency, and move to find one when
> > necessary.
> > > Even though emergencies do take precedence that doesn't assure that any
> of
> > the 5
> > > channels will be available for emergency use at any given time. Early in
> > an
> > > emergency before the word gets out they are likely to be overeloaded
> with
> > > routine use and thus too cluttered to use.
> >
> > Dick,
> > I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
> > overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
> > MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
> > Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
> > accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
> > current "routine" use.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
>
> I hope your right Bill. I had a incident where the FCC declaired a specific
> frequency for emergency comm in tornado situation. I asked a station to
> give us some room (2 kc up). He then proceeded to jump right on top of the
> net and call me and everyone there a liar.
>
> Takes all kinds.

Well, there you have it. It only takes a few -maybe very few- clowns to stall
things out.

Dick

1876. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 03:30:46 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb6j96$44k$0@208.207.71.154>
Source record: 68075

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> I would think that in a 'real event' any method of maintaining commo to/from
> an area would not be a problem.
>
> I know I'll use whatever means are available to me to maintain commo. If
> its cw, or digital...matters not. Just get the job done.
>
> Then worry about the 'consequences'.
>

Agreed, but when no one uses a mode you suddenly find you need, who you gonna talk to? No one will be monitoring or otherwise listening in any mode except USB, so you can call till you're blue in the face on any other and all you're likely to get for a response is "Hey that dummy doesn't know that you're supposed to use only USB on this band!".

1877. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 03:45:52 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529234552.15044.00000587@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68076

From: N2EY

>The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.

Its for "fun".

>For several years I ran FD single-handed. Class 1B-1. With my homebrew
>100 watt station, tent, generator, mast, the whole works. Site was an
>open field with no facilities other than grass, which I had to mow in
>order to have a place for the tent, generator and 44 foot homebrew
>mast. No usable trees or buildings. Put it all up myself in a few
>hours and took it all down again afterward. Site was 73 miles from
>home and had to bring everything to the site and back in a 15 year old
>VW Rabbit. Setup took about 5 hours and takedown about half that.

Most Hams, including myself, are not EEs (IF you can call me a "Ham").

>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
>

Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.

> Battery/solar will do the job
>- why not use the best technology?

I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would like
to know how they use one's car as power.

>> Also should have strong wind stability.
>
>Sounds like hot air to me.

Believe it or not, the random group of Hams I met a few weeks ago did indeed
plan for windy conditions. I got to see some of their adaptations for the wind.

And heavy winds were there that weekend, even the whole night. The setup lasted
under those windy conditions.

1878. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 03:58:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030529235807.15044.00000588@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68077

From: k4yz

>>Some Hams I met a few weeks ago could do very well in a food eating contest.
>
>
> But no cow, I imagine. I want a LOT of dead cow there!

Why would you imagine no cow? Remember, I joined a RANDOM group of Hams.

Also, I mentioned some of the items consumed in an earlier post. Some meat items included hamburgers, chili (with beef), bacon, sausage, ham, chicken, shrimp, and more. Seems like you would be very happy there.

>>Did you know it takes more energy to heat a room when there is a greater
>>volume
>>of people (in other words, more fat people) in the room? I was told this by
>>an
>>Engineer'g. Prof.
>
> Your "enginer'g prof" was an idiot.

Okay, but this Prof was very large, himself. Someone was turning up the thermostat and the Prof made that statement. Why would he say that if it wasn't true?

1879. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 04:12:31 UTC
From: "L." <Tech_nospam_@DP.NET>
Message-ID: <bb6lro$2uek$1@news.dp.net>
Source record: 68079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner

Stealing toilet paper? Man, what is this world coming to? Speaking of Dayton, how was it? I've never been there yet (maybe some day). Used to always hear hams on 2 meters talking of their adventures. Haven't heard a peep on radio thus far, but it helps if one flips the power button to "on".
--
Junk Man Skip

"Catch ME, Spank ME." <public@e.mail> wrote in message news:vcsg7gammnfg63@corp.supernews.com...
> "Randy Thomas" <TP@pradirandco.org> wrote in news:bagtn2$s5j$0
> @pita.alt.net:
>
> > Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
> > at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
> > mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
> > hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
> > the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
> > cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the
> > blanks. Hope you washed your hands after shaking hands
> > with other hams.
> >
> > Thanks,
> >
> > Randy
>
>
> Could've been the FCC took the paper. I hear they're running short on paper
> to print ham licenses.
>
> Toilet Paper is plenty good ham licenses since restructuring took effect.
>
>

1880. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 04:14:41 UTC
From: The Patriot <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <8cmddvkhlhufpam09lgluna0u6l3seute6@4ax.com>
Source record: 68078

On 29 May 2003 06:06:44 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: The Patriot bogus@fake.com
>>Date: 5/28/03 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <fh1bdvs28701onbropnpmuq8vdrgmhigdo@4ax.com>

> Perhaps you need a tutorial on my qualifications on squad-level weapons
>and my proficiency therewith? And my temerity to use them.

Squad level weapons? Bwahahahahahahahahaha. You'd probably shoot
yourself in the foot, Barney. You're almost as big a pompous ass as
Roll is.

> "Patriot"'s don't threaten other Americans...Unless of course you consider
>yourself a "patriot" for a different flag, Scummy One.

Nobody threatened you, Mr. Paranoia.

--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1881. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 04:16:44 UTC
From: The Patriot <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <hmmddvgcat86an5lva9751fhu8b8u1ee9j@4ax.com>
Source record: 68080

On Thu, 29 May 2003 16:07:23 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

> FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
>morning - much less in fact.

Well, it's not smart to make it easier for the nuts to find you,
though.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

1882. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 04:23:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530002339.15044.00000589@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68081

From the partners:
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
AND
Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

K4CAP said:
>I think you should ask Vipul Shah how much good it did him to remain
>"anonymous", Your Supreme Putziness.

No, Sir. You are mistaken. I did not purposely remain anonymous. I only refused to give my callsign, which you found out.

The time has passed where you can keep bringing this up (which was never valid to begin with anyway).

There have been several posts since your "outing". Any you know they are from me, so not anonymous.

Then his partner, mjc5 said:
>FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
>morning - much less in fact.

How do U know?

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! !

mjc5 said:
>>Also, don't make the mistake of thinking that using a handle grants
>>anonymity.
Then K4CAP said:
> Like I said...Ask Vipul!

Dont U know? It was not anonymous - that "handle" was just for YOU, Steve.

Then mjc5 said:
>You know something like this could be a good hobby. Outing the anonymii...

Like I explained above, that doesn't apply to me. I am not anonymous.

1883. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 07:31:33 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0305292331.22c99897@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68083

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...

> - Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......

I'll swap ya my Yaesu FT-757GX mkII, Mike...!?!?

Steve, K4CAP

1884. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 09:39:00 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0305300139.6013f671@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68084

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030530002339.15044.00000589@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> From the partners:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> AND
> Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> K4CAP said:
> >I think you should ask Vipul Shah how much good it did him to remain
> >"anonymous", Your Supreme Putziness.
>
> No, Sir. You are mistaken. I did not purposely remain anonymous. I only refused
> to give my callsign, which you found out.

You are lying.

You were REPEATEDLY asked your name and callsign which you refused
to render. You NEVER rendered either until I discovered it on my own.

> The time has passed where you can keep bringing this up (which was never valid
> to begin with anyway).

It was very valid. It demonstrates that you are not being
truthful.

> There have been several posts since your "outing". Any you know they are from
> me, so not anonymous.
>
> Then his partner, mjc5 said:
> >FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
> >morning - much less in fact.
>
> How do U know?
>
> BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! !

Now you're a copy cat too?

> mjc5 said:
> >>Also, don't make the mistake of thinking that using a handle grants
> >>anonymity.
> Then K4CAP said:
> > Like I said...Ask Vipul!
>
> Dont U know? It was not anonymous - that "handle" was just for YOU, Steve.

Vipul, you have been REPEATEDLY proven to be non-truthful. WHY
in the light of evidence to the contrary keep trying to say anything
different?

> Then mjc5 said:
> >You know something like this could be a good hobby. Outing the anonymii...
>
> Like I explained above, that doesn't apply to me. I am not anonymous.

Not anymore you're not. And not because of any initiative on
your part, either.

Please stop lying.

Steve, K4CAP

1885. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 09:41:19 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0305300141.45c22ba2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68085

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030529235807.15044.00000588@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz

Check your references, Vipul.

> >>Some Hams I met a few weeks ago could do very well in a food eating contest.
> >
> >
> > But no cow, I imagine. I want a LOT of dead cow there!
>
> Why would you imagine no cow? Remember, I joined a RANDOM group of Hams.
>
> Also, I mentioned some of the items consumed in an earlier post. Some meat
> items included hamburgers, chili (with beef), bacon, sausage, ham, chicken,
> shrimp, and more. Seems like you would be very happy there.
>
> >>Did you know it takes more energy to heat a room when there is a greater
> >>volume
> >>of people (in other words, more fat people) in the room? I was told this by
> >>an
> >>Engineer'g. Prof.
> >
> > Your "enginer'g prof" was an idiot.
>
> Okay, but this Prof was very large, himself. Someone was turning up the
> thermostat and the Prof made that statement. Why would he say that if it wasn't
> true?

Why do YOU say things that are untrue, Vipul?

Steve, K4CAP

1886. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 11:15:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530071513.23745.00000276@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68086

In article <20030529234552.15044.00000587@mb-m12.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: N2EY
>
>>The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
>
>Its for "fun".

So is the rest of Field Day.

Are you willing to start paying people to do the things you want them to do?

You're forgetting the most important point: The only way to KNOW what the capabilities of a station are is to actually operate it. Not only to prove that everyhting works, but to find out how well it actually works under real world conditions.

I suspect you don't like those real-world conditions....
>
>>For several years I ran FD single-handed.

....

>>Setup took about 5 hours and takedown about half that.
>
>Most Hams, including myself, are not EEs (IF you can call me a "Ham").

What does that have to do with anything? Nothing that I did those FD weekends required EE level knowledge or skills. What was required was real-world skills and knowledge.
>
>>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
>>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
>
>Okay, lets see who can run longer.

I run every morning. Last Saturday I ran for 45 minutes. I've done much longer runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?

>Just, joking.

Not, funny.

>> Battery/solar will do the job
>>- why not use the best technology?
>
>I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would like

>to know how they use one's car as power.

Didn't they teach you anything in school?

One word: Inverter.
>
>>> Also should have strong wind stability.
>>
>>Sounds like hot air to me.
>
>Believe it or not, the random group of Hams I met a few weeks ago did indeed
>plan for windy conditions. I got to see some of their adaptations for the
>wind.

My mast stood up to very windy conditions.
>
>And heavy winds were there that weekend, even the whole night. The setup
>lasted under those windy conditions.
>
I've had to put up with a lot of wind from the likes of you and some
others.....

W3RV is right....

1887. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 12:51:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb7k9a$tv7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68087

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bb6j0n$ln$0@208.207.71.154...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:bb32fg$ngn$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bb19om$2o8$0@208.207.71.135...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > > > > > > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough
to
> > > "slide
> > > > > > up" a few
> > > > > > > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with
its
> > > > channelized
> > > > > > > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally
> > unfamiliar.
> > > > > > We'll
> > > > > > > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding
one
> > > vacant
> > > > > > is pretty
> > > > > > well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most
> > > likely
```

> > > > > all 5 will
> > > > > > be.
> > > > > >
> > > > > But if the need is for an emergency, that should
> > > > > take priority of any other comms.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure. But one of the strengths of ham radio has always been the
ability
> > > to set
> > > > up wherever one can find a clear frequency, and move to find one
when
> > > necessary.
> > > > Even though emergencies do take precedence that doesn't assure that
any
> > of
> > > the 5
> > > > channels will be available for emergency use at any given time.
Early in
> > > an
> > > > emergency before the word gets out they are likely to be overeloaded
> > with
> > > > routine use and thus too cluttered to use.
> > >
> > > Dick,
> > > I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
> > > overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
> > > MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
> > > Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
> > > accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
> > > current "routine" use.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > I hope your right Bill. I had a incident where the FCC declaired a
specific
> > frequency for emergency comm in tornado situation. I asked a station to
> > give us some room (2 kc up). He then proceeded to jump right on top of
the
> > net and call me and everyone there a liar.
> >
> > Takes all kinds.
>
> Well, there you have it. It only takes a few -maybe very few- clowns to
stall
> things out.
>

> Dick

I think there's a big difference, however, with the 5MHz channels.
Both the FCC and NTIA stand a much greater chance of hearing
the situation where a ham didn't surrender the channel to emergency
use which could then result in the ham being cited. It may well
be that those channels could be tape recorded on a continuos ongoing
basis at various points to provide a definitive record of how hams are
actually using the channels once they can do so. Monitoring 5 channels
is a piece of cake these days as there is recording equipment capable of
recording many separate audio feeds.

Personally, I'd love to knowthat there was such oversight, at least
initially and/or upon request if a specific ham abuser is ID'd.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1888. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 13:05:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305300505.4e09aa4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68088

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED58F0D.7E0C4032@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > If I'm double-posting kindly excuse me. Something is screwed up with
> > either Windoze or Google today and I'm having a bad time of it.
>
> No problem. Just pull an Anderson and tell me that it was a cleverly
> laid trap and that we fell into it.

Gawd forbid I should ever sink to his level.

> I'm not going to make any manufacturer rich either. I owned the Paragon
> for six years before buying the Omni VI and I owned the Omni VI for a
> full ten years.

Common sense. You got your money's worth. There are churners out there
though.

> Goose, W8AV up in Ohio Amish country to my northwest
> has a shack full of TS-940's for his multi-multi setup.

Great xcvrs, a real classic. I've had one for several years. Has all
the options except the voice card and is loaded with Inrads. Bought it
from PVRCer w4rw. But I've only managed to get one good six-month
period of heavy use out of it and one Field Day. Did not take long to
get very attached to it. It's a piece of cake to operate yet it has
bells & whistles galore. The passband tuning and variable bandwith
setup is a dream come true. If ya can't dredge a weak one up out of
the crud with a 940 it can't be done except maybe in the case of a
Sherwood R-4C on 160 & 80. The front end shows the K2 folk how the big
boys can play the BDRs game when they choose to do so. And it was
designed well over twenty years ago.

I put it on the air last FD and three contacts into the event it
completely lost it mind. Works fine on ssb, goes absolutely
silly-bonkers on cw and that terminated FD 2002 for me. I haven't
packed it off to the Kenwood shop yet but I gotta get around to that.
Then I'm gonna offload it. Superb radio but it's full of creaky old
point-to-point wiring, parts are quickly becoming unavailable, etc.
It's time.

I shoulda taken the TS-50 to the FD site with the 940 but I ran outta
patience with hauling "stuff". This time I'm going with both the 847

and the TS-50, I yam not gonna get caught with my pants down again.

> > Thus I've
> > bought into being a TS-50 station in a world of 940s and I'm
> > comfortable with the limitations. But come the day when I get some
> > beams up and 80 & 160 antennas I'll be all over some high-end xcvr.
>
> That was my dream and I'm happy that we found a place where I could make
> it come true on a modest scale. My antenna farm would have been
> considered super in the 1960's and 1970's. Nowadays it seems pretty
> commonplace.

You've done well. I've seen the .JPGs of your "modest" antenna farm. I only wish!

> It got scaled back a few notches when I realized that I'd
> be moving into the age group where maintaining three 70 to 100 foot
> towers with stacked monobanders would become impractical. Thus the
> trapless tribander, nothing with gain on 80m and the modest Cushcraft
> "shorty forty" on the two towers. One tower has the Hazer and the other
> cranks down and tilts over. I can work on that stuff for years yet.

Smart moves. Father Time is creeping up on many the big guns I keep referencing and they still have the multiple 150 footers. They're now paying arms and legs to commercial tower mechanics to keep their antenna farms up and running. Back when any number of us usta scamper up and down the things like monkeys weather be damned. Dunno how many hours I spent dangling from nothing at 150-180 feet horsing full size 40M beams around but dozens. Today? Fuhgeddit - not me 'ole buddy, those days are over, hit the Yellow Pages and start dialing around.

> > That changes a bunch when the spots come into play. In this situation
> > all club stations are on the same overhead network and the need for
> > software rig contol becomes a gotta-have.
>
> I'll have to make a pilgrimage one of these days to one of the big PVRC
> or FRC multi-multis.

You need to do that. From where you are W3LPL should be the first stop ya make. He's a pile of contesting history by himself. You'd enjoy a visit to N3RS. His Telrex 3 el 40 is 150 feet above a 150 foot cliff and looms over the PA turnpike two minutes before the Downingtown interchange headed East. There are others. Let me know when the urge overcomes you.

As a bit of an aside I think you'd be amazed at the volume of homebrewing these guys do. They don't reinvent the wheel and brew the radios but they do brew just about everything else. You ougta see some of the beams they come up with. N3RS has a 5 over over 5 over 5 self-designed & built stack on 15M, fifteen elements. Then come the hombrewed station control systems. CPUs, sensors, preamps, filters, you'd have to see it to believe it. Packaged in nice one-off

enclosures with custom silk-screened panels. No, hombrewing is not
dead.

> One famed OH2 I know visited a large East Coast
> (non-FRC) multi-multi one year while I was living in Finland and came
> away with the idea that the operation was a total goat rope.

What's a "goat rope"??! Haywired? Yeah, they're out there. FD stations
with big amps.

> > The only shot I have at a
> > half-decent score is to play the search & pounce game so even I'll
> > have Writelog rig control running here as a lame single op with the
> > 847.
>
> I don't connect to the Pittsburgh cluster if I'm going for score.

Unassisted is certainly an option. I gotta at least try operating
assisted, maybe I'll like it, maybe I won't. I'm OK with operating
unassisted because my scores have always lopsided, higher mults/q's
ratio than average. I'm not a big-time runner but I usually did well
with the mults.

> > tech info to the software writers so Omni support is probably already
> > in both or is close. It's up to Elecraft and the K2 owners to do the
> > leaning if they wanna join the parade.
>
> If it is compatible with the Kenwood driver, should be no problem. The
> Paragon used to work with the Icom IC-735 drivers for logging programs.

The K2 uses the Kenwood command set per several spankings I got. It
would be nice if Elecraft & Writelog sed so in their websites.
Especially when there are guys out there saying that the mainstream
loggers don't support the K2.

> > > From the Orion specifications sheet:
> > >
> > > "SSB sensitivity: <0.18 ï¿½V for 10 dB SINAD at 2.4 kHz BW, pre-amp on
> > > typical"
> > >
> > > "Internal birdies: None stronger than specified sensitivity."
> > >
> > > If they're lying about the specs, I haven't yet found one of the
> > > birdies.
> >
> > Yeah, they listened.
>
> It helps that they have Doug Smith designing and Scott W4PA, an active
> contester, providing his input and that of others.

Looks like the K2 reflector has that kind of "factory participation &
support" too. 'Tis good. We should live long enough to see the guys
who design the rice boxes jump into a U.S. based rig reflector.

(IC-7800)
>
> Earlier reports of that price may have been incorrect. The latest TT
> reflector scuttlebutt mentions something about $7k list and $6k street
> price.

That makes a lot more sense. It'll probably gravitate down into the
$4-4.5k range. I think my FT-847 lists for $2300, I paid HRO $1200 for
it.

> If true, that makes it only about twice as expensive as an
> Orion. By the way, would you have been more tempted to buy if they
> called it, as one wag suggested, the O'Ryan?

Bwaaahaha! No!

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1889. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 13:25:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305300525.dfd7d51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68089

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...

> > their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
> > ?em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.
>
>
> Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
> operator than there is to the rig, huh?

A resounding yes. You can spend yer life nit-picking yer way thru xcvr
technical specs like we've been doing here, then pop $4k on the latest
& greatest wunderbox and when it's all said and done it's the op which
is the biggest variable.

> - Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......

If your 745 works for you it works, end of.

w3rv

1890. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 14:49:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ED76F5C.6090800@psu.edu>
Source record: 68090

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
>
>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
>>
>
>> - Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......
>
>
> I'll swap ya my Yaesu FT-757GX mkII, Mike...!?!?

That's a coincidence, I almost bought one of them once. Seems like a
decent enough radio.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1891. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 15:03:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ED772DB.3040808@psu.edu>
Source record: 68091

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
>
>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
>>
>
>>>their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
>>>?em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.
>>
>>
>> Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
>>operator than there is to the rig, huh?
>
>
> A resounding yes. You can spend yer life nit-picking yer way thru xcvr
> technical specs like we've been doing here, then pop $4k on the latest
> & greatest wunderbox and when it's all said and done it's the op which
> is the biggest variable.

That's hobbies for you! My XYL has a saying about people who get huge trucks with huge tires, massive amateur telescopes, and monster towers. Something about other parts being inversely porportional.....

But back to the contesting, I have been amazed at comparing my scores as I have "matured". I'm not winning yet (tho' I did place third in my class in NEQP last year, and helped move my club to second in it's class in last years FD) but I think I just might in a few more years!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1892. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 15:33:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3ED779AD.9010301@psu.edu>
Source record: 68092

Vshah101 wrote:
> From the partners:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> AND
> Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> K4CAP said:
>
>>I think you should ask Vipul Shah how much good it did him to remain
>>"anonymous", Your Supreme Putziness.
>
>
> No, Sir. You are mistaken. I did not purposely remain anonymous. I only refused
> to give my callsign, which you found out.
>
> The time has passed where you can keep bringing this up (which was never valid
> to begin with anyway).
>
> There have been several posts since your "outing". Any you know they are from
> me, so not anonymous.
>
> Then his partner, mjc5 said:
>
>>FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
>>morning - much less in fact.
>
>
> How do U know?

Ever get injured in a pileup on your computer?

> BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! !

heh, heh, ... I don't get it

Answer me this. I have used my real name and email addy since day one.

How come:
I only get a few pieces of spam a day. I include the email I get from
infected computers in that number. Most of the others come from
scattershot approaches due to the way my employer sets email - initials,
a number, and of course the domain. Some of these spammers are sending
out email to every mjc5 on the net as well as every other combo the
spammers can think of. Not much I can do about that.

The crazies haven't hit me yet. They could you know. My phone number is in the book, my name and addy can be looked up on the ARRL, FCC, QRZ, whoever's databases. Unless a person cuts themselves off from the world and lives in a cabin without any utilities and grows their own food, etc., they are broadcasting to the world who and where they are.

> mjc5 said:
>
>>>Also, don't make the mistake of thinking that using a handle grants
>>>anonymity.
>>
> Then K4CAP said:
>
>> Like I said...Ask Vipul!
>
>
> Dont U know? It was not anonymous - that "handle" was just for YOU, Steve.
>
> Then mjc5 said:
>
>>You know something like this could be a good hobby. Outing the anonymii...
>
>
> Like I explained above, that doesn't apply to me. I am not anonymous.

Seems to me you were trying to remain anonymous. You act now like you were upfront with us when at the time you were certainly weren't.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1893. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 16:47:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305300847.6e49f2cd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68093

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bb7k9a$tv7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> I think there's a big difference, however, with the 5MHz channels.
> Both the FCC and NTIA stand a much greater chance of hearing
> the situation where a ham didn't surrender the channel to emergency
> use which could then result in the ham being cited. It may well
> be that those channels could be tape recorded on a continuos ongoing
> basis at various points to provide a definitive record of how hams are
> actually using the channels once they can do so. Monitoring 5 channels
> is a piece of cake these days as there is recording equipment capable of
> recording many separate audio feeds.

All good points, Bill.
>
> Personally, I'd love to knowthat there was such oversight, at least
> initially and/or upon request if a specific ham abuser is ID'd.

Be careful what you wish for - we just may get it. And the
consequences may go far beyond citing the ham involved. The entire ARS
gets a black eye under such circumstances. It would be kinda hard to
justify our allocations if other services who want them can play tapes
of hams not knowing how to behave properly on the air.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1894. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 16:49:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0305300849.29739f23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68094

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305300525.dfd7d51@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
> > > ?em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.
> >
> >
> > Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
> > operator than there is to the rig, huh?
>
> A resounding yes. You can spend yer life nit-picking yer way thru xcvr
> technical specs like we've been doing here, then pop $4k on the latest
> & greatest wunderbox and when it's all said and done it's the op which
> is the biggest variable.

Sure. But ya don't see the big guns giving up any sort of advantage in
rig, antennas, computers, location, etc.

> > - Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......
>
> If your 745 works for you it works, end of.
>
My K2 and Type 7 work for me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1895. Re: Dayton Toilet Paper Theft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 17:00:03 UTC
From: Kappy the Klown <cfirske2000@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ed78e48@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 68095
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner

Yes. believe it......some hams are SO F-CKING CHEAP
that they will steal toilet paper at the hamfests. I've seen
it at Shelby NC. Dayton was a washout. Rained all
weekend, outside tailgaters left on saturday and whoever
was left had obscenly high prices for radios. One guy
wanted $300 for a 20 year old Tempo 2020 HF rig.
Ha Ha Ha! good luck finding a sucker for that "sweet
deal" - he should have tried e-Bay, more suckers and
shill-bid auctions per mouse click than you'll ever find!
As fo us, this is/was the LAST YEAR we will ever goto
Dayton. It's too damm expensive and too much of a
hassle to get into and out of the Hara Arena. No fun.

"L." <Tech_nospam_@DP.NET> wrote in message
news:bb6lro$2uek$1@news.dp.net...
> Stealing toilet paper? Man, what is this world coming to? Speaking of
> Dayton, how was it? I've never been there yet (maybe some day). Used to
> always hear hams on 2 meters talking of their adventures. Haven't heard a
> peep on radio thus far, but it helps if one flips the power button to
"on".
> --
> Junk Man Skip
>
> "Catch ME, Spank ME." <public@e.mail> wrote in message
> news:vcsg7gammnfg63@corp.supernews.com...
> > "Randy Thomas" <TP@pradirandco.org> wrote in news:bagtn2$s5j$0
> > @pita.alt.net:
> >
> > > Will any hams who stole toilet paper from the rest rooms
> > > at Dayton please return same to the Dayton Convention or
> > > mail a check for payment of same. Contrary to what some
> > > hams believed, toilet paper in the rest rooms was not one of
> > > the "freebie" hand outs. We ran out of toilet paper in many
> > > cases and hams having to take a dump.....well....you fill in the
> > > blanks. Hope you washed your hands after shaking hands
> > > with other hams.
> > >
> > > Thanks,
> > >
> > > Randy
> >
> >
> > Could've been the FCC took the paper. I hear they're running short on

> paper
> > to print ham licenses.
> >
> > Toilet Paper is plenty good ham licenses since restructuring took
effect.
> >
> >
>
>

1896. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 17:20:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb83rb$1eq$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68096

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bb6j96$44k$0@208.207.71.154...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > I would think that in a 'real event' any method of maintaining commo
to/from
> > an area would not be a problem.
> >
> > I know I'll use whatever means are available to me to maintain commo.
If
> > its cw, or digital...matters not. Just get the job done.
> >
> > Then worry about the 'consequences'.
> >
>
> Agreed, but when no one uses a mode you suddenly find you need, who you
gonna
> talk to? No one will be monitoring or otherwise listening in any mode
except
> USB, so you can call till you're blue in the face on any other and all
you're
> likely to get for a response is "Hey that dummy doesn't know that you're
> supposed to use only USB on this band!".
>
Wait a minute here.....I don't even follow that. First off if your in the
USB mode and someone comes up on say...CW...you can tell the mode. Or say
on PSK, or RTTY, or packet.

If one is not operational in most to all of the common modes he should stick
to the general rag chewing and talk about the weather.

Dan/W4NTI

1897. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 17:25:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb844q$k91$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68097

>
> I think there's a big difference, however, with the 5MHz channels.
> Both the FCC and NTIA stand a much greater chance of hearing
> the situation where a ham didn't surrender the channel to emergency
> use which could then result in the ham being cited. It may well
> be that those channels could be tape recorded on a continuos ongoing
> basis at various points to provide a definitive record of how hams are
> actually using the channels once they can do so. Monitoring 5 channels
> is a piece of cake these days as there is recording equipment capable of
> recording many separate audio feeds.
>
> Personally, I'd love to knowthat there was such oversight, at least
> initially and/or upon request if a specific ham abuser is ID'd.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

I also hope folks in the right places monitor these 'channels'. I also hope they hear, record, send a NAL to and collect the fines. In fact that would also be nice if they did that on 14.313 and other spots.

But ya know sumtin? I just dont think its gonna happen. I hope Im wrong.

Dan/W4NTI

1898. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 17:26:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb8478ker1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68098

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0305300847.6e49f2cd@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bb7k9a$tv7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > I think there's a big difference, however, with the 5MHz channels.
> > Both the FCC and NTIA stand a much greater chance of hearing
> > the situation where a ham didn't surrender the channel to emergency
> > use which could then result in the ham being cited. It may well
> > be that those channels could be tape recorded on a continuos ongoing
> > basis at various points to provide a definitive record of how hams are
> > actually using the channels once they can do so. Monitoring 5 channels
> > is a piece of cake these days as there is recording equipment capable of
> > recording many separate audio feeds.
>
> All good points, Bill.
> >
> > Personally, I'd love to knowthat there was such oversight, at least
> > initially and/or upon request if a specific ham abuser is ID'd.
>
> Be careful what you wish for - we just may get it. And the
> consequences may go far beyond citing the ham involved. The entire ARS
> gets a black eye under such circumstances. It would be kinda hard to
> justify our allocations if other services who want them can play tapes
> of hams not knowing how to behave properly on the air.
> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

If it ain't been done already there is no need in it. Just check out 75 at
night sometime on a night of the full moon.

Dan/W4NTI

1899. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 17:34:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb84sg$d4h$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68100

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0305300847.6e49f2cd@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bb7k9a$tv7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > I think there's a big difference, however, with the 5MHz channels.
> > Both the FCC and NTIA stand a much greater chance of hearing
> > the situation where a ham didn't surrender the channel to emergency
> > use which could then result in the ham being cited. It may well
> > be that those channels could be tape recorded on a continuos ongoing
> > basis at various points to provide a definitive record of how hams are
> > actually using the channels once they can do so. Monitoring 5 channels
> > is a piece of cake these days as there is recording equipment capable of
> > recording many separate audio feeds.
>
> All good points, Bill.
> >
> > Personally, I'd love to knowthat there was such oversight, at least
> > initially and/or upon request if a specific ham abuser is ID'd.
>
> Be careful what you wish for - we just may get it. And the
> consequences may go far beyond citing the ham involved. The entire ARS
> gets a black eye under such circumstances. It would be kinda hard to
> justify our allocations if other services who want them can play tapes
> of hams not knowing how to behave properly on the air.
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Yes there's some risk, but it would be great to get rid of a few
of the extremist jerks. The ARS would benefit greatly (IMHO).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1900. is H.A.A.R.P. doing this?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 17:34:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb84lu$p1m$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68099

Has anyone else noticed how pityful conditions have been on HF since around 1997 when H.A.A.R.P. fired up? Especially in summertime when the bands basically die.

Go to http://www.haarp.alaska.edu and get an education on what their up to.

I have operated HF radio since 1961, in several places on this globe. Not only ham but military too. And I can not EVER remember such crummy summertime propagation. And that included peaks and nulls of the sunspot cycle.

I am aware that right now we are in the middle of a 'solar burp'. But think about it. Or am I just being paranoid?

Dan/W4NTI

1901. Re: is H.A.A.R.P. doing this?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 18:01:00 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <w%MBa.2620$6T7.1487@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 68001

Dan,

I'd bet on B:)

If you consider how many transmitters are running on this ol' planet ... forget VLF and LF ... start with MF and many commercial broadcast stations running perhaps from 250 watts to 50,000 watts. Then go up and there are many international broadcast stations which run more than a couple of watts. Amateurs, although fairly low power, are on the air daily from MF to SHF and beyond. CB is running on the high end of HF. Some of those stations run a tad more than 5 or 10 watts. Next comes commercial television stations; in the USA, channel two runs between 56 and 60 MHz and they are definitely *not* low power. Next comes commercial FM broadcasting in the USA from 88 to 108 MHz. UHF television is not known for low erp. These are mostly fairly high power stations and a *lot* of them. 3,000,000 watts erp is a drop in the bucket. Heck, back in the HF days for the military, it wasn't unusual to come up with a million watts erp. Tack 40 or 50 kilowatts into the optimized center of a big rhombic with 15+ dB gain or so ... That one rhombic I remember was 200 feet in the air, 600 feet on a leg, and located over salt water. A formidable sky hook, indeed! Phone patches were run with excellent copy at 20 watts out of a homebrew transistor rig.

Be aware if you are going after certificates that amateur equipment and propagation seem to have a 'necessity detector'. The more you want and need another state/country/grid ... the less everything cooperates with you :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.486 / Virus Database: 284 - Release Date: 5/29/03

1902. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 19:37:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED7B2DD.1050105@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68002

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
>
> Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
> operator than there is to the rig, huh?

Good antennas should help more than the latest fancy radio. Kilowatt
linears help too.
Also operating skill should make a difference.....

>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......

All you really need is a decent front end (atmospheric noise is higher than
noise inside a modern radio anyway) and a reasonable transmitter with
correctly adjusted processing. Having a 5 element 80 meter yagi helps
too..... :-) (Heard that someone in Australia actually has such a
monster).

One thing about the new 5Mhz channels, top power is about that produced
by a "barefoot" modern transceiver with some slightly lossy coax and dipole
antenna. So most everyone will have an equal chance to be the first
to do WAS on 5. Assuming someone in North Dakota gets on 5.....

>
>

1903. Re: is H.A.A.R.P. doing this?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 21:07:03 UTC
From: ac7xc@aol.com.edu
Message-ID: <20030530170703.18689.00000399@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68003

>Has anyone else noticed how pityful conditions have been on HF since around
>1997 when H.A.A.R.P. fired up?

What are you talking about? HF conditions are related to the ionosphere and the Sun. Right now there is a major solar flare effecting HF conditions. Although 6 meters has been open and so has 10 meters for short periods because of E-skip. Do some basic reading on the Van Allen Belts, the Ionosphere, the Sun and understanding HF propagation. You might as well as blame poor HF propagation conditions on UFO's and Bigfoot instead of HAARP!
;)

Best Regards, Keith
--
NW Oregon Radio Page
http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
remove .edu to reply by e-mail.

1904. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 22:28:48 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530182848.20945.00000740@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68004

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>Seems to me you were trying to remain anonymous.

No, I gave full details to my account of events, including locations. If I were trying to be anonymous, I would not do that.

You act now like you
>were upfront with us when at the time you were certainly weren't.

No, just giving my honest opinions, being truthful in my account of events- such as Field day, Hamfests, local club meetings, etc. Without giving my callsign. No need to do that to make my point.

1905. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 22:32:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530183217.20945.00000741@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68005

From Steve Robeson, K4CAP

>Why do YOU say things that are untrue, Vipul?

My account of events has been based on what people actually said at certain events which I attended. I have formed logical conclusions from what I observed.

1906. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 22:46:38 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530184638.20945.00000743@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68006

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Its for "fun".
>
>So is the rest of Field Day.

Boring to some. Fun for Hams, maybe.

>You're forgetting the most important point: The only way to KNOW what the
>capabilities of a station are is to actually operate it.

Yes, thats standard Ham radio hype. You don't need Field Day to operate your
radio.

>I suspect you don't like those real-world conditions...

Field day is not "real-world" conditions. The Hams I met up with, operated
under more difficult conditions including strong winds. The purpose of Field
Day is not for "real-world" conditions. Anything learned in that aspect is
chance correlation.

>I've had to put up with a lot of wind from the likes of you and some
>others...

Since you keep bringing up wind. I could mention that the random group of Hams
I joined were skilled in passing wind. Of course, the chili helped. As you
know, they ate ALOT. Also, they were well prepared for their station. However,
it seems, they were not prepared for taking a shower.

1907. Re: is H.A.A.R.P. doing this?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 23:02:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb8ns7muf1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68007

What Im talking about is H.A.A.R.P. punching holes in the ionosphere. How about reading my post then commenting again. And while your at it go read the info H.A.A.R.P. provides on the internet. If that don't get you thinking then this discussion is over.

Dan/W4NTI

"Keith" <ac7xc@aol.com.edu> wrote in message news:20030530170703.18689.00000399@mb-m20.aol.com...
> >Has anyone else noticed how pityful conditions have been on HF since around
> >1997 when H.A.A.R.P. fired up?
>
> What are you talking about? HF conditions are related to the ionosphere and the
> Sun. Right now there is a major solar flare effecting HF conditions. Although 6
> meters has been open and so has 10 meters for short periods because of E-skip.
> Do some basic reading on the Van Allen Belts, the Ionosphere, the Sun and
> understanding HF propagation. You might as well as blame poor HF propagation
> conditions on UFO's and Bigfoot instead of HAARP!
> ;)
>
>
> Best Regards, Keith
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
> remove .edu to reply by e-mail.

1908. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 23:04:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bb8o3q$8ei$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68008

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030530182848.20945.00000740@mb-m27.aol.com...

> No, just giving my honest opinions, being truthful in my account of
events-
> such as Field day, Hamfests, local club meetings, etc. Without giving my
> callsign. No need to do that to make my point

Your right....but to establish credibility it wouldn't hurt.

See my point?

Dan/W4NTI

1909. Re: is H.A.A.R.P. doing this?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-30 23:27:16 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86add46mnf.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 68009

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dan" == Dan <Dan> writes:

Dan> What Im talking about is H.A.A.R.P. punching holes in the
Dan> ionosphere. How about reading my post then commenting again.
Dan> And while your at it go read the info H.A.A.R.P. provides on the
Dan> internet. If that don't get you thinking then this discussion is
Dan> over.

The way I read their web pages, they don't punch a hole in the
ionosphere so much as massage the power density of a small region of
the ionosphere. After playing with their calculator, I've found that
the ionospheric area their stuff affects ranges from eighty square
kilometers at the E layer to twelve hundred square kilometers above
the F2 layer. That will have an effect on a portion of the northern
hemisphere (and thus, on signals that would bounce across that
portion), but the net result would appear to be a strengthening of the
ionosphere in that volume of space, not a weakening.

I was disappointed that no mention of this side effect was mentioned
on their FAQ page. Their primary reference to amateur radio and
interference had to do with transmitting on the amateur bands.

Dan> Dan/W4NTI

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+1+qCGPFSfAB/ezgRAjC0AJ90EXwTkahj9G9KcEoOOAqgtMo1YACfYxai
aQ/65R1HhLn8NxoF9DQ1IpQ=
=+QaQ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1910. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 01:04:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED7FFE6.90701@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68010

N2EY wrote:
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305300525.dfd7d51@posting.google.com>...
>
>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
>>
>>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>>
>>>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
>>>
>>
>>
>>>>their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
>>>>?em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.
>>>
>>>
>>> Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
>>>operator than there is to the rig, huh?
>>
>>A resounding yes. You can spend yer life nit-picking yer way thru xcvr
>>technical specs like we've been doing here, then pop $4k on the latest
>>& greatest wunderbox and when it's all said and done it's the op which
>>is the biggest variable.
>
>
> Sure. But ya don't see the big guns giving up any sort of advantage in
> rig, antennas, computers, location, etc.

Course not, but you need to be good to make full use of that stuff. A
Craftsman toolset does not a master mechanic make.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1911. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 01:29:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030530212935.28806.00000426@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68011

In article <1g2bdvgkvqjb6rj0275jt84e3hp9a12nah@4ax.com>, The Patriot <bogus@fake.com> writes:

>
>Maybe you ought to look at the phonetic alphabet again, T is Tango,
>not Triple. D is Delta, not Double. Jeez, what a moron.

Uhh, don't look now, Patriot, but that was exactly my point! A lot of people use wierd, non-standard phonetics, and could mistake a suffix said as "Triple A" to be TA in stead of AAA. And if I were you, I'd be careful who I was calling a "moron," you numbnutz!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1912. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 01:32:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb90nh$6kn$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 68012

```
Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bb6j0n$ln$0@208.207.71.154...
> >
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bb32fg$ngn$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:bb19om$2o8$0@208.207.71.135...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:bb0loa$q0r$0@208.207.71.143...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Robert Casey wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Be interesting to see what activity
> > > > > > > > >amounts to and how hams handle QRM issues. It's a bit tough
> to
> > > > > "slide
> > > > > > > > up" a few
> > > > > > > > >Khz when channelized. We'll have to alter some old habits.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Some of us got our first taste of 2 way radio with CB, with
> its
> > > > > channelized
> > > > > > > > frequencies and limited power. So 5 MHz is not totally
> > > unfamiliar.
> > > > > > > > We'll
> > > > > > > > > change channels if the QRM gets bad enough.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Yes, but when there are only 5 channels the chances of finding
> one
> > > > > vacant
> > > > > > > > is pretty
```

> > > > > > > well nil. If the one you're getting clobberred on is loaded most
> > > > likely
> > > > > > all 5 will
> > > > > > > be.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > But if the need is for an emergency, that should
> > > > > > take priority of any other comms.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure. But one of the strengths of ham radio has always been the
> ability
> > > > to set
> > > > > up wherever one can find a clear frequency, and move to find one
> when
> > > > necessary.
> > > > > Even though emergencies do take precedence that doesn't assure that
> any
> > > of
> > > > the 5
> > > > > channels will be available for emergency use at any given time.
> Early in
> > > > an
> > > > > emergency before the word gets out they are likely to be overeloaded
> > > with
> > > > > routine use and thus too cluttered to use.
> > > >
> > > > Dick,
> > > > I have to disagree. Regardless of how much they are in use and/or
> > > > overloaded, those using the channels for non-emergency purposes
> > > > MUST surrender the frequencies when an emergency is indicated.
> > > > Towards that, I believe 99% of hams would immediately
> > > > accomodate the emergency priority use and stop their
> > > > current "routine" use.
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > I hope your right Bill. I had a incident where the FCC declaired a
> specific
> > > frequency for emergency comm in tornado situation. I asked a station to
> > > give us some room (2 kc up). He then proceeded to jump right on top of
> the
> > > net and call me and everyone there a liar.
> > >
> > > Takes all kinds.
> >
> > Well, there you have it. It only takes a few -maybe very few- clowns to
> stall

> > things out.
> >
> > Dick
>
> I think there's a big difference, however, with the 5MHz channels.
> Both the FCC and NTIA stand a much greater chance of hearing
> the situation where a ham didn't surrender the channel to emergency
> use which could then result in the ham being cited. It may well
> be that those channels could be tape recorded on a continuos ongoing
> basis at various points to provide a definitive record of how hams are
> actually using the channels once they can do so. Monitoring 5 channels
> is a piece of cake these days as there is recording equipment capable of
> recording many separate audio feeds.
>
> Personally, I'd love to knowthat there was such oversight, at least
> initially and/or upon request if a specific ham abuser is ID'd.
>

But none of this will help any ham who finds himself needing to use those channels to handle emergency traffic NOW.

Maybe next time. Maybe.

1913. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 01:37:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bb9106$79i$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 68013

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bb6j96$44k$0@208.207.71.154...
> >
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > I would think that in a 'real event' any method of maintaining commo
> to/from
> > > an area would not be a problem.
> > >
> > > I know I'll use whatever means are available to me to maintain commo.
> If
> > > its cw, or digital...matters not. Just get the job done.
> > >
> > > Then worry about the 'consequences'.
> > >
> >
> > Agreed, but when no one uses a mode you suddenly find you need, who you
> gonna
> > talk to? No one will be monitoring or otherwise listening in any mode
> except
> > USB, so you can call till you're blue in the face on any other and all
> you're
> > likely to get for a response is "Hey that dummy doesn't know that you're
> > supposed to use only USB on this band!".
> >
> Wait a minute here.....I don't even follow that. First off if your in the
> USB mode and someone comes up on say...CW...you can tell the mode. Or say
> on PSK, or RTTY, or packet.
>
> If one is not operational in most to all of the common modes he should stick
> to the general rag chewing and talk about the weather.

So if you hear someone on 60 meters using some mode other than USB,
and you have no idea that he has an emergency, what will be your initial
response? Most will react as above -"That dummy is using the wrong mode for this
band!" Few if any will fire up on his mode to see what's going on.

1914. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 01:50:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED80A8A.3030305@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68014

Robert Casey wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
>> operator than there is to the rig, huh?
>
>
> Good antennas should help more than the latest fancy radio. Kilowatt
> linears help too.
> Also operating skill should make a difference.....
>
>>
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......
>
>
> All you really need is a decent front end (atmospheric noise is higher than
> noise inside a modern radio anyway) and a reasonable transmitter with
> correctly adjusted processing. Having a 5 element 80 meter yagi helps
> too..... :-) (Heard that someone in Australia actually has such a
> monster).

Good lord, what holds the ends up, balloons?

> One thing about the new 5Mhz channels, top power is about that produced
> by a "barefoot" modern transceiver with some slightly lossy coax and dipole
> antenna. So most everyone will have an equal chance to be the first
> to do WAS on 5. Assuming someone in North Dakota gets on 5.....

I guess. I'm not going to be in a hurry to get on those few channels.
- Mike KB3EIA -

1915. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 02:04:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305301804.697ca2a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68015

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3ED772DB.3040808@psu.edu>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
> >
> >>Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>
> >>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
> >>
> >
> >>>their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
> >>>?em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.
> >>
> >>
> >> Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
> >>operator than there is to the rig, huh?
> >
> >
> > A resounding yes. You can spend yer life nit-picking yer way thru xcvr
> > technical specs like we've been doing here, then pop $4k on the latest
> > & greatest wunderbox and when it's all said and done it's the op which
> > is the biggest variable.
>
> That's hobbies for you! My XYL has a saying about people who get huge
> trucks with huge tires, massive amateur telescopes, and monster towers.
> Something about other parts being inversely porportional.....

In the case of Big Wheel trucks well, OK, I think they're a bit silly
and sure there's a macho issue involved. In the cases of the guys I
know who have big telescopes & towers I've noticed that they don't
seem to have problems reproducing. In volume in several instances.
They gotta be doing something besides radio with their vertical
things.

>
> But back to the contesting, I have been amazed at comparing my scores
> as I have "matured". I'm not winning yet (tho' I did place third in my
> class in NEQP last year, and helped move my club to second in it's class
> in last years FD) but I think I just might in a few more years!

There ya go, that's what it's all about.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

1916. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 02:07:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305301807.98d6839@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68016

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0305300849.29739f23@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305300525.dfd7d51@posting.google.com>...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED6C939.4030809@adelphia.net>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > their collections of "old junkers" it's kinda difficult to convince
> > > > ?em they just gotta buy new radios every two years.
> > >
> > >
> > > Kinda makes you think that just maybe there's a lot more to the
> > > operator than there is to the rig, huh?
> >
> > A resounding yes. You can spend yer life nit-picking yer way thru xcvr
> > technical specs like we've been doing here, then pop $4k on the latest
> > & greatest wunderbox and when it's all said and done it's the op which
> > is the biggest variable.
>
> Sure. But ya don't see the big guns giving up any sort of advantage in
> rig, antennas, computers, location, etc.

Translate that for me.

>
> > > - Mike KB3EIA - who does his contesting with a lowly IC-745.......
> >
> > If your 745 works for you it works, end of.
> >
> My K2 and Type 7 work for me.

Obviously . . .

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1917. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 03:03:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530230312.15922.00000699@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68017

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/29/03 10:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030529234552.15044.00000587@mb-m12.aol.com>

>>The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
>
>Its for "fun".

It's for both.

>Most Hams, including myself, are not EEs (IF you can call me a "Ham").

You never were an EE, so why make an issue of it, Vipul?

>>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
>>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
>>
>
>Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.

I'm not...Let's, Vipul.

>I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would like
>to know how they use one's car as power.

Was this a serious question?

Steve, K4CAP

1918. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 03:11:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530231113.15922.00000702@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68018

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/30/03 5:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030530183217.20945.00000741@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>From Steve Robeson, K4CAP
>
>>Why do YOU say things that are untrue, Vipul?
>
>My account of events has been based on what people actually said at certain
>events which I attended. I have formed logical conclusions from what I
>observed.

This has got nothing to do with observations or opinions. It has to do
with you not telling the truth. One can express an opinon contrary to others
beliefs, and not be untruthful.

"I think Amateur Radio is a cult" is an opinion. I do not agree with it,
but in this context I appreciate your opinion.

"Amateur Radio is a cult" is a false assertion. It HAS been disproven.
To reassert it over and over in the face of contraindicating evidence makes it
a lie.

"I did not try to hide my identity" as uttered by you is false. Google
archives prove you to be untruthful.

Precious little of what you have offered here has been valid. It has been
the trollings of someone who obviously has very little experience in or
tolerence for Amateur Radio. Why, we may never know. I certainly don't have
the inclination to travel to the Northeast and knock on your door to find out.

Steve, K4CAP

1919. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 03:14:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530231437.15922.00000703@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68019

>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 5/30/03 9:49 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED76F5C.6090800@psu.edu>

>> I'll swap ya my Yaesu FT-757GX mkII, Mike...!?!?
>
>That's a coincidence, I almost bought one of them once. Seems like a
>decent enough radio.

To be truthful I prefered the original 757. The MkII was a replacement after the first was stolen. But the only real "problem" that I have with it is that the "mode" switch is a push button that steps through the modes. If you get a bit too hair triggered you have to go all the way around again.

Technology be danged...give me rotary switches ! !

Steve, K4CAP

1920. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 03:18:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530231849.15922.00000705@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68020

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/29/03 10:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED6CB22.1090402@adelphia.net>

>> Like I said...Ask Vipul!
>
> And thereby providing the group with hours of fun!!! WE are in your
>debt Steve. 8^)
>
> You know something like this could be a good hobby. Outing the
anonymii...

Thanks...But I grow weary of the chase! Thumping Vipul's various rants is a bit too much like fishing with grenades. Maybe something serious for a while...?!?!

Naaaaaaaaaaaah!

Steve, K4CAP

1921. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 03:30:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530233012.15922.00000706@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68021

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/29/03 11:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030530002339.15044.00000589@mb-m12.aol.com>

>K4CAP said:
>>I think you should ask Vipul Shah how much good it did him to remain
>>"anonymous", Your Supreme Putziness.
>
>No, Sir. You are mistaken. I did not purposely remain anonymous. I only
>refused
>to give my callsign, which you found out.

You are LYING, Vipul.

You were specifically asked your callsign, name, etc as it pertains to
Amateur Radio and you refused time after time.

>The time has passed where you can keep bringing this up (which was never
>valid
>to begin with anyway).

If you don't like being disproven over and over in a public forum, Vipul,
stop being untruthful. Honesty does not have any "term limits". Sorry.

>There have been several posts since your "outing". Any you know they are from
>me, so not anonymous.

We know them NOW, Vipul...NOW is not in question. Your identity is known
due to a bit of armchair detective work on my part...NOT from any initiative on
YOUR part... ! ! ! ! !

>Then his partner, mjc5 said:
>>FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
>>morning - much less in fact.
>
>How do U know?

Because of a lack of evidence to the contrary, Vippy. I can find any
number of "road rage" stories in the paper on almost any given day.

On the otherhand, misdeeds perpetrated as a result of Internet abuse are
far fewer. This is archived in the mass media.

>BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! !

Too late, Vipul...We've already been laughing AT you for months.

>mjc5 said:
>>>Also, don't make the mistake of thinking that using a handle grants
>>>anonymity.
>Then K4CAP said:
>> Like I said...Ask Vipul!
>
>Dont U know? It was not anonymous - that "handle" was just for YOU, Steve.

You are pretty poor at after-the-fact storytelling, Vipul. You were
hiding behind your screen name long before I joined the fray.

>Then mjc5 said:
>>You know something like this could be a good hobby. Outing the anonymii...
>
>Like I explained above, that doesn't apply to me. I am not anonymous.

And like the FACTS prove, Vipul, NOT any more and NOT because of any
initiative on YOUR part.

Steve, K4CAP

1922. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 03:37:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030530233727.15922.00000708@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68022

>Subject: Re: Serious question:
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 5/30/03 8:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030530212935.28806.00000426@mb-m02.aol.com>

>>Maybe you ought to look at the phonetic alphabet again, T is Tango,
>>not Triple. D is Delta, not Double. Jeez, what a moron.
>
>Uhh, don't look now, Patriot, but that was exactly my point! A lot of
>people use wierd, non-standard phonetics, and could mistake a suffix
>said as "Triple A" to be TA in stead of AAA. And if I were you, I'd be
>careful who I was calling a "moron," you numbnutz!

Hmmmmmm....

No callsign....

Obviously no or very little experience in practical radio operating...

Basically trolling the same people that another unlicensed, inexperienced
person does...

Every bit as much an idiot....

Nahhh....God WOULDN'T make TWO scumbags in one newsgroup, would He...?!?!

Hmmmmmmmmmmmmmm

Steve, K4CAP

1923. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 10:36:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531063643.15427.00000365@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68025

In article <bb479f$69s$0@208.207.71.156>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 28 May 2003 03:11:35 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> > And if you ever get to Cheyenne, Wyoming, drop off I-80 onto
>> > Lincolnway and drive by the city park. It's where the lone
>> > remaining example of Union Pacific's Big Boy is set up on
>> > display. That's the huge 4-8-8-4 specially built to cross the
>> > Rockies between Cheyenne and Ogden, Utah. It's 132 feet long. Of
>> > only 25 built, it's the only one left in existance. I got some
>> > great digital photos.
>>
>> Didn't the You Pee revive one for Steve Lee to drive?

No, that was a Challenger. 4-6-6-4 wheel arrangement as opposed to the Big
Boy's 4-8-8-4.
>
> I'm unfamiliar with that, but the local blurb says that the Cheyenne
>display is the last remaining Big Boy.

Various websites detail at least seven Big Boys in various museums. None are
operational, although a few look like they would not need a lot of work to get
running again. Passing all the required tests is another matter.
>
>> I
>> confuse the 3945 and the 8444 (now the 844). Or was that the
>> Challenger?

> The Cheyenne engine is #4004.
>
I think the Challenger is 3985.

One of the websites shows a museum with a Big Boy indoors (!) next to a tuscan
red GG-1.

Google will reveal all.

btw, nobody has answered the original trivia question (what is the
purpose/meaning of the letter "F" on electric locomotives and MU cars?). I can
tell that Phil knows the answer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1924. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 10:36:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531063644.15427.00000366@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68023

In article <NdGdnX9aaaZKiUijXTWcog@crocker.com>, "David Robbins"
<k1ttt@arrl.net> writes:

>in some cases it is faster to say the phonetics than the section name.

Another reason I like CW.

>"Western Massachusettes" is harder than saying w-m-a, and whiskey-mike-alfa
>is probably about the same as the whole name... and for some sections its
>better to spell it out than let the other guy guess at the abbreviation for
>the log.

"WMA" on CW. Gotta luv it.

>you would be amazed at how many people don't know that 'me' is
>maine and 'ma' is massachusetts, let alone sort out the valleys in
>california!

The good 'phone ops say "west mass" (two syllables) and "maine" (one syllable)
2-3 times while the clueless are stumbling over "western massachusetts"

Anybody who is half serious about a domestic contest learns the ARRL sections
and their abbreviations beforehand. Heck, there's only 80 of 'em.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1925. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 10:36:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531063645.15427.00000367@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68024

In article <20030530184638.20945.00000743@mb-m27.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>Its for "fun".
>>
>>So is the rest of Field Day.
>
>Boring to some.

Not for me.

>Fun for Hams, maybe.
>
So do what interests you.

Here's a tip: Many Field Day groups need help during set-up and take-down. Volunteer to help with those things and leave the operating to others.

>>You're forgetting the most important point: The only way to KNOW what the
>>capabilities of a station are is to actually operate it.
>
>Yes, thats standard Ham radio hype.

No, it's a fact.

>You don't need Field Day to operate your radio.

You do need Field Day to operate it under conditions where lots of other stations are on the air under similar conditions.
>
>>I suspect you don't like those real-world conditions...
>
>Field day is not "real-world" conditions.

Sure it is. You have a limited set up time, power from non-mains sources, operation from locations other than home and vehicle. It's a test of imagination, versatility, skill, knowledge and endurance.

Let's see you make 3000 points in 1B-1, Vipul...

1926. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 11:15:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED88EB4.C17A492F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68026

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED593CA.CB4C9D43@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > > > > (Brian Kelly) writes:

> > > > Then howcum ya bought a K2?
> > >
> > > Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:
> > >
> > > "Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."
> > >
> > > And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
> > > spending decisions.
> >
> > I think you've driven that nail home.
>
> Yet there are some who don't understand that plain, simple fact at
> all. Remember when ol' Gary and Carl lectured us on how contests could
> be simulated on a network?

But that wouldn't be a radio contest, would it? That'd be a virtual
radio contest or a computer network contest.

> > > Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
> > > SINGCARS units around.
> >
> > ALE doesn't seem to have taken the amateur radio world by storm.
>
> Imagine CQ WW handled that way....

The rates would certainly go down. So would the fun factor.

> > > > Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome. We'ere not talking
> > > > newbies or nitwits here, we're talking seasoned HFers, contesters and
> > > > otherwise who are quite aware of the entire range of high-performance
> > > > xcvrs and can write the check for any of 'em.
> > >
> > > Not as many of those folks as you might think, compared to the great

> > > unwashed masses of us who do not have huge antenna farms and the
> > > resources to buy, say, an FT-1000.
> >
> > I can remember a time about 25 years or a little more back in time when
> > I was already a seasoned contester and DXer. I bought used gear and had
> > some wires and a small tribander on a pushup mast because it is what I
> > could afford.
>
> I'm not sure what your point is, Dave. I was simply saying that
> top-end rigs like the Orion are not a realistic option for the vast
> majority of hams. 'RV's talking about the folks who are not only
> interested but who can write the check. I'm not one of 'em - yet.

...and I was confirming what you wrote. No matter that my skills had
developed. My bank account hadn't.

> > Agreed. I don't think that many of the ragchewers can tell difference
> > between nor do I think that many of 'em use anywhere near all the
> > capabilities of that a high end rig offers.
>
> Agreed. Many of the features are contest/DX specific anyway. Heck, for
> ragchewing a 2-B and Ranger setup is just about ideal. Or an HW-101.
> Add a Courier amp/SB-200 for some wattage.

That's part of what makes amateur radio a great avocation.
Participation is possible no matter what the family finances dictate.
The guy on the other end can't easily tell how old your equipment
happens to be.

> > Internet surfers and word
> > processor users don't drive increases in computer processor and graphics
> > speed and sound card capabilities. Gamers do.
>
> bwaahaahhaaa

The Gateways and Dells would have the typical home user think that they
need a really fast computer when the things which most of us do on a
computer could be handled by a '486. My "fast" computer doesn't sit in
the shack but rather in the next room where it handles large scans,
digital photos and music files for recording or editing.

> > > > It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.
> > >
> > > And you say "Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome."? "QRP
> > > image" is just another term for it.
> >
> > The K-2 should drive an amp as well as anything else :)
>
> Not any amp you can buy. Base model only puts out 10-15 watts. btw,
> its QSK time is programmable so those who don't want to hear between
> dits at 60 per don't have to.

I should have specified the K-2/100 as being able to drive an amp as well as anything else.

Dave K8MN

1927. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 11:19:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED88F86.21EFB97B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68027

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED5862F.AAD34CD@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED5371D.65C7D642@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > the RRAP Challenge Cup, best 2 out of three aggregate scores?
> > > > >
> > > > > Hope this finds everyone well today. It's a darn pretty day today.
> > > >
> > > > 432 megs in the ARRL June VHF? :)
> > >
> > > CW or SSB? Doan laugh, I can do bofum on 432.
> >
> > Why, both of course!
> >
> > Shhhh! I'm trying to sucker Steve and am rushing to complete the power
> > supply for the pair of 8930's. No fancy stacked or H-framed yagis here
> > though--just a single boomer at about 55 feet.
> >
> > You could actually do pretty well from there even with lower power and
> > smaller antennas given the amount of activity right there in the East
> > Coast VHF/UHF corridor.
>
> Lotta activity north & south but we hit the wall east-wall, you live
> on the other side of the wall. The little FT-847 operates on 6/2/432
> all modes, 100/50/50W out. I bought a Diamond nine-foot triband glass
> stick antenna for it along with some 9913 and a vent pipe mount. I
> need to dredge up a ladder and get it up and running. Oughta get me at
> least started. If I like what I hear on cw & ssb I'll move on to small
> beams.

Yagis, even small ones, will open up a whole new world for you. Some of
that will be from just changing polarities from vertical to horizontal.

> > We have the easy pickin's in Cincinnati,
> > Columbus, Cleveland, Pittsburgh and the couple of big boys to the SE of
> > me here in the Mountain State. For everything else, I have to work.
>
> Yeah but I'll bet it's quiet.

It is but too much quiet, like in the absence of signals, isn't good.

Dave K8MN

1928. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 11:51:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8972D.1A0F793D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68028

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED53692.205DCA11@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
>
> > > Isn't that sorta like the guys who have only ever owned Fords sitting
> > > around the bar beasting on Chebbys?
> >
> > Not at all. I've owned other than Fords. I beat on Chevrolet because
> > they once sold me a '73 Vega.
>
> You didn't buy it, they sold it to you. I see.

I bought after several of the gentle nudges which car salesmen are known
to use. At no time did the discussion center around things like the
eventual rust which would consume the car or the likihood of failure of
the aluminum engine at only 54,000 miles. Compared to automobiles, the
transceivers of any period have been super!
>
> Ask Jim about his beloved diesel Rabbit.

Well, Jim? I always enjoy a good automotive tale.

>
> > > Nuttin' under the hood eh? Not-so-hypothetical scenario: One guy has
> > > say an Omni6+. 'Nother guy in the same neighborhood has the same
> > > antennas and same set of operating skills and an MP. Both jump into a
> > > dx contest and go at it. Come the end of the contest the guy with the
> > > Omni obviously has to have have beaten the guy with the MP,
> > > absolutetly has to be, yes?
> >
> > I don't think you're being fair to yourself in setting your
> > hyptothetical even though we know that two ops aren't really going to
> > have the same operating skills. One guy might be a whiz at handling
> > rapid fire QSOs but he might be on the wrong band.
>
> Yew are absolutely right there. I'll tellya how bad that can get.
> Within the club there are well-known differences amongst the guest ops
> who run in the multi-multis. You'll find "classified ads" in the
> reflector like "W3ABC needs two runners for the CQ phone." Runners &
> pouncers, different critters.

The fellows who fly solo from their home stations or as guest ops from a
big station end up being the best ops because they must learn to run as
well as search and pounce if they are going to have competitive scores.

> > To make your scenario slightly better, the guy
> > with the MP would have his rig rise about a foot-and-a-half off the
> > table with keying from the nearby Omni VI+ when the receiver of the MP
> > folded up. Things might even out though: The guy with the Omni would
> > have to deal with the key clicks from the MP :)
>
> I doubt it. Copied-pasted from from another e-mailed missive I
> recieved:
>
> w3rv: "The Ten-Tec Omni 6+ supposedly has a rcvr which noticeably
> better than any of the FT-1000 series and any of the big Icoms."
>
> Response from MP owner: "I'm not convinced of this claim. My
> neighbor, K3WU has one of these rigs and his signal is all over the
> place! Lot's of harmonics and very hard keying. He hears less well
> than I do, much less better."
>
> . . . so there . . !

Let's look at the possible flaws in the guy's statement:

Lots of harmonics and very hard keying (Ten-Tec is known for neither of
these). Could it be that the guy's MP is overloading and going
non-linear in the presence of strong signals from a nearby Omni VI?

"He hears less well than I do...". How do we know this? Is the guy who
owns the Omni VI a good op? Are his antennas in the same league?

> > The Ten-Tec reflector is just as bad. There are a number of technically
> > astute fellows whose opinions I value. When they comment, I read
> > thoroughly. Scott W4PA from TT often responds to comments. The
> > huggy-kissy content is balanced by several of those characters
> > complaining about knob eccentricity and font style/size.
>
> Heee! It's those idiots who make us look good.

Oh, I don't think we need to stand next to a Monday morning engineer in
order to look good.

>
> > > > Whet your interest any? You might want to take a look at Doug Smith's
> > > > article on the programmable AGC at
> > > > http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm
> > >
> > > Puts the AGC discussion solidly to bed.
> >
> > I'm interested in what Jim has to say about it.
>
> Doan matter, he could never bring hisself to use the AGC on cw. No

> matter what.

We take these things in very small steps. One day you'll look around
and he'll be a convert.

> > > > What I'm trying to get across to you is that you should sell the car,
> > > > take a second mortgage on the house, tell the kids that they'll have to
> > > > work their way through college but order an Orion.
> > >
> > > Welp, the last of my three brats graduated from collitch seven years
> > > ago. They owe me. Maybe it's time I "collected" . . ? (As if . . !)
> >
> > Well, you don't really need a car. Don't they have good public transit
> > in your area?
>
> Yeah, we still even have trolley cars here by golly. Unfortunately
> taking public transit to Lew Turk's takes an hour and a half one way
> but only ten minutes by driving. Ya can die of thirst in an hour and a
> half.

You'll be so busy operating that you won't have time for all that. Look
at all the additional loot you'll save!

Dave K8MN

1929. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 12:14:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED89D1B.965F35BD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68029

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0305281332.3fb63c96@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > >
> > > > Naw, the only radio outfit I'm that close to is Southgate Radio
> > >
> > > Then howcum ya bought a K2?
> >
> > Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:
> >
> > "Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."
>
> Ya shoulda peddled more five-pin tube sockets and waited until ya had
> a bigger wad before ya leaped on the K2. Can't tell you how often I've
> refused to settle for a lesser rig and bided my time until I could
> afford the rig I wanted.

You failed the test, Brian. Jim DID get the rig he wanted.

>
> > And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
> > spending decisions. Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
> > SINGCARS units around.
>
> Who could be bothered with one of those kluges??

Len would be a candidate.

> I think you're giving the advertising too much credit and not giving
> hams in general enough credit for being able to tear and compare.
> Particularly when it comes to experienced HFers.

I don't think he is. I believe a lot of guys buy the latest because the
ads are glitzy and because "W4** bought one". If W4** bought one, it
has to be great.

> > And in the end, in that arena where cost isn't even a secondary
> > consideration, one criterion will decide: Which rig made the most
> > points? To the really big guns, that's the bottom line.
>
> Damn, you do think in straight lines. Life ain't a straight line and
> neither are the routes hams follow to come to purchase decisions. The

> big guns (and most of the rest of us) make their purchase decisions
> based on a whole slew of considerations. Rigs don't make points, dx
> contest operators make the points and given any of a number of
> possible choices of upscale rigs their scores will be so close
> together that any differences in the scores from rig to rig will be in
> the noise level.

You may be correct on this one. My purchasing decisions run something like this:

Does the rig attempt to cram ten pounds of questionable matter in a five pound bag (160m-70cm)? What are the receiver specs? Is it something which will likely be repairable in seven or eight years? What is the manufacturers repair record in terms of cost and time? In a world where 90% of transceivers are made in Japan, can I obtain a comparable or better piece of gear made in the United States? Finally, can I afford it?

I've listened to many a QSO where a European using an FT-1000MP works an American using his FT-1000MP. He signs and works an Argentinian using his FT-1000MP. I like supporting the underdog. I like supporting American workers. There isn't a piece of Japanese gear at my operating position. I've already bought plenty of their home entertainment equipment since there is not much in the way of alternatives.

Dave K8MN

1930. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 12:16:53 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0305310416.2a71fec2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68030

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030530231437.15922.00000703@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
> >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >Date: 5/30/03 9:49 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3ED76F5C.6090800@psu.edu>
>
> >> I'll swap ya my Yaesu FT-757GX mkII, Mike...!?!?
> > >
> > >That's a coincidence, I almost bought one of them once. Seems like a
> > >decent enough radio.
>
> To be truthful I prefered the original 757. The MkII was a replacement
> after the first was stolen. But the only real "problem" that I have with it is
> that the "mode" switch is a push button that steps through the modes. If you
> get a bit too hair triggered you have to go all the way around again.
>
> Technology be danged...give me rotary switches ! !

No class at all, it's plug-in coils or FUHGEDDIT!

>
> Steve, K4CAP

w3rv

1931. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 12:18:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED89E25.5C1045FF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68031

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: N2EY
>
> >The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
>
> Its for "fun".

Partly so.

> >For several years I ran FD single-handed. Class 1B-1. With my homebrew
> >100 watt station, tent, generator, mast, the whole works. Site was an
> >open field with no facilities other than grass, which I had to mow in
> >order to have a place for the tent, generator and 44 foot homebrew
> >mast. No usable trees or buildings. Put it all up myself in a few
> >hours and took it all down again afterward. Site was 73 miles from
> >home and had to bring everything to the site and back in a 15 year old
> >VW Rabbit. Setup took about 5 hours and takedown about half that.
>
> Most Hams, including myself, are not EEs (IF you can call me a "Ham").

I could call you a ham before I could call you a EE.

> >Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
> >foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
> >
>
> Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.

I get the feeling that you're setting yourself up for a chump bet.

> > Battery/solar will do the job
> >- why not use the best technology?
>
> I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would like
> to know how they use one's car as power.

See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.

> >> Also should have strong wind stability.
> >
> >Sounds like hot air to me.
>
> Believe it or not, the random group of Hams I met a few weeks ago did indeed
> plan for windy conditions. I got to see some of their adaptations for the wind.

Adaptions? The random hams I hang out with all put their antennas up so
that they'll stay up in the wind.

> And heavy winds were there that weekend, even the whole night. The setup lasted
> under those windy conditions.

Yeah, most do.

Dave K8MN

1932. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 12:23:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED89F38.3D338B33@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68032

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20030529234552.15044.00000587@mb-m12.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >From: N2EY

> What does that have to do with anything? Nothing that I did those FD weekends
> required EE level knowledge or skills. What was required was real-world skills
> and knowledge.

The first time I see some guy with a scientific calculator figuring how
to best launch a rope into a tree, I'm quitting FD forever.

> >>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
> >>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
> >
> >Okay, lets see who can run longer.
>
> I run every morning. Last Saturday I ran for 45 minutes. I've done much longer
> runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?

There are only two times when I run: 1) when someone is chasing me and
2) when I am chasing someone.

> >> Battery/solar will do the job
> >>- why not use the best technology?
> >
> >I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would like
> >to know how they use one's car as power.
>
> Didn't they teach you anything in school?
>
> One word: Inverter.

Second word: refund.

Dave K8MN

1933. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 12:47:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531084745.06694.00000490@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68034

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> >The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
>>
>> Its for "fun".
>
>Partly so.

Yes, but if you invited someone to Field Day, who would find contests fun?

>I could call you a ham before I could call you a EE.

Unfortunately, I found amateur radio AFTER working as an EE. THEN, I learned about "Ham" radio, from a co-worker Ham. Now I am no longer an EE.

>> Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.
>
>I get the feeling that you're setting yourself up for a chump bet.

Whats that?

>> I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would
>like
>> to know how they use one's car as power.
>
>See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.

EE courses, is more directly useable than most fields. However, EE courses, like any other field does not show you the practical application. They don't teach you automechanics in EE. Amateur radio could give you a practical application of EE, but doesn't.

>> And heavy winds were there that weekend, even the whole night. The setup
>lasted
>> under those windy conditions.
>
>Yeah, most do.

Yes, but it takes knowledge and experience. I learned some of their tricks. Ham radio should have more events like that one.

1934. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 12:48:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8A484.E5C6E7E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68033

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED58F0D.7E0C4032@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED4C75A.CF7BBB36@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > If I'm double-posting kindly excuse me. Something is screwed up with
> > > either Windoze or Google today and I'm having a bad time of it.
> >
> > No problem. Just pull an Anderson and tell me that it was a cleverly
> > laid trap and that we fell into it.
>
> Gawd forbid I should ever sink to his level.

I don't think you could unless weighted down by an inferiority complex
relating to ham radio envy.

>
> > I'm not going to make any manufacturer rich either. I owned the Paragon
> > for six years before buying the Omni VI and I owned the Omni VI for a
> > full ten years.
>
> Common sense. You got your money's worth. There are churners out there
> though.

I know a number of those guys. They buy the latest, use it for several
months and then buy the next "latest".

> > Goose, W8AV up in Ohio Amish country to my northwest
> > has a shack full of TS-940's for his multi-multi setup.
>
> Great xcvrs, a real classic. I've had one for several years. Has all
> the options except the voice card and is loaded with Inrads. Bought it
> from PVRCer w4rw. But I've only managed to get one good six-month
> period of heavy use out of it and one Field Day. Did not take long to
> get very attached to it. It's a piece of cake to operate yet it has
> bells & whistles galore. The passband tuning and variable bandwith
> setup is a dream come true. If ya can't dredge a weak one up out of
> the crud with a 940 it can't be done except maybe in the case of a
> Sherwood R-4C on 160 & 80. The front end shows the K2 folk how the big
> boys can play the BDRs game when they choose to do so. And it was
> designed well over twenty years ago.

I think Goose uses 'em because they are a "known", he and his crew are
familiar with them, he finds them reliable,he knows much about repairing
them and he has several parts units sitting around.

> I put it on the air last FD and three contacts into the event it
> completely lost it mind. Works fine on ssb, goes absolutely
> silly-bonkers on cw and that terminated FD 2002 for me. I haven't
> packed it off to the Kenwood shop yet but I gotta get around to that.
> Then I'm gonna offload it. Superb radio but it's full of creaky old
> point-to-point wiring, parts are quickly becoming unavailable, etc.
> It's time.

Yep. It is worth it to get the thing repaired so you can get some cash
out of it toward your Orion *grin*.

> I shoulda taken the TS-50 to the FD site with the 940 but I ran outta
> patience with hauling "stuff". This time I'm going with both the 847
> and the TS-50, I yam not gonna get caught with my pants down again.

On FD, there's always a chance that I'll get caught with my pants down
but it won't be because of a broken rig. If Bert's '1000MP "Field and
Stream" breaks, I'll happily haul the Paragon out.

> > That was my dream and I'm happy that we found a place where I could make
> > it come true on a modest scale. My antenna farm would have been
> > considered super in the 1960's and 1970's. Nowadays it seems pretty
> > commonplace.
>
> You've done well. I've seen the .JPGs of your "modest" antenna farm. I
> only wish!

The stuff pleases me 'cuz I get out well but BIG 40m yagis and four
squares on 80m and even 160m are becoming more common. A friend of mine
in Indiana is agonizing over buying either a 2 element or a 3 element
40m yagi. The 3 element costs a lot more money. I've advised him to
grab the 2 element yagi because thusfar, he has been a vertical or
dipole user. The 2 element yagi at height is going to out perform
verticals and dipoles by a wide margin and most of hamdom is still using
verticals and dipoles.

> > It got scaled back a few notches when I realized that I'd
> > be moving into the age group where maintaining three 70 to 100 foot
> > towers with stacked monobanders would become impractical. Thus the
> > trapless tribander, nothing with gain on 80m and the modest Cushcraft
> > "shorty forty" on the two towers. One tower has the Hazer and the other
> > cranks down and tilts over. I can work on that stuff for years yet.
>
> Smart moves. Father Time is creeping up on many the big guns I keep
> referencing and they still have the multiple 150 footers. They're now
> paying arms and legs to commercial tower mechanics to keep their
> antenna farms up and running. Back when any number of us usta scamper
> up and down the things like monkeys weather be damned. Dunno how many
> hours I spent dangling from nothing at 150-180 feet horsing full size

> 40M beams around but dozens. Today? Fuhgeddit - not me 'ole buddy,
> those days are over, hit the Yellow Pages and start dialing around.

I figure I'm good for another decade of climbing. What I don't do is digging. I hire the local grave digger (yes, this area has a fellow who still digs graves by hand). He does fine with rectangular holes but has trouble with simple trenches. The one I had him dig for burial of coaxial cable and control cables for the higher tower was crooked as a dog's hind leg. I did the other myself after loosening the dirt with a garden tiller.

> > > That changes a bunch when the spots come into play. In this situation
> > > all club stations are on the same overhead network and the need for
> > > software rig contol becomes a gotta-have.
> >
> > I'll have to make a pilgrimage one of these days to one of the big PVRC
> > or FRC multi-multis.
>
> You need to do that. From where you are W3LPL should be the first stop
> ya make. He's a pile of contesting history by himself. You'd enjoy a
> visit to N3RS. His Telrex 3 el 40 is 150 feet above a 150 foot cliff
> and looms over the PA turnpike two minutes before the Downingtown
> interchange headed East. There are others. Let me know when the urge
> overcomes you.

Frank is the friend and former co-worker of my pal K3FK, who was posted in Helsinki with me in the mid-nineties. I was invited to an open house there in '2000 but I couldn't make it with shuttling back and forth between Washington and here.

> As a bit of an aside I think you'd be amazed at the volume of
> homebrewing these guys do. They don't reinvent the wheel and brew the
> radios but they do brew just about everything else. You ougta see some
> of the beams they come up with. N3RS has a 5 over over 5 over 5
> self-designed & built stack on 15M, fifteen elements. Then come the
> hombrewed station control systems. CPUs, sensors, preamps, filters,
> you'd have to see it to believe it. Packaged in nice one-off
> enclosures with custom silk-screened panels. No, hombrewing is not
> dead.

That's the way W9ZRX's place was as far back as twenty plus years ago. The station design was incredible and the antennas were all homebrew.

> > One famed OH2 I know visited a large East Coast
> > (non-FRC) multi-multi one year while I was living in Finland and came
> > away with the idea that the operation was a total goat rope.
>
> What's a "goat rope"??! Haywired? Yeah, they're out there. FD stations
> with big amps.

The station was superb. The operators were, in Ville's view, poor. He noted constant CQing with little listening and said that he was standing

by and copying callsigns when the operator was doing the QRZ? number.
Of course Ville has probably been number one in the world in CQ WW CW
than anyone else.

> > > The only shot I have at a
> > > half-decent score is to play the search & pounce game so even I'll
> > > have Writelog rig control running here as a lame single op with the
> > > 847.
> >
> > I don't connect to the Pittsburgh cluster if I'm going for score.
>
> Unassisted is certainly an option. I gotta at least try operating
> assisted, maybe I'll like it, maybe I won't. I'm OK with operating
> unassisted because my scores have always lopsided, higher mults/q's
> ratio than average. I'm not a big-time runner but I usually did well
> with the mults.

That's typical of the low power/small antenna guy. Starting a run and
holding a frequency are extremely tough under those circumstances.

> > > Yeah, they listened.
> >
> > It helps that they have Doug Smith designing and Scott W4PA, an active
> > contester, providing his input and that of others.
>
> Looks like the K2 reflector has that kind of "factory participation &
> support" too. 'Tis good. We should live long enough to see the guys
> who design the rice boxes jump into a U.S. based rig reflector.

That kind of customer support can't be discounted.

Dave K8MN

1935. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 13:15:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8AB85.F5844DDA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68035

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>Its for "fun".
> >
> >So is the rest of Field Day.
>
> Boring to some.

You just told us that it is for fun.

> Fun for Hams, maybe.

Who else is involved in Field Day?

> >You're forgetting the most important point: The only way to KNOW what the
> >capabilities of a station are is to actually operate it.
>
> Yes, thats standard Ham radio hype.

You believe that the statement above is hype? Why not provide us with
your alternate reality view, Vipul?

> You don't need Field Day to operate your
> radio.

No, you can drag your equipment, antennas and a power source out to some
remote location daily if you like.

> >I suspect you don't like those real-world conditions...
>
> Field day is not "real-world" conditions.

It isn't? What would make it more real?

> The Hams I met up with, operated
> under more difficult conditions including strong winds. The purpose of Field
> Day is not for "real-world" conditions. Anything learned in that aspect is
> chance correlation.

Are you saying that the winds are never strong during Field Day, Vipul?
What is the purpose of FD? Your "chance correlation" stuff is just so
much blowing of smoke.

> >I've had to put up with a lot of wind from the likes of you and some
> >others...
>

> Since you keep bringing up wind. I could mention that the random group of Hams
> I joined were skilled in passing wind. Of course, the chili helped. As you
> know, they ate ALOT. Also, they were well prepared for their station. However,
> it seems, they were not prepared for taking a shower.

It is obvious that they were simulating "real world" conditions. During
a real emergency, folks may not have the option of showering for days.
You might have to live with human smells mingled with chili, garlic or
curry.

Dave K8MN

1936. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 13:29:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8AEBC.DE12760D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68036

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> >The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
> >>
> >> Its for "fun".
> >
> >Partly so.
>
> Yes, but if you invited someone to Field Day, who would find contests fun?

Probably the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you at bowling
or the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you as you are
fishing. Maybe it'd be the same person who would enjoy watching you
paint an entire portrait or the one who would find watching you mount
stamps in an album to be exciting.

> >I could call you a ham before I could call you a EE.
>
> Unfortunately, I found amateur radio AFTER working as an EE. THEN, I learned
> about "Ham" radio, from a co-worker Ham.

...and you still haven't understood, despite numerous corrections of
your mistake, that "amateur radio" and "ham radio" are one and the same.

> Now I am no longer an EE.

We have no evidence that you ever were a EE. Sounds to me like you were
a student and one who wasn't paying attention to the part about how
fluorescent lights work.

> >> Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.
> >
> >I get the feeling that you're setting yourself up for a chump bet.
>
> Whats that?

Playing pool with a pool shark; playing cards with a card shark; racing
your car against Mika Salo; running a foot race with Jim.

> >> I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would
> >like
> >> to know how they use one's car as power.
> >
> >See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.
>

> EE courses, is more directly useable than most fields. However, EE courses,
> like any other field does not show you the practical application.

My friends who are working EE's didn't have any problem translating
their classroom knowledge into work in a real job. Besides, what you
didn't learn in the classroom about fluorescent lamps isn't practical
knowledge. You asked how they'd work on 12 VDC. This isn't rocket
science. It is a simple matter of your not understanding the theory.

>They don't teach you automechanics in EE.

No kidding? They don't teach astronomy in art class either.

> Amateur radio could give you a practical
> application of EE, but doesn't.

Then you aren't paying attention.

> >> And heavy winds were there that weekend, even the whole night. The setup
> >lasted
> >> under those windy conditions.
> >
> >Yeah, most do.
>
> Yes, but it takes knowledge and experience. I learned some of their tricks. Ham
> radio should have more events like that one.

It does.

Dave K8MN

1937. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 13:41:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531094153.06694.00000491@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68037

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> You were specifically asked your callsign, name, etc as it pertains to
>Amateur Radio and you refused time after time.

How is that relavant to the point?

>Honesty does not have any "term limits". Sorry.

I was honest. I didn't VOLUNTEER my callsign or name. How is that not honest? I didn't have to tell you that. Not volunteering one's name or callsign is not dis-honest or hiding. Hint: if someone does not tell you their name, it does not mean they are dis-honest.

Now that you know my name and callsign, its not anonymous. That time has passed. So, that no longer applies.

> You are pretty poor at after-the-fact storytelling, Vipul. You were
>hiding behind your screen name long before I joined the fray.

Yes, I am pretty poor at after-the-fact storytelling. Not one of my talents. Any story of the events I have attended were from actually going there and telling what people said. I give one part at a time, otherwise it would be a very long account of events. Nothing is added on to "improve" the story. Just the true story.

Never had any intention of hiding. How does the obvious qualify as "hiding"? Also, I did not deny it when you found it out. Hiding and not volunteering is two different things.

>>>FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
>>>morning - much less in fact.
>>
>>How do U know?
>
> Because of a lack of evidence to the contrary, Vippy. I can find any
>number of "road rage" stories in the paper on almost any given day.

Yes, but it does happen. Children getting kidnapped after meeting someone throught the internet, for example.

>Too late, Vipul...We've already been laughing AT you for months.

Non-Hams laugh AT the behaviour of Hams. Mostly show dis-interest, rather than laugh, actually.

1938. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 13:49:14 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531094914.06694.00000492@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68038

>From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Fun for Hams, maybe.
>
>Who else is involved in Field Day?

Maybe, one would invite someone.

>It is obvious that they were simulating "real world" conditions. During
>a real emergency, folks may not have the option of showering for days.
>You might have to live with human smells mingled with chili, garlic or
>curry.

Thats a good one!

1939. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 14:00:48 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531100048.06694.00000493@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68039

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> Unfortunately, I found amateur radio AFTER working as an EE. THEN, I
>learned
>> about "Ham" radio, from a co-worker Ham.
>
>...and you still haven't understood, despite numerous corrections of
>your mistake, that "amateur radio" and "ham radio" are one and the same.

Okay. Before finding about Ham radio, I experimented with amateur radio
circuits, including kits. Then, I learned about Ham radio from a co-worker.
Then I got an amateur radio license.

>> >I get the feeling that you're setting yourself up for a chump bet.
>>
>> Whats that?
>
>Playing pool with a pool shark; playing cards with a card shark; racing
>your car against Mika Salo; running a foot race with Jim.

Okay. I get it.

1940. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 14:23:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531102357.23307.00000358@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68041

In article <3ED88EB4.C17A492F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3ED593CA.CB4C9D43@earthlink.net>...
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> > >
>> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> > > > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> > > > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>> > > > Then howcum ya bought a K2?
>> > >
>> > > Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:
>> > >
>> > > "Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."
>> > >
>> > > And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
>> > > spending decisions.
>> >
>> > I think you've driven that nail home.
>>
>> Yet there are some who don't understand that plain, simple fact at
>> all. Remember when ol' Gary and Carl lectured us on how contests could
>> be simulated on a network?
>
>But that wouldn't be a radio contest, would it? That'd be a virtual
>radio contest or a computer network contest.

Their idea was that the network would be via radio on the amateur bands, so it
would be an amateur radio contest. I can repost their idea, if you like. I
recall all sorts of put-downs of any sort of radiosport, using such phrases as
"electronic paintball wars" and griping about how their idea was held back by
"dinosaur-dung-encrusted regulations".

Nice guys with great leadership skills, huh?

I remember explaining that it would be like running the Boston Marathon on a
treadmill hooked to a VCR that would show video of the course. They claimed

their emulations would be very realistic and they could not understand why
anyone would insist on the "real thing".
>
PLC (power line communications) may make it all a moot point.

>> > > Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
>> > > SINGCARS units around.
>> >
>> > ALE doesn't seem to have taken the amateur radio world by storm.
>>
>> Imagine CQ WW handled that way....
>
>The rates would certainly go down. So would the fun factor.
>
Tell it to the PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO

>> > > > Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome. We'ere not talking
>> > > > newbies or nitwits here, we're talking seasoned HFers, contesters and
>> > > > otherwise who are quite aware of the entire range of high-performance
>> > > > xcvrs and can write the check for any of 'em.
>> > >
>> > > Not as many of those folks as you might think, compared to the great
>> > > unwashed masses of us who do not have huge antenna farms and the
>> > > resources to buy, say, an FT-1000.
>> >
>> > I can remember a time about 25 years or a little more back in time when
>> > I was already a seasoned contester and DXer. I bought used gear and had
>> > some wires and a small tribander on a pushup mast because it is what I
>> > could afford.
>>
>> I'm not sure what your point is, Dave. I was simply saying that
>> top-end rigs like the Orion are not a realistic option for the vast
>> majority of hams. 'RV's talking about the folks who are not only
>> interested but who can write the check. I'm not one of 'em - yet.
>
>...and I was confirming what you wrote. No matter that my skills had
>developed. My bank account hadn't.

OK. Same deal here.
>
>> > Agreed. I don't think that many of the ragchewers can tell difference
>> > between nor do I think that many of 'em use anywhere near all the
>> > capabilities of that a high end rig offers.
>>
>> Agreed. Many of the features are contest/DX specific anyway. Heck, for
>> ragchewing a 2-B and Ranger setup is just about ideal. Or an HW-101.
>> Add a Courier amp/SB-200 for some wattage.
>
>That's part of what makes amateur radio a great avocation.
>Participation is possible no matter what the family finances dictate.
>The guy on the other end can't easily tell how old your equipment

>happens to be.

That's another Great Equalizer. The effect is most pronounced on CW/Morse, of course. In that mode, skill or its lack are very apparent and the equipment used is not apparent at all. On the air with CW/Morse, no one can tell whether I am using an IC-7800 or a rebuilt Southgate Type 1. I suspect that is one big reason some folks dislike the mode so much.
>
>> > Internet surfers and word
>> > processor users don't drive increases in computer processor and graphics
>> > speed and sound card capabilities. Gamers do.
>>
>> bwaahaahhaaa
>
>The Gateways and Dells would have the typical home user think that they
>need a really fast computer when the things which most of us do on a
>computer could be handled by a '486.

Well, a 300 MHz Pentium 2 or equivalent, if ya wanna run later Windoze versions and newer apps.

Plus the dern things are getting so inexpensive that us dumpster divers are finding gold mines everywhere.

I have a 486DX4 100 MHz in prime working shape, btw. VLB video card, Win 95B and everything. Cost me maybe $100 to build a couple years back. Dinosaur.

>My "fast" computer doesn't sit in
>the shack but rather in the next room where it handles large scans,
>digital photos and music files for recording or editing.
>
Same here.

To prove yer point, I recently "upgraded" from Quicken 98 to Quicken 2003 Deluxe. Couldn't get 2003 to network, plus it had lotta features I didn't need. Uninstalled it and put Q98 back to work. Anybody want 2003?

>> > > > It also seems to suffer a "QRP" image.
>> > >
>> > > And you say "Brand allegiance is a newbie/nitwit syndrome."? "QRP
>> > > image" is just another term for it.
>> >
>> > The K-2 should drive an amp as well as anything else :)
>>
>> Not any amp you can buy. Base model only puts out 10-15 watts. btw,
>> its QSK time is programmable so those who don't want to hear between
>> dits at 60 per don't have to.
>
>I should have specified the K-2/100 as being able to drive an amp as
>well as anything else.
>
Agreed!

I'm thinking of an external grid-driven single 811 amp to put the K2 in the 100 watt class plus light up the shack. Or maybe a pair of 807s. Just until the Southgate Type 8 is done. The guy on the other end can't tell.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1941. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 14:23:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531102358.23307.00000359@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68040

In article <3ED89F38.3D338B33@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030529234552.15044.00000587@mb-m12.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>> (Vshah101) writes:
>>
>> >From: N2EY
>
>> What does that have to do with anything? Nothing that I did those FD
>> weekends required EE level knowledge or skills. What was required was
>> real-world skills and knowledge.
>
>The first time I see some guy with a scientific calculator figuring how
>to best launch a rope into a tree, I'm quitting FD forever.

Don't worry, Dave. The Vipuls of the world want you to show them how it's done,
not to do it themselves.
>
>> >>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
>> >>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.

>> >Okay, lets see who can run longer.
>>
>> I run every morning. Last Saturday I ran for 45 minutes.

47+ minutes of hills this morning. Working my way up to an hour. Then I'll
probably measure out a ten-mile course starting and ending at this house.

>> I've done much longer
>> runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?
>
>There are only two times when I run: 1) when someone is chasing me and
>2) when I am chasing someone.
>
Notice that Vipul doesn't answer the question.

>> >> Battery/solar will do the job- why not use the best technology?
>> >
>> >I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would
>> >like
>> >to know how they use one's car as power.
>>
>> Didn't they teach you anything in school?
>>

>> One word: Inverter.
>
>Second word: refund.
>
'zactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1942. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 14:56:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8C31C.40C11B2A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68042

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Fun for Hams, maybe.
> >
> >Who else is involved in Field Day?
>
> Maybe, one would invite someone.

Those are onlookers, not participants. They might enjoy seeing the technology, marvel at the use of morse code, like an occasional burned hot dog and be on their way in an hour.

> >It is obvious that they were simulating "real world" conditions. During
> >a real emergency, folks may not have the option of showering for days.
> >You might have to live with human smells mingled with chili, garlic or
> >curry.
>
> Thats a good one!

I spent ten years of my life in Africa. After you've been in an African disco when the temperature exceeds 100 degrees F and the person standing next to you exudes the odor of a bag or rotten onions, human smells don't offend you as easily as they might have in the past.

Dave K8MN

1943. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 15:08:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8C5CB.E097829D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68043

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> > You were specifically asked your callsign, name, etc as it pertains to
> >Amateur Radio and you refused time after time.
>
> How is that relavant to the point?

It seems *relevant* to this point.

> >Honesty does not have any "term limits". Sorry.
>
> I was honest. I didn't VOLUNTEER my callsign or name. How is that not honest? I
> didn't have to tell you that. Not volunteering one's name or callsign is not
> dis-honest or hiding.

Fibbing about whether you attempted to keep your identity anonymous in
the here and now is certainly not being honest.

> Hint: if someone does not tell you their name, it does
> not mean they are dis-honest.

No, telling people that you never attempted to keep your name anonymous
is dishonest.

> Now that you know my name and callsign, its not anonymous. That time has
> passed. So, that no longer applies.

But you would have us believe that you were totally forthcoming. You
were not. It took the efforts of another to reveal who you are. Only
then did you admit it.

> > You are pretty poor at after-the-fact storytelling, Vipul. You were
> >hiding behind your screen name long before I joined the fray.
>
> Yes, I am pretty poor at after-the-fact storytelling. Not one of my talents.
> Any story of the events I have attended were from actually going there and
> telling what people said. I give one part at a time, otherwise it would be a
> very long account of events. Nothing is added on to "improve" the story. Just
> the true story.

Your stories only come in bits and pieces. Those bits and pieces only
seem to confirm your latest preconceptions.

> Never had any intention of hiding. How does the obvious qualify as "hiding"?
> Also, I did not deny it when you found it out. Hiding and not volunteering is

> two different things.

You were asked. You did not provide the information.

> >>>FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
> >>>morning - much less in fact.
> >>
> >>How do U know?
> >
> > Because of a lack of evidence to the contrary, Vippy. I can find any
> >number of "road rage" stories in the paper on almost any given day.
>
> Yes, but it does happen. Children getting kidnapped after meeting someone
> throught the internet, for example.

We're not children here. You have confirmed your adult status.

> >Too late, Vipul...We've already been laughing AT you for months.
>
> Non-Hams laugh AT the behaviour of Hams. Mostly show dis-interest, rather than
> laugh, actually.

Which is it? You've reversed yourself.

Dave K8MN

1944. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 15:17:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8C7C1.4040500@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68044

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>> You were specifically asked your callsign, name, etc as it pertains to
>>Amateur Radio and you refused time after time.
>
>
> How is that relavant to the point?

The relvance to the point is that it IS the point.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1945. Re: "Uncle says..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 15:27:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbahmbvik1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68045

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bb9106$79i$0@208.207.71.144...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bb6j96$44k$0@208.207.71.154...
> > >
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > I would think that in a 'real event' any method of maintaining commo
> > to/from
> > > > an area would not be a problem.
> > > >
> > > > I know I'll use whatever means are available to me to maintain
commo.
> > If
> > > > its cw, or digital...matters not. Just get the job done.
> > > >
> > > > Then worry about the 'consequences'.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Agreed, but when no one uses a mode you suddenly find you need, who
you
> > gonna
> > > talk to? No one will be monitoring or otherwise listening in any mode
> > except
> > > USB, so you can call till you're blue in the face on any other and all
> > you're
> > > likely to get for a response is "Hey that dummy doesn't know that
you're
> > > supposed to use only USB on this band!".
> > >
> > Wait a minute here.....I don't even follow that. First off if your in
the
> > USB mode and someone comes up on say...CW...you can tell the mode. Or
say
> > on PSK, or RTTY, or packet.
> >
> > If one is not operational in most to all of the common modes he should
stick
> > to the general rag chewing and talk about the weather.
```

>
> So if you hear someone on 60 meters using some mode other than USB,
> and you have no idea that he has an emergency, what will be your initial
> response? Most will react as above -"That dummy is using the wrong mode
for this
> band!" Few if any will fire up on his mode to see what's going on.
>

Well I guess I must be one of the few then.

Dan/W4NTI

1946. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 15:32:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8CB76.DE513BCC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68046

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3ED88EB4.C17A492F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3ED593CA.CB4C9D43@earthlink.net>...
> >> > N2EY wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0305270436.4b579d4f@posting.google.com>...
> >> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030526162502.01631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >> > > > > In article <d22b54c3.0305260935.6d0a55ee@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> > > > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> >> > > > Then howcum ya bought a K2?
> >> > > >
> >> > > Lotsa reasons but they all boil down to this:
> >> > > >
> >> > > "Cause I wanted one and I figured out a way to afford it."
> >> > > >
> >> > > And those are really the driving forces behind most amateur radio
> >> > > spending decisions.
> >> >
> >> > I think you've driven that nail home.
> >>
> >> Yet there are some who don't understand that plain, simple fact at
> >> all. Remember when ol' Gary and Carl lectured us on how contests could
> >> be simulated on a network?
> >
> >But that wouldn't be a radio contest, would it? That'd be a virtual
> >radio contest or a computer network contest.
>
> Their idea was that the network would be via radio on the amateur bands, so it
> would be an amateur radio contest. I can repost their idea, if you like.

I've forgotten the specifics. It might be nice to see what they
actually proposed.

> I recall all sorts of put-downs of any sort of radiosport, using such phrases as
> "electronic paintball wars" and griping about how their idea was held back by

> "dinosaur-dung-encrusted regulations".

I do recall those those ignorant comments and Carl's line about stomping
others into the dust.

> Nice guys with great leadership skills, huh?

I never thought they were either nice guys or had any leadership skills.

> I remember explaining that it would be like running the Boston Marathon on a
> treadmill hooked to a VCR that would show video of the course. They claimed
> their emulations would be very realistic and they could not understand why
> anyone would insist on the "real thing".

They had it backward. Why would anyone want to do a virtual contest
when they could do the real thing?

> PLC (power line communications) may make it all a moot point.

That's one of the most serious problems that radio could face. I don't
see how anyone at the Commission could fail to see the interference
potential and even likelihood.

> >> > > Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
> >> > > SINGCARS units around.
> >> >
> >> > ALE doesn't seem to have taken the amateur radio world by storm.
> >>
> >> Imagine CQ WW handled that way....
> >
> >The rates would certainly go down. So would the fun factor.
> >
> Tell it to the PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO

A lot of the PROFESSIONALS spend their time in
point-to-very-specific-point work. Most hams do not. I can remember one
instance in which we worked into an African relay which suddenly went
down hard and permanently. We were faced with working long haul HF back
into the U.S.--a four thousand mile hop during periods of frequent solar
flares. Two of us attempted to explain to the ambassador that
communications outages could be frequent and prolonged. He was silent
for a moment and said, "That'll be okay. If we have anything urgent to
go, we'll just send it NIACT (night action precedent). The two of us
doing the explaining stared at each other with opend mouths and decided
to start over with the explanation.

> >> Agreed. Many of the features are contest/DX specific anyway. Heck, for
> >> ragchewing a 2-B and Ranger setup is just about ideal. Or an HW-101.
> >> Add a Courier amp/SB-200 for some wattage.
> >
> >That's part of what makes amateur radio a great avocation.
> >Participation is possible no matter what the family finances dictate.
> >The guy on the other end can't easily tell how old your equipment

> >happens to be.
>
> That's another Great Equalizer. The effect is most pronounced on CW/Morse, of
> course. In that mode, skill or its lack are very apparent and the equipment
> used is not apparent at all. On the air with CW/Morse, no one can tell whether
> I am using an IC-7800 or a rebuilt Southgate Type 1. I suspect that is one big
> reason some folks dislike the mode so much.

It is easy to put out a clean and stable signal from an HT-46, an HT-32B
or a T-4X but CW gear is much easier to homebrew. It'd be harder to
disguise a Swan 500-C "Drift-o-matic".

> >> > Internet surfers and word
> >> > processor users don't drive increases in computer processor and graphics
> >> > speed and sound card capabilities. Gamers do.
> >>
> >> bwaahaahhaaa
> >
> >The Gateways and Dells would have the typical home user think that they
> >need a really fast computer when the things which most of us do on a
> >computer could be handled by a '486.
>
> Well, a 300 MHz Pentium 2 or equivalent, if ya wanna run later Windoze versions
> and newer apps.

I haven't found much that I want to use which won't run on my 200 MHz
Pentium with Win 98 SE.

> Plus the dern things are getting so inexpensive that us dumpster divers are
> finding gold mines everywhere.

I see 300-600 meg machines for sale in the local classified ads for
$150-$250 all the time. A number of companies give them away when they
upgrade.

> I have a 486DX4 100 MHz in prime working shape, btw. VLB video card, Win 95B
> and everything. Cost me maybe $100 to build a couple years back. Dinosaur.

But useable for the forseeable future.

> >My "fast" computer doesn't sit in
> >the shack but rather in the next room where it handles large scans,
> >digital photos and music files for recording or editing.
> >
> Same here.

...and when mine gets upgraded, I'll slide the currently fast one into
the shack. In the interim, I have several networked and have my inkjet
printer set up in the other room and my laser printer in the shack.

> >I should have specified the K-2/100 as being able to drive an amp as
> >well as anything else.
> >

> Agreed!
>
> I'm thinking of an external grid-driven single 811 amp to put the K2 in the 100
> watt class plus light up the shack. Or maybe a pair of 807s.

...or you could do a pair of cheap, grid-driven 4CX250B's for less light
and more snot. WA5FIR once built a pair in a Drake speaker cabinet just
to show how small a KW amp could be.

> Just until the
> Southgate Type 8 is done. The guy on the other end can't tell.....

All right. You've kept alluding to the Southgate series. What's been
the evolution?

Dave K8MN

1947. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 15:36:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8CC74.4B9012A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68047

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3ED89F38.3D338B33@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030529234552.15044.00000587@mb-m12.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> >> (Vshah101) writes:
> >>
> >> >From: N2EY
> >
> >> What does that have to do with anything? Nothing that I did those FD
> >> weekends required EE level knowledge or skills. What was required was
> >> real-world skills and knowledge.
> >
> >The first time I see some guy with a scientific calculator figuring how
> >to best launch a rope into a tree, I'm quitting FD forever.
>
> Don't worry, Dave. The Vipuls of the world want you to show them how it's done,
> not to do it themselves.

...because they learned the theory, but not the practical application
(to paraphrase Vipul).

> >> >>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
> >> >>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
>
> >> >Okay, lets see who can run longer.
> >>
> >> I run every morning. Last Saturday I ran for 45 minutes.
>
> 47+ minutes of hills this morning. Working my way up to an hour. Then I'll
> probably measure out a ten-mile course starting and ending at this house.
>
> >> I've done much longer
> >> runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?
> >
> >There are only two times when I run: 1) when someone is chasing me and
> >2) when I am chasing someone.
> >
> Notice that Vipul doesn't answer the question.

But he finally got the idea of a chump bet.

> >> >I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would
> >> >like
> >> >to know how they use one's car as power.
> >>
> >> Didn't they teach you anything in school?
> >>
> >> One word: Inverter.
> >
> >Second word: refund.
> >
> 'zactly.

Reminds me of the Latvian-American captain of OSU's volleyball team (full scholarship) who graduated with a EE degree. We were both in sales for an industrial electronics distributor. His classic line to me was, "I kept hearing terms like IF and RF and never figured out what they meant". That probably explains why he was in sales and not working in design.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

1948. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 17:14:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3ED8E2D9.3040104@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68048

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In article <3ED3E9E0.2749DA4E@yahoo.bomb>, Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
>writes:
>
>
>
>>If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>>
>>
>
>Interesting question. A few years ago, I had a "problem" with a repeater
>user who was signing "[prefix]3Triple-A." My assumption was that his
>call sign was [prefix]3TA, since he was using the phonetic word "triple"
>instead just saying the letter 'T'. However, he clarified that his call sign
>was, in fact, [prefix]3AAA, but he was just shortening it to "Triple A."
>Well, you can imagine what went on from there. Since he didn't live in
>my county, I took no action. I did inform the ARRL Official Observer
>in his area, but I never learned what became of it.
>
>
Did the guy quit IDing incorrectly? He may have been told informally
that there was a problem,
and he since IDed more properly.... If he insisted on doing it wrong,
then they could bring
in the funny cookie corporation.

1949. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 18:10:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8F031.9030205@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68049

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>> You were specifically asked your callsign, name, etc as it pertains to
>>Amateur Radio and you refused time after time.
>
>
> How is that relavant to the point?
>
>
>>Honesty does not have any "term limits". Sorry.
>
>
> I was honest. I didn't VOLUNTEER my callsign or name. How is that not honest? I
> didn't have to tell you that. Not volunteering one's name or callsign is not
> dis-honest or hiding. Hint: if someone does not tell you their name, it does
> not mean they are dis-honest.

Do a google search and find out. I googled your handle in this group,
and under one thread, (Immoral Truths) there is all the evidence you
might like.

A very smart gentleman once told me that regardless of what you may or
may not know to be true, if everyone else but you holds a different
opinion, your own opinion becomes moot. The best you can do is observe
why they have a different opinion, and learn from that.

If you are right, and we all are wrong, even then you have had a
communications failure.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1950. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 18:12:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8F0AE.9040604@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68050

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Hey Jim N2EY!
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 5/30/03 9:49 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3ED76F5C.6090800@psu.edu>
>
>
>>> I'll swap ya my Yaesu FT-757GX mkII, Mike...!?!?
>>
>>That's a coincidence, I almost bought one of them once. Seems like a
>>decent enough radio.
>
>
> To be truthful I prefered the original 757. The MkII was a replacement
> after the first was stolen. But the only real "problem" that I have with it is
> that the "mode" switch is a push button that steps through the modes. If you
> get a bit too hair triggered you have to go all the way around again.
>
> Technology be danged...give me rotary switches ! !

Same thing on the 745. And yes, I tend to push the button once too
often and have to cycle through again.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1951. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 18:41:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8F762.7000800@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68101

N2EY wrote:
> In article <20030530184638.20945.00000743@mb-m27.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
>
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>>
>>>>Its for "fun".
>>>
>>>So is the rest of Field Day.
>>
>>Boring to some.
>
>
> Not for me.
>
>
>>Fun for Hams, maybe.
>>
>
> So do what interests you.
>
> Here's a tip: Many Field Day groups need help during set-up and take-down.
> Volunteer to help with those things and leave the operating to others.

And HOW! If Vipul would like some instant acceptance, all he would have
to do is help put up and tear down the Field day stations at his local
club. Our club has a pretty involved operation, and we can always use
some more help. That might help me not use up so many calories over the
weekend.

>
>>>You're forgetting the most important point: The only way to KNOW what the
>>>capabilities of a station are is to actually operate it.
>>
>>Yes, thats standard Ham radio hype.
>
>
> No, it's a fact.

HAR! I missed that comment of his, Jim. The entire idea of putting up a
station, something which Vipul professes to like doing, is so that it
can get a good signal on the air. I would submit that a beautiful setup
can be made that will radiate virtually nothing. So how does Vipul

suggest that we test out his station setups?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1952. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 18:47:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8F8F6.6030307@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68102

Dave Heil wrote:
Dave Heil wrote:
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>From: N2EY
>>
>>
>>>The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
>>
>>Its for "fun".
>
>
> Partly so.
>
>
>>>For several years I ran FD single-handed. Class 1B-1. With my homebrew
>>>100 watt station, tent, generator, mast, the whole works. Site was an
>>>open field with no facilities other than grass, which I had to mow in
>>>order to have a place for the tent, generator and 44 foot homebrew
>>>mast. No usable trees or buildings. Put it all up myself in a few
>>>hours and took it all down again afterward. Site was 73 miles from
>>>home and had to bring everything to the site and back in a 15 year old
>>>VW Rabbit. Setup took about 5 hours and takedown about half that.
>>
>>Most Hams, including myself, are not EEs (IF you can call me a "Ham").
>
>
> I could call you a ham before I could call you a EE.
>
>
>>>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
>>>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
>>>
>>
>>Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.
>
>
> I get the feeling that you're setting yourself up for a chump bet.
>
>
>>>Battery/solar will do the job
>>>- why not use the best technology?
>>
>>I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would like

>>to know how they use one's car as power.
>
>
> See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.

And use it to buy that really really long extension cord they use to
power those florescent lights they use in the cars.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1953. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 18:54:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8FA8C.3000005@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68103

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
>
>>>>The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
>>>
>>>Its for "fun".
>>
>>Partly so.
>
>
> Yes, but if you invited someone to Field Day, who would find contests fun?

Me.

>
>>I could call you a ham before I could call you a EE.
>
>
> Unfortunately, I found amateur radio AFTER working as an EE. THEN, I learned
> about "Ham" radio, from a co-worker Ham. Now I am no longer an EE.

How does one become an EE based on thier present job?

>>>Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.
>>
>>I get the feeling that you're setting yourself up for a chump bet.
>
>
> Whats that?
>
>
>>>I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would
>>
>>like
>>
>>>to know how they use one's car as power.
>>
>>See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.
>
>
> EE courses, is more directly useable than most fields. However, EE courses,
> like any other field does not show you the practical application.

Could you maybe deduce the likely powering of the lights from what you
have learned?

> They don't
> teach you automechanics in EE. Amateur radio could give you a practical
> application of EE, but doesn't.

They don't teach about inverters?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1954. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 19:05:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED8FD3B.4080507@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68104

Dave Heil wrote:
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>
>>>>Fun for Hams, maybe.
>>>
>>>Who else is involved in Field Day?
>>
>>Maybe, one would invite someone.
>
>
> Those are onlookers, not participants. They might enjoy seeing the
> technology, marvel at the use of morse code, like an occasional burned
> hot dog and be on their way in an hour.
>
>
>>>It is obvious that they were simulating "real world" conditions. During
>>>a real emergency, folks may not have the option of showering for days.
>>>You might have to live with human smells mingled with chili, garlic or
>>>curry.
>>
>>Thats a good one!
>
>
> I spent ten years of my life in Africa. After you've been in an African
> disco when the temperature exceeds 100 degrees F and the person standing
> next to you exudes the odor of a bag or rotten onions, human smells
> don't offend you as easily as they might have in the past.

Yuck. I trust you didn't spend too much time in those African discos, Dave?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1955. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 19:28:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531152833.10617.00000393@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68105

>From: Dave Heil k8mn

>It took the efforts of another to reveal who you are. Only
>then did you admit it.

Correct.

>No, telling people that you never attempted to keep your name anonymous
>is dishonest.

I did not attempted to keep my name anonymous. I just didn't volunteer my name.

>But you would have us believe that you were totally forthcoming.

Yes, my views on Ham radio, as I expressed them, have not changed after you found out my name.

>Your stories only come in bits and pieces. Those bits and pieces only
>seem to confirm your latest preconceptions.

Yes, I know about those "bits and pieces". I just decide which ones to include first, and which ones later. It makes it more interesting that way.

They dont always seem to confirm my latest preconceptions. Once in a while some of the "bits and pieces" are positive for Ham radio, and I give credit for that. One example is when I added that some homebrewing occured at a CT hamfest, something untypical.

>We're not children here.

How do I know that? Children are allowed to get an amateur radio license.

>You have confirmed your adult status.

Thats true. At least you believe some of the things I say.

>Which is it? You've reversed yourself.

I'll reverse myself again. Not enough people know about Hams to laugh at them. I was trying to use the word AT. It was not correct. Most non-Hams do not laugh at Hams. The more correct statement is that most (this includes spouses of Hams) are dis-interested in Ham radio.

1956. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 19:42:50 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531154250.10617.00000395@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68106

>If you are right, and we all are wrong, even then you have had a
>communications failure.
>- Mike KB3EIA -

Alot of non-Hams and some Hams have the same opinions as some of my points.

1957. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 19:49:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531154928.10617.00000397@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68107

From: Mike Coslo, KB3EIA

>If Vipul would like some instant acceptance, all he would have
>to do is help put up and tear down the Field day stations at his local
>club.

I've helped other Hams with some antenna setups. Of course, the Ham whose station it is is grateful. I will do the setups, but not the take downs. (Don't learn as much from that).

1958. Re: is H.A.A.R.P. doing this?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 19:56:11 UTC
From: "Rev. Cleetus P Hogjowles" <voovoom5@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ed908ef@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 68108

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bb8ns7muf1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> What Im talking about is H.A.A.R.P. punching holes in the ionosphere.
How
> about reading my post then commenting again. And while your at it go
read
> the info H.A.A.R.P. provides on the internet. If that don't get you
> thinking then this discussion is over.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I doubt it Dan. More like sunspots messing things up.
The stuff about the HAARP doing everything from
changing the weather to causing cows not to give milk
is all so much hog-fat. Don't fall for that Shortwave
radio conspiracy-loon urban legend...

1959. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 19:58:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531155806.10617.00000399@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68109

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Don't worry, Dave. The Vipuls of the world want you to show them how it's
>done,
>> not to do it themselves.
>
>...because they learned the theory, but not the practical application
>(to paraphrase Vipul).

Yes, good point. Ham radio clubs should do this more. If I were to have a club, I would get more people using the equipment.

From k8mn:
>> >There are only two times when I run: 1) when someone is chasing me and
>> >2) when I am chasing someone.
>> >

From n2ey:
> >> I've done much longer
>> >> runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?

How far will a Ham chase me?

>"I kept hearing terms like IF and RF and never figured out what
>they meant". That probably explains why he was in sales and not working
>in design.

It could also be that schools do not always have practical projects. Also, many schools do not have any rf courses in their curriculum.

1960. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 20:10:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531161001.10617.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68110

From: Mike Coslo, KB3EIA

>However, EE courses,
>> like any other field does not show you the practical application.
>
> Could you maybe deduce the likely powering of the lights from what you
>have learned?

Sometimes I have figured things like that out in they worked. But, its not always easy to do. Figuring it out may not always work.

The steps may be easy enough to follow AFTER you know how to do it. It better if you had the specialty automechanics electronics training.

>
>> See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.
>
>
> And use it to buy that really really long extension cord they use to
>power those florescent lights they use in the cars.

They dont give refunds for courses.

1961. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 20:11:19 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0305311211.4b2c6183@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68111

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030531102358.23307.00000359@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <3ED89F38.3D338B33@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
they teach you anything in school?
> >>
> >> One word: Inverter.
> >
> >Second word: refund.
> >
> 'zactly.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Third word....Naaaaahhhhhhh. Not today.

Steve, K4CAP

1962. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 20:23:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531162343.20217.00000373@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68112

In article <3ED8CC74.4B9012A7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >The first time I see some guy with a scientific calculator figuring how
>> >to best launch a rope into a tree, I'm quitting FD forever.
>>
>> Don't worry, Dave. The Vipuls of the world want you to show them how it's
>> done, not to do it themselves.
>
>...because they learned the theory, but not the practical application
>(to paraphrase Vipul).

And then they will criticize how you do it.
>
>> >> >>Let's see you beat that, Vipul. Including things like raising a 44
>> >> >>foot mast that can hold a wire antenna with no help.
>>
>> >> >Okay, lets see who can run longer.
>> >>
>> >> I run every morning. Last Saturday I ran for 45 minutes.
>>
>> 47+ minutes of hills this morning. Working my way up to an hour. Then I'll
>> probably measure out a ten-mile course starting and ending at this house.

I used to measure my runs in miles. Now I use minutes.
>>
>> >> I've done much longer
>> >> runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?
>> >
>> >There are only two times when I run: 1) when someone is chasing me and
>> >2) when I am chasing someone.
>> >
>> Notice that Vipul doesn't answer the question.
>
>But he finally got the idea of a chump bet.
>
Hopefully.

>Reminds me of the Latvian-American captain of OSU's volleyball team
>(full scholarship) who graduated with a EE degree. We were both in
>sales for an industrial electronics distributor. His classic line to me
>was, "I kept hearing terms like IF and RF and never figured out what
>they meant". That probably explains why he was in sales and not working
>in design.
>

".....about as sharp as a BOWLIN ball....."

73 de Jim, N2EY

1963. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 20:23:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531162345.20217.00000374@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68113

In article <3ED8CB76.DE513BCC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >> Yet there are some who don't understand that plain, simple fact at
>> >> all. Remember when ol' Gary and Carl lectured us on how contests could
>> >> be simulated on a network?
>> >
>> >But that wouldn't be a radio contest, would it? That'd be a virtual
>> >radio contest or a computer network contest.
>>
>> Their idea was that the network would be via radio on the amateur bands, so
>it
>> would be an amateur radio contest. I can repost their idea, if you like.
>
>I've forgotten the specifics. It might be nice to see what they
>actually proposed.

They never gave anyhting really specific. Basically it sounded like a form of
frame relay or TCP/IP adapted to amateur radio. Toss yer packets into the mix
and the network will get 'em where they are supposed to go, that sort of thing.

>
>> I recall all sorts of put-downs of any sort of radiosport, using such
>> phrases as
>> "electronic paintball wars" and griping about how their idea was held back
>> by
>> "dinosaur-dung-encrusted regulations".
>
>I do recall those those ignorant comments and Carl's line about stomping
>others into the dust.

You got the drift.
>
>> Nice guys with great leadership skills, huh?
>
>I never thought they were either nice guys or had any leadership skills.

Dry Yankee humor. Eh?
>
>> I remember explaining that it would be like running the Boston Marathon on
>> a
>> treadmill hooked to a VCR that would show video of the course. They claimed
>> their emulations would be very realistic and they could not understand why
>> anyone would insist on the "real thing".
>
>They had it backward. Why would anyone want to do a virtual contest

>when they could do the real thing?

The idea was that with their system the bands would never be crowded with contesters. Nobody would need big antennas or high power, just a little setup that could access the network. Nobody who wasn't in the contest would have to deal with contest QRM. In theory, anyway.
>
>> PLC (power line communications) may make it all a moot point.
>
>That's one of the most serious problems that radio could face. I don't
>see how anyone at the Commission could fail to see the interference
>potential and even likelihood.

Doesn't matter - if they think getting everyone a highspeed net connection is more important, or is going to spur the economy, they'll push it. Heck, in Germany there's a proposal to rewrite the rules so that only safety-of-life radio services are protecte from Part 15-type interference.

We all have to fight this thing because it goes way beyond raising the noise floor on 60 meters. The acceptable noise limits of incidental radiators are already too high.
>
>> >> > > Which is why you don't see a lot of hams lugging
>> >> > > SINGCARS units around.
>> >> >
>> >> > ALE doesn't seem to have taken the amateur radio world by storm.
>> >>
>> >> Imagine CQ WW handled that way....
>> >
>> >The rates would certainly go down. So would the fun factor.
>> >
>> Tell it to the PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO
>
>A lot of the PROFESSIONALS spend their time in
>point-to-very-specific-point work.

You mean like Japan-to-the-USA stuff?

>Most hams do not.

Yer preachin' to the choir.

>I can remember one
>instance in which we worked into an African relay which suddenly went
>down hard and permanently.

I can guess why.

>We were faced with working long haul HF back
>into the U.S.--a four thousand mile hop during periods of frequent solar
>flares. Two of us attempted to explain to the ambassador that
>communications outages could be frequent and prolonged. He was silent
>for a moment and said, "That'll be okay. If we have anything urgent to

>go, we'll just send it NIACT (night action precedent). The two of us
>doing the explaining stared at each other with opend mouths and decided
>to start over with the explanation.

Reminds me of the old joke about the proposed manned expedition to the sun.
When told how hot the sun is, the response was "no problem - we'll go at
night".

Consider that "the ambassador" could be a Commissioner today. Or someday.
>
>> >> Agreed. Many of the features are contest/DX specific anyway. Heck, for
>> >> ragchewing a 2-B and Ranger setup is just about ideal. Or an HW-101.
>> >> Add a Courier amp/SB-200 for some wattage.
>> >
>> >That's part of what makes amateur radio a great avocation.
>> >Participation is possible no matter what the family finances dictate.
>> >The guy on the other end can't easily tell how old your equipment
>> >happens to be.
>>
>> That's another Great Equalizer. The effect is most pronounced on CW/Morse,
>>of
>> course. In that mode, skill or its lack are very apparent and the
>>equipment
>> used is not apparent at all. On the air with CW/Morse, no one can tell
>>whether
>> I am using an IC-7800 or a rebuilt Southgate Type 1. I suspect that is one
>>big
>> reason some folks dislike the mode so much.
>
>It is easy to put out a clean and stable signal from an HT-46, an HT-32B
>or a T-4X but CW gear is much easier to homebrew.

BTDT. Another reason the mode is disliked by some.

> It'd be harder to disguise a Swan 500-C "Drift-o-matic".

Any Swan was rock-steady compared to the famous Eico "seven-drifty-three" that
was popular in these parts. Fortunately, I learned about it from others.

>> Well, a 300 MHz Pentium 2 or equivalent, if ya wanna run later Windoze
>versions
>> and newer apps.
>
>I haven't found much that I want to use which won't run on my 200 MHz
>Pentium with Win 98 SE.
>
>> Plus the dern things are getting so inexpensive that us dumpster divers are
>> finding gold mines everywhere.
>
>I see 300-600 meg machines for sale in the local classified ads for
>$150-$250 all the time. A number of companies give them away when they
>upgrade.

Check out the Dell website. Incredible what you can get for under $500.
>
>> I have a 486DX4 100 MHz in prime working shape, btw. VLB video card, Win
>95B
>> and everything. Cost me maybe $100 to build a couple years back. Dinosaur.
>
>But useable for the forseeable future.

Yup. Meanwhile things like 386 motherboards are parts sources for me.....
>
>> >My "fast" computer doesn't sit in
>> >the shack but rather in the next room where it handles large scans,
>> >digital photos and music files for recording or editing.
>> >
>> Same here.
>
>...and when mine gets upgraded, I'll slide the currently fast one into
>the shack. In the interim, I have several networked and have my inkjet
>printer set up in the other room and my laser printer in the shack.
>
The older computers move down the food chain.

>> I'm thinking of an external grid-driven single 811 amp to put the K2 in the
>> 100
>> watt class plus light up the shack. Or maybe a pair of 807s.
>
>...or you could do a pair of cheap, grid-driven 4CX250B's for less light
>and more snot. WA5FIR once built a pair in a Drake speaker cabinet just
>to show how small a KW amp could be.

kewl!
>
>> Just until the
>> Southgate Type 8 is done. The guy on the other end can't tell.....
>
>All right. You've kept alluding to the Southgate series. What's been
>the evolution?

Very, very long story. Only hombrew and certain suplus lashups got Southagte
designations. Full of sideroads and A/B/C models. Here's a start:

The Southgate Type 1 was my first SWL/Novice station Circa 1967. Built from
pieces of old TVs and the remains of an NRI radio-correspondence course that I
got at a fleamarket.auction for fifty cents. Rx was a 6SN7/6K6 regen, tx a 6V6
xtal osc on 3726 and later 7175 (back when the Novice bands were different).
Actually learned the code and made contacts with it. Antenna was a wire out to
the crab apple tree. Ground was the radiator pipe. Ten watts in, five watts out
on a good day.

Replaced by a Heath AR-2/QF-1 and DX-20 combo. Eventually added a Gonset Super
6 converter ahead of the AR-2 for better performance and a VF-1 to the DX-20
when I got the Advanced in '68. Then an SX-99 and a Viking Adventurer. All gone
now except the J-37 key and some bits and pieces from the Type 1. I don;t want

to think what some of that stuff would be worth now.

Not bad for a 13 year old with no help from the parental units, huh?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1964. Re: is H.A.A.R.P. doing this?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 20:29:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbb39h$74p$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68114

"Rev. Cleetus P Hogjowles" <voovoom5@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ed908ef@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bb8ns7muf1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > What Im talking about is H.A.A.R.P. punching holes in the ionosphere.
> How
> > about reading my post then commenting again. And while your at it go
> read
> > the info H.A.A.R.P. provides on the internet. If that don't get you
> > thinking then this discussion is over.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I doubt it Dan. More like sunspots messing things up.
> The stuff about the HAARP doing everything from
> changing the weather to causing cows not to give milk
> is all so much hog-fat. Don't fall for that Shortwave
> radio conspiracy-loon urban legend...
>
>

Wasnt aware it was a 'Shortwave radio conspiracy-loon urban legend'. It was
a legitimate question I thought I posed.

Dan/W4NTI

1965. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 20:29:51 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0305311229.2f03af74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68115

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030531094153.06694.00000491@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> > You were specifically asked your callsign, name, etc as it pertains to
> >Amateur Radio and you refused time after time.
>
> How is that relavant to the point?

How can we put any credibility into your posts when you are
so-often proven untrustworthy, Vipul?

Lennie the Liar is probably a very intelligent person, but he too
is so-often proven to be a liar that nothing he says, even that which
IS truthful or factual is respected.

> >Honesty does not have any "term limits". Sorry.
>
> I was honest. I didn't VOLUNTEER my callsign or name. How is that not honest?

The part that is NOT honest is that you keep repeating that all
you refused to give was your callsign. That is not true. You were
asked your name. You refused. You we asked your experience/education
to validate some of your posts...you refused. We asked you your age
and profession...You refused.

The part you are being dishonest about is stating that you DID
give your name and other information. You did NOT do any of that
until I proved who you were.

> I didn't have to tell you that. Not volunteering one's name or callsign is not
> dis-honest or hiding. Hint: if someone does not tell you their name, it does
> not mean they are dis-honest.

I have already made my point.

> Now that you know my name and callsign, its not anonymous. That time has
> passed. So, that no longer applies.

You keep repeating that you DID give your name, etc. That is not
true. As long as you keep asserting that you did not decieve or
mislead, the subject is relevent.

> > You are pretty poor at after-the-fact storytelling, Vipul. You were
> >hiding behind your screen name long before I joined the fray.
>
> Yes, I am pretty poor at after-the-fact storytelling. Not one of my talents.

> Any story of the events I have attended were from actually going there and
> telling what people said. I give one part at a time, otherwise it would be a
> very long account of events. Nothing is added on to "improve" the story. Just
> the true story.

You missed the point again. You keep trying to re-write what you
already said. It can't be done in this forum. You are seemingly
oblivious to the fact that "Google" exactly archives everything posted
to USENET. Your numerous attempts to re-write things you said are
archived.

> Never had any intention of hiding. How does the obvious qualify as "hiding"?
> Also, I did not deny it when you found it out. Hiding and not volunteering is
> two different things.

It is when you try to decieve people about who you are, what you
are, etc.

> >>>FACT: The internet is no more dangerous than driving to work in the
> >>>morning - much less in fact.
> >>
> >>How do U know?
> >
> > Because of a lack of evidence to the contrary, Vippy. I can find any
> >number of "road rage" stories in the paper on almost any given day.
>
> Yes, but it does happen. Children getting kidnapped after meeting someone
> throught the internet, for example.

I didn't say it DIDN'T happen, Vipul. I (and others) said it is
LESS DANGEROUS than driving. This is a fact. Also, many of the
"bad" things that happen that also involve the Internet involve mutual
participation. One prominent local case involved a 30+ year old man
who seduced a local teenager, met her here locally and spent the
weekend with her in a local motel. Illegal, yes...but she was at
liberty to walk out the door at any moment. He could have just as
easily "met" her at the local hamburger joint or movie theater.

> >Too late, Vipul...We've already been laughing AT you for months.
>
> Non-Hams laugh AT the behaviour of Hams. Mostly show dis-interest, rather than
> laugh, actually.

The difference here, of course, is that WE (many of the
participant in RRAP) are Hams laughing at another Ham (you). It has
nothing to do with non-Amateurs.

Steve, K4CAP

1966. Unmanned station / telemetry question...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 20:48:16 UTC
From: achilles03@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <fef44ceb.0305311248.73c899e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68116

I'm currently studying to get a tech's license in AR for a project I'm working on involving an airborne balloon transmitting morse code. From what I've read, only repeaters are allowed as unmanned stations.

My question is, what about location-oriented telemetry? I'm sure they don't fall under the 'telecommand' type of transmission, as aren't coming from a controller to a controlled device. Instead, it's an uncontrolled device transmitting to a(ny) listener. Do you have to get a permit or waiver to do this type of radio telemetry?

Thanks in advance for any insight anyone has to offer.

Dave

1967. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:02:37 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bbbcadbsk1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 68127

The Patriot <bogus@fake.com> wrote:
>And you (and others) are idiots for publishing your names, and
>especially your calls on these looney-toon forums. Why, suppose you
>said the wrong thing to some REALLY CRAZY PERSON? He/she could just
>look you up on QRZ, come right to your door, ring your bell, and when
>you come to the door, BLAM!! Blow your head clean off. This would
>probably ruin your whole day. :-)

The same could happen from something you say on the air. Does this mean that you don't identify yourself (i.e.,use your callsign) and thus, operate illegally? (Or is it that you don't have a call?)

The key to avoiding the situation you outline is to state your opinion in a thoughtful and respectful manner, never condemning those who might disagree. Signing your name and call adds a touch of validity to your comments; without them, few will take you serious.

I've been posting here since 1992 and have never had anyone show up on my doorstep, even during the heated code/no-code wars!

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1968. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:06:54 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bbbciebtj1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 68126

The Patriot <bogus@fake.com> wrote:
>What a pompous ass you are, roll, and a squealer too.
>Jeez, what a moron.

See what I mean? You wouldn't have to be an anon if you
avoided the name-calling.

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1969. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:21:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531192101.14936.00000653@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68117

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/31/03 2:49 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030531154928.10617.00000397@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo, KB3EIA
>
>>If Vipul would like some instant acceptance, all he would have
>>to do is help put up and tear down the Field day stations at his local
>>club.
>
>I've helped other Hams with some antenna setups. Of course, the Ham whose
>station it is is grateful. I will do the setups, but not the take downs.
>(Don't
>learn as much from that).

Perhaps not, but you learn who your friends are this way.

I think we have you pegged already, though.

Steve, K4CAP

1970. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:26:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531192633.14936.00000654@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68118

>ubject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/31/03 7:47 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030531084745.06694.00000490@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
>>> >The operating part of FD is done to prove the capabilities.
>>>
>>> Its for "fun".
>>
>>Partly so.
>
>Yes, but if you invited someone to Field Day, who would find contests fun?
>
>>I could call you a ham before I could call you a EE.
>
>Unfortunately, I found amateur radio AFTER working as an EE. THEN, I learned
>about "Ham" radio, from a co-worker Ham. Now I am no longer an EE.

You were never an EE anyway, so why make an issue of it?

>>> Okay, lets see who can run longer. Just, joking.
>>
>>I get the feeling that you're setting yourself up for a chump bet.
>
>Whats that?

That's American for "How Much Money Would You Like To Lose?"

>>> I've seen flourescent lights operated with car power in parades. I would
>>like
>>> to know how they use one's car as power.
>>
>>See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.
>
>EE courses, is more directly useable than most fields. However, EE courses,
>like any other field does not show you the practical application. They don't
>teach you automechanics in EE. Amateur radio could give you a practical
>application of EE, but doesn't.

Oh? I took several electrical engineering courses while in SoCal, all of
which were "practical application" courses. (As part and parcel of my duties in
the USMC, paid for by same)

Guess you took the "K-Tel" version of "electrical engineering" courses,
Vippy?

>>> And heavy winds were there that weekend, even the whole night. The setup
>>lasted
>>> under those windy conditions.
>>
>>Yeah, most do.
>
>Yes, but it takes knowledge and experience. I learned some of their tricks.
>Ham
>radio should have more events like that one.

We do. You just aren't paying attention.

Steve, K4CAP

1971. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:28:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531192807.14936.00000655@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68119

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/31/03 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030531100048.06694.00000493@mb-m19.aol.com>

>Okay. Before finding about Ham radio, I experimented with amateur radio
>circuits, including kits. Then, I learned about Ham radio from a co-worker.
>Then I got an amateur radio license.

And now you need to learn ABOUT Amateur Radio.

Steve, K4CAP

1972. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:32:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531193203.14936.00000656@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68120

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/31/03 3:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030531161001.10617.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>

Mike said:
>>> See if you can get your money back for the EE courses you took.

Vippy replied:
>They dont give refunds for courses.

Another point missed.

Steve, K4CAP

1973. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:34:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531193402.14936.00000657@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68121

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/31/03 2:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030531155806.10617.00000399@mb-m15.aol.com>

>From n2ey:
>> >> I've done much longer
>>> >> runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?
>
>How far will a Ham chase me?

A well trained one doesn't have to "chase".

>It could also be that schools do not always have practical projects. Also,
>many
>schools do not have any rf courses in their curriculum.

I was right...He got his "EE" from "K-Tel".

Steve, K4CAP

1974. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:41:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531194127.14936.00000658@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68122

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/31/03 2:42 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030531154250.10617.00000395@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>>If you are right, and we all are wrong, even then you have had a
>>communications failure.
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>Alot of non-Hams and some Hams have the same opinions as some of my points.

It's not about the validity of your opinions, Vipul. It's about your credibility over your repeated acts of untruthfulness and misdirection.

Steve, K4CAP

1975. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-05-31 23:51:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531195153.14936.00000659@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68123

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 5/31/03 2:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030531152833.10617.00000393@mb-m15.aol.com>

>>No, telling people that you never attempted to keep your name anonymous
>>is dishonest.
>
>I did not attempted to keep my name anonymous. I just didn't volunteer my
>name.

Nor did you provide it when directly asked.

Nor did you provide your callsign when directly asked.

Nor did you provide your technical background when directly asked.

Nor did you provide your experience in Amateur Radio when directly asked.

Now you are not telling the truth about how you refused all that
information and how, since we now "know" who you are that your previous
obfuscation is now "OK".

>>But you would have us believe that you were totally forthcoming.
>
>Yes, my views on Ham radio, as I expressed them, have not changed after you
>found out my name.

Nor has my opinion on how inadequate they are and how unfounded much of it
is.

>Yes, I know about those "bits and pieces". I just decide which ones to
>include
>first, and which ones later. It makes it more interesting that way.

No, it adds to the confusion of what you are trying to say. You have some
valid points, but who tell make out what youa re trying to say on the rest.

You seem to get your insults out easily. The rest is cryptic and appears
childish in it's content and presentation. It is NOT the work of somone who is
allegedly college educated in electronics.

>>We're not children here.
>
>How do I know that? Children are allowed to get an amateur radio license.

You can look at many of our QRZ profiles. Most of us are old enough that
our DOB (including mine) is on the QRZ site.

>>You have confirmed your adult status.
>
>Thats true. At least you believe some of the things I say.

Other than saying he's an adult, I've not seen any evidence of it here.

>>Which is it? You've reversed yourself.
>
>I'll reverse myself again. Not enough people know about Hams to laugh at
>them.
>I was trying to use the word AT. It was not correct. Most non-Hams do not
>laugh
>at Hams. The more correct statement is that most (this includes spouses of
>Hams) are dis-interested in Ham radio.

This is another example of your cryptic and ill-prepared rantings, Vippy.

Steve, K4CAP

1976. Re: Unmanned station / telemetry question...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 00:00:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030531200059.14936.00000660@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68124

>Subject: Unmanned station / telemetry question...
>From: achilles03@hotmail.com (David Harper)
>Date: 5/31/03 3:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <fef44ceb.0305311248.73c899e7@posting.google.com>
>
>I'm currently studying to get a tech's license in AR for a project I'm
>working on involving an airborne balloon transmitting morse code.
>From what I've read, only repeaters are allowed as unmanned stations.

Hi Dave and welcome to Amateur Radio.

>My question is, what about location-oriented telemetry? I'm sure they
>don't fall under the 'telecommand' type of transmission, as aren't
>coming from a controller to a controlled device. Instead, it's an
>uncontrolled device transmitting to a(ny) listener. Do you have to
>get a permit or waiver to do this type of radio telemetry?

Nope. As long as your telemetry ID's once every ten minutes as required
by Part 97 (the FCC's rules and regulations for Amateur Radio), you are "OK".

There ARE "band plans", or mutually agreed upon conventions, that "divide"
many of the bands into certain types of activities. Obviously you don't want
your telemetry in the middle of a busy repeater input or output, both to ensure
you get uncorrupted data, but also to avoid interfering with other users of the
spectrum.

Don't despair, there is more than enough spectrum for all users!

>Thanks in advance for any insight anyone has to offer.

Stop by some time and let us know how it's going.

73

Steve Robeson, LPN
Amateur Radio call K4CAP

1977. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 00:07:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3ED943EC.3010508@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68125

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo, KB3EIA
>
>
>>If Vipul would like some instant acceptance, all he would have
>>to do is help put up and tear down the Field day stations at his local
>>club.
>
>
> I've helped other Hams with some antenna setups. Of course, the Ham whose
> station it is is grateful. I will do the setups, but not the take downs. (Don't
> learn as much from that).

What a nice guy! So right at the moment you would be needed the most,
you don't help because you aren't "learning" anything.

I'll bet that you might change your mind about hams if you would lose
the attitude of *only* doing things that you consider beneficial to
yourself.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1978. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 01:46:36 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbblts$r82$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 68128

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bb479f$69s$0@208.207.71.156>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> >> On 28 May 2003 03:11:35 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >>
> >> > And if you ever get to Cheyenne, Wyoming, drop off I-80 onto
> >> > Lincolnway and drive by the city park. It's where the lone
> >> > remaining example of Union Pacific's Big Boy is set up on
> >> > display. That's the huge 4-8-8-4 specially built to cross the
> >> > Rockies between Cheyenne and Ogden, Utah. It's 132 feet long. Of
> >> > only 25 built, it's the only one left in existance. I got some
> >> > great digital photos.
> >>
> >> Didn't the You Pee revive one for Steve Lee to drive?
>
> No, that was a Challenger. 4-6-6-4 wheel arrangement as opposed to the Big
> Boy's 4-8-8-4.
> >
> > I'm unfamiliar with that, but the local blurb says that the Cheyenne
> >display is the last remaining Big Boy.
>
> Various websites detail at least seven Big Boys in various museums. None are
> operational, although a few look like they would not need a lot of work to get
> running again. Passing all the required tests is another matter.
> >
> >> I
> >> confuse the 3945 and the 8444 (now the 844). Or was that the
> >> Challenger?
>
> > The Cheyenne engine is #4004.
> >
> I think the Challenger is 3985.
>
> One of the websites shows a museum with a Big Boy indoors (!) next to a tuscan
> red GG-1.
>
> Google will reveal all.
>

Google sure did. So much for believing the local blurbs. Good stuff on Google
along with some great pix. Thanks, Jim.

>
> btw, nobody has answered the original trivia question (what is the
> purpose/meaning of the letter "F" on electric locomotives and MU cars?). I can
> tell that Phil knows the answer.
>

Youse guys are the hardcore railfans, I'm just an 'amateur'. Har.

Ya got me, what does it mean?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1979. Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 02:40:29 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <nGdCa.35020$Vf5.586@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68129

Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets through when nothing else will!

End of story.

73 de KR4AJ

1980. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 04:34:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED982D1.16954BED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68130

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> >>>From: Dave Heil k8mn
> >>
> >>>>Fun for Hams, maybe.
> >>>
> >>>Who else is involved in Field Day?
> >>
> >>Maybe, one would invite someone.
> >
> >
> > Those are onlookers, not participants. They might enjoy seeing the
> > technology, marvel at the use of morse code, like an occasional burned
> > hot dog and be on their way in an hour.
> >
> >
> >>>It is obvious that they were simulating "real world" conditions. During
> >>>a real emergency, folks may not have the option of showering for days.
> >>>You might have to live with human smells mingled with chili, garlic or
> >>>curry.
> >>
> >>Thats a good one!
> >
> >
> > I spent ten years of my life in Africa. After you've been in an African
> > disco when the temperature exceeds 100 degrees F and the person standing
> > next to you exudes the odor of a bag or rotten onions, human smells
> > don't offend you as easily as they might have in the past.
>
> Yuck. I trust you didn't spend too much time in those African discos, Dave?

Not too much but there are places where fun is where you find it. If
you're in a country with no TV, a night of listening to eighteen guys in
identical tie-dyed pajamas singing a 25 minute song in unison can be
entertaining.

"It isn't the heat or the humidity. It is the throbbing of the drums
which is slowly driving me mad".

Dave K8MN

1981. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 04:48:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED98617.E3397E62@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68131

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >It took the efforts of another to reveal who you are. Only
> >then did you admit it.
>
> Correct.
>
> >No, telling people that you never attempted to keep your name anonymous
> >is dishonest.
>
> I did not attempted to keep my name anonymous. I just didn't volunteer my name.

Look, Vipul. If people ask your name or your call sign and you decline
to give it, you are attempting to keep them anonymous. Your statement
above is simply false.

> >But you would have us believe that you were totally forthcoming.
>
> Yes, my views on Ham radio, as I expressed them, have not changed after you
> found out my name.

Not your ideas, Vipul--we're discussing the fact that you did not
provide your name or call when asked several times.

> >Your stories only come in bits and pieces. Those bits and pieces only
> >seem to confirm your latest preconceptions.
>
> Yes, I know about those "bits and pieces". I just decide which ones to include
> first, and which ones later. It makes it more interesting that way.

...only to you.

> They dont always seem to confirm my latest preconceptions. Once in a while some
> of the "bits and pieces" are positive for Ham radio, and I give credit for
> that. One example is when I added that some homebrewing occured at a CT
> hamfest, something untypical.

That is atypical. Most homebrewing does not take place at a hamfest.

> >We're not children here.
>
> How do I know that? Children are allowed to get an amateur radio license.

How many children do you know who have been in amateur radio for forty
years and who are retired?

> >You have confirmed your adult status.
>
> Thats true. At least you believe some of the things I say.

I didn't say that I find it easy to believe.

> >Which is it? You've reversed yourself.
>
> I'll reverse myself again. Not enough people know about Hams to laugh at them.
> I was trying to use the word AT. It was not correct. Most non-Hams do not laugh
> at Hams. The more correct statement is that most (this includes spouses of
> Hams) are dis-interested in Ham radio.

My computer has all sorts of ways to delete things which I do not mean
to say. I can use the "delete" key. I can highlight and cut. If you
write something which you don't mean, why keep it at all? Why not just
get rid of it before sending to the newsgroup. That might give some
clarity to your comments. Clarity won't necessarily prompt anyone to
agree with your sweeping generalizations.

Dave K8MN

1982. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 04:53:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3ED9873E.204F9D05@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68132

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Don't worry, Dave. The Vipuls of the world want you to show them how it's
> >done,
> >> not to do it themselves.
> > >
> > >...because they learned the theory, but not the practical application
> > >(to paraphrase Vipul).
> >
> > Yes, good point. Ham radio clubs should do this more. If I were to have a club,
> > I would get more people using the equipment.

A cattle prod would be more efficient than a club.

> From k8mn:
> >> >There are only two times when I run: 1) when someone is chasing me and
> >> >2) when I am chasing someone.
> >> >
> >
> From n2ey:
> > > >> I've done much longer
> >> >> runs, including two 26.22 mile marathons. How far can your run, Vipul?
> >
> How far will a Ham chase me?

...depends on what you've said to him.

> >"I kept hearing terms like IF and RF and never figured out what
> >they meant". That probably explains why he was in sales and not working
> >in design.
>
> It could also be that schools do not always have practical projects. Also, many
> schools do not have any rf courses in their curriculum.

Or it could mean that the man was at Ohio State to play volleyball and
that his EE degree was a gift.

Dave K8MN

1983. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 05:14:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601011432.20766.00000512@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68133

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
>Date: 5/31/03 6:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bbbcadbsk1@news.hawaii.edu>

>The same could happen from something you say on the air. Does
>this mean that you don't identify yourself (i.e.,use your
>callsign) and thus, operate illegally? (Or is it that you don't
>have a call?)

psssssst....hey Jeff...think "Lennie"

>I've been posting here since 1992 and have never had anyone
>show up on my doorstep, even during the heated code/no-code
>wars!

Having your doorstep 2500 miles from CONUS helps! =)

73

Steve, K4CAP

1984. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 05:16:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601011658.20766.00000513@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68134

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/31/03 11:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED982D1.16954BED@earthlink.net>

>Not too much but there are places where fun is where you find it. If
>you're in a country with no TV, a night of listening to eighteen guys in
>identical tie-dyed pajamas singing a 25 minute song in unison can be
>entertaining.

Whew....there's only one way to relieve that...

"Olongopo".

73

Steve, K4CAP

1985. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 05:22:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601012222.20766.00000515@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68135

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/31/03 11:53 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ED9873E.204F9D05@earthlink.net>

>> >...because they learned the theory, but not the practical application
>> >(to paraphrase Vipul).
>>
>> Yes, good point. Ham radio clubs should do this more. If I were to have a
>club,
>> I would get more people using the equipment.
>
>A cattle prod would be more efficient than a club.

Awwww...CRAP Dave! I ought to bill you for the dry cleaning for the Coke
I dropped in my lap for that one ! ! ! ! ! =) =) =)

But will HE get it...?!?!

ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! ! ! !

>> How far will a Ham chase me?
>
>...depends on what you've said to him.

A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire point
sighted!

73 and thanks ! ! !

Steve, K4CAP

1986. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 11:35:53 UTC
From: Merl Turkin <Terk@astroburp.net>
Message-ID: <nvlCa.3$eo.4435@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 68136

On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:

> Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
> time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
> through when nothing else will!
>
> End of story.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

Kind of like PSK31 huh?

1987. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 11:42:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601074234.29071.00000282@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68137

>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3ED53692.205DCA11@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian Kelly wrote:

>> Ask Jim about his beloved diesel Rabbit.
>
>Well, Jim? I always enjoy a good automotive tale.

Back in late '79, after enduring the gas shortages and the make-do pollution controls of that era, I ordered a new diesel Rabbit. Made in Westmoreland, PA, although the engine came from Germany. They were so popular that you had to wait 6-8 weeks while they built 'em.

Most of the driving I did back then was the very worst kind for any car - short trips, stop-and-go driving, bouncing over bad city streets. Car took it all and kept on humming. In '87 it was rear ended on Mac Dade Boulevard and the insurance company declared it totalled even though it was fixable. I took the insurance money and found a small shop in Yeadon that would fix it for a very good price.

In '89 I got a good deal on a used one with a remanufactured engine and trans. The original was well over 100,000 miles by then, so in the spring of 1990 my dad and I did an engine/transmission swap. Actually it was more of a "make one good car out of two mediocre ones". End result was rather odd looking because the interior parts were not all the same color. But it ran really well and I had a pile of spares to keep it going.

I tried to keep after the rust but with the steel they used and the road salt it was a losing game unless I learned to weld in new body panels. By 1997 it was getting to the point where I knew it would fail inspection at some point. So I traded it in on a Saturn. Still ran and drove great after 17 years, but it prolly went straight from the Saturn dealer to the crusher because there's not much call for those cars.

No ignition noise, no computer, easy to take care of. Change the oil, change the filters, get the timing checked once a year when you get it inspected, have 'em change the timing belt every 5 years or so while they're at it. Met all the pollution specs and got 40+ mpg in the city. On long road trips it would get well over 50 mpg. Although not a big car, it was comfy for me, and I'm 6' 3" .

For Field Day, I would remove all of the seats except the driver's seat, load all the gear inside and put the mast on the roof. Weighed everyhting beforehand to avoid exceeding the 837 pound limit. Never a problem.

Well, you asked for a story...

>> > > Nuttin' under the hood eh? Not-so-hypothetical scenario: One guy has
>> > > say an Omni6+. 'Nother guy in the same neighborhood has the same
>> > > antennas and same set of operating skills and an MP. Both jump into a
>> > > dx contest and go at it. Come the end of the contest the guy with the
>> > > Omni obviously has to have have beaten the guy with the MP,
>> > > absolutetly has to be, yes?

Only if everything else is equal. Which it never is.
>> >
>> > I don't think you're being fair to yourself in setting your
>> > hyptothetical even though we know that two ops aren't really going to
>> > have the same operating skills. One guy might be a whiz at handling
>> > rapid fire QSOs but he might be on the wrong band.
>>
>> Yew are absolutely right there. I'll tellya how bad that can get.
>> Within the club there are well-known differences amongst the guest ops
>> who run in the multi-multis. You'll find "classified ads" in the
>> reflector like "W3ABC needs two runners for the CQ phone." Runners &
>> pouncers, different critters.
>
>The fellows who fly solo from their home stations or as guest ops from a
>big station end up being the best ops because they must learn to run as
>well as search and pounce if they are going to have competitive scores.

Most of all they gotta learn when to run and when to pounce.
>
>> > To make your scenario slightly better, the guy
>> > with the MP would have his rig rise about a foot-and-a-half off the
>> > table with keying from the nearby Omni VI+ when the receiver of the MP
>> > folded up. Things might even out though: The guy with the Omni would
>> > have to deal with the key clicks from the MP :)
>>
>> I doubt it. Copied-pasted from from another e-mailed missive I
>> recieved:
>>
>> w3rv: "The Ten-Tec Omni 6+ supposedly has a rcvr which noticeably
>> better than any of the FT-1000 series and any of the big Icoms."
>>
>> Response from MP owner: "I'm not convinced of this claim. My
>> neighbor, K3WU has one of these rigs and his signal is all over the
>> place! Lot's of harmonics and very hard keying. He hears less well
>> than I do, much less better."
>>
>> . . . so there . . !
>
>Let's look at the possible flaws in the guy's statement:
>
>Lots of harmonics and very hard keying (Ten-Tec is known for neither of
>these). Could it be that the guy's MP is overloading and going
>non-linear in the presence of strong signals from a nearby Omni VI?

Probably. 'Specially if the MP is running with the AGC on and RF gain turned up.....
>
>"He hears less well than I do...". How do we know this? Is the guy who
>owns the Omni VI a good op? Are his antennas in the same league?

Or does he have to endure the MP's key clicks?

>> > > > Whet your interest any? You might want to take a look at Doug
>Smith's
>> > > > article on the programmable AGC at
>> > > > http://www.doug-smith.net/digitalagc.htm
>> > >
>> > > Puts the AGC discussion solidly to bed.
>> >
>> > I'm interested in what Jim has to say about it.
>>
>> Doan matter, he could never bring hisself to use the AGC on cw. No
>> matter what.

Not at all. I use it sometimes. Most of the time I turn it off, though. My main point is that from the beginning of the transceiver era until recently most low and middle end rigs did not let you turn the AGC off.
>
>We take these things in very small steps. One day you'll look around
>and he'll be a convert.

That reminds me, I gotta change the threshold resistor in the K2....

>> Yeah, we still even have trolley cars here by golly.

Kawasakis. 1981 vintage. Not true trolleys, they got pantographs.

>> Unfortunately
>> taking public transit to Lew Turk's takes an hour and a half one way
>> but only ten minutes by driving. Ya can die of thirst in an hour and a
>> half.

ogawd, Lew Turk's!
>
>You'll be so busy operating that you won't have time for all that. Look
>at all the additional loot you'll save!
>
HAW!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1988. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 11:42:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601074235.29071.00000283@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68138

In article <20030531154928.10617.00000397@mb-m15.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: Mike Coslo, KB3EIA
>
>>If Vipul would like some instant acceptance, all he would have
>>to do is help put up and tear down the Field day stations at his local
>>club.
>
>I've helped other Hams with some antenna setups. Of course, the Ham whose
>station it is is grateful.

We're talking about complete setup, not just antennas. Grounding, power, weather protection, etc.

>I will do the setups, but not the take downs.

Look up the term "prima donna".

>(Don't learn as much from that).

Sure you do. Here are some things you learn from taking down a Field Day setup:

- How to safely lower antennas and disconnect equipment
- How to roll up antennas, coax, and wire so that they are not damaged. (no, you do NOT hank up coax as if it were a clothesline!)
- How to pack things away properly
- How to do it better next year
- How to clean up messes as well as making them
- How to be of service to others
- How to get things done even though you're tired.

Of course, you may think yourself above doing things like folding up tarps and rolling up coax. Such an attitude doesn't endear you to others.

>

1989. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 12:44:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601084441.00862.00000621@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68139

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>If I were to have a club,
>> I would get more people using the equipment.
>
>A cattle prod would be more efficient than a club.

No, that would be more useful for traditional Ham radio clubs.

>Or it could mean that the man was at Ohio State to play volleyball and
>that his EE degree was a gift.

In that case, he made more productive use of his time and learned more useful skills.

Ohio State has rf courses, by the way. One of the few colleges that offer rf courses.

1990. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 12:48:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601084833.00862.00000622@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68140

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>> How far will a Ham chase me?
>>
>>...depends on what you've said to him.
>
> A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire point
>sighted!

Don't forget. I lived among Hams for a weekend. No one wanted to hunt me down.
In fact, I got re-invited. Now who is the smart Ham?

1991. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 12:51:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WEmCa.738$NF5.357632@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68141

"Merl Turkin" <Terk@astroburp.net> wrote in message
news:nvlCa.3$eo.4435@news.uswest.net...
> On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
>
> > Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> > activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
> > time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
> > through when nothing else will!
> >
> > End of story.
> >
> > 73 de KR4AJ
>
>
> Kind of like PSK31 huh?

Not everyone is set up for PSK31 or they feel typing on the keyboard makes it no different from the internet.

However, so far PSK31 has yet to prove that it will gain and keep a significant number of adherents. It may or may not be a "flash in the pan". Look at how little packet there is today compared to its heyday. The same holds true for other modes. Each was popular at one time but now has only a very modest usage. It's rather like they were the "flavor of the month". PSK31 could go the same way. On the other hand, CW is still the most popular and heavily used of all the digital modes (yes it is digital even though not requiring a computer). Check out the various surveys on ARRL to get a feel for how much each of the various modes is used.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1992. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 12:53:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601085345.00862.00000623@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68142

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>It could also be that schools do not always have practical projects. Also,
>>many
>>schools do not have any rf courses in their curriculum.
>
> I was right...He got his "EE" from "K-Tel".

I don't know about K-Tel University, but I've looked at several colleges. Even the few that have rf lab facilities available have few rf courses available each semester. Most colleges do not have rf courses at all.

I chose to leave EE at the end of April. I had a choice to continue in EE, or do something that is more stable and pays more. My parents advised me that the other field would be better. Even though I spent years in school for EE, I will do that other field instead.

> And now you need to learn ABOUT Amateur Radio.

Originally I planned to learn a lot about amateur radio. Now that I am not an EE, I do not plan that. Now my plan has been reduced to being a utility Ham. Perhaps learning about ARPS, how to order pizza over amateur radio, using repeater directories, and other amateur radio communications. I don't see any other point for an ex-EE.

1993. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 12:55:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601085535.00862.00000624@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68143

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Yes, but if you invited someone to Field Day, who would find contests fun?
>
>Probably the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you at bowling
>or the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you as you are
>fishing. Maybe it'd be the same person who would enjoy watching you
>paint an entire portrait or the one who would find watching you mount
>stamps in an album to be exciting.

Yes, those are good examples. Contesting is about as much fun as those events.

>...and you still haven't understood, despite numerous corrections of
>your mistake, that "amateur radio" and "ham radio" are one and the same.

Are you having an "identity crisis"?

>> Now I am no longer an EE.
>
>We have no evidence that you ever were a EE.

Okay, so I must have planned that so that one day I could say I am no longer an
EE. Good plan.

>>They don't teach you automechanics in EE.
>
>No kidding? They don't teach astronomy in art class either.

Yes, but they require literature courses or other liberal arts courses and that
has nothing to do with EE (or reality).

>> Amateur radio could give you a practical
>> application of EE, but doesn't.
>
>Then you aren't paying attention.

Yes, I am paying attention. Ham radio is an operator-focused hobby, allowing
for antennas.

1994. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 13:06:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306010506.3072467a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68144

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED8972D.1A0F793D@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >

> >
> > Ask Jim about his beloved diesel Rabbit.
>
> Well, Jim? I always enjoy a good automotive tale.
>

. . . qrx . . . . qrx . . . . qrx . . . Jim . ?

> > w3rv: "The Ten-Tec Omni 6+ supposedly has a rcvr which noticeably
> > better than any of the FT-1000 series and any of the big Icoms."
> >
> > Response from MP owner: "I'm not convinced of this claim. My
> > neighbor, K3WU has one of these rigs and his signal is all over the
> > place! Lot's of harmonics and very hard keying. He hears less well
> > than I do, much less better."
> >
> > . . . so there . . !
>
> Let's look at the possible flaws in the guy's statement:
>
> Lots of harmonics

He's a multi-multi, has other kW rigs operating in the same room on
harmonically-related bands. Has outboard bandpass filters between all
xcvr T/R relays and the rcvr inputs. Plus there's another upstream
bank of bandpass filters on the lines between the outputs of the amps
and the antennas. If the guy, who is a bit over a mile away from the
Omni is hearing the Omni's harmonics they're there. Loudly it seems.
That area is contest kilowatt alley, harmonics draw a lotta
"displeasure" in that neighborhood.

> and very hard keying (Ten-Tec is known for neither of
> these). Could it be that the guy's MP is overloading and going
> non-linear in the presence of strong signals from a nearby Omni VI?

He's smart enough to sort that out.

> "He hears less well than I do...". How do we know this? Is the guy who
> owns the Omni VI a good op? Are his antennas in the same league?

On 160 & 80 yes. 40 & up no.

> > Doan matter, he could never bring hisself to use the AGC on cw.
No
> > matter what.
>
> We take these things in very small steps. One day you'll look around
> and he'll be a convert.

All we've managed to accomplish is to stiffen his resolve to never run
CW with the AVC on. Ever. Come hell or high water.

> > Yeah, we still even have trolley cars here by golly. Unfortunately
> > taking public transit to Lew Turk's takes an hour and a half one way
> > but only ten minutes by driving. Ya can die of thirst in an hour and a
> > half.
>
> You'll be so busy operating that you won't have time for all that. Look
> at all the additional loot you'll save!

There exists the possibility that I might move in with one of 'em in
my old age and pay her NOTHIN'. Would save me a bucket of money. The
one who owns my 3/4 acre FD site. Backs on a wooded golf club which
screams for the addition of beverages amongst the trees. Known as an
area having very good ground condx. Already has the concrete pad for a
Rohn 25 tower which was installed by a former property owner/ham. That
would work.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1995. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 13:08:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601090830.00862.00000625@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68145

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>How many children do you know who have been in amateur radio for forty
>years and who are retired?

They are called "Hams".

1996. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 13:09:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601090919.00862.00000626@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68146

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>I did not attempted to keep my name anonymous. I just didn't volunteer my
>>name.

> Nor did you provide it when directly asked.
Correct. But, I did not hide it either.
> Nor did you provide your callsign when directly asked.
Correct.
> Nor did you provide your technical background when directly asked.
I may have said I was an EE. I didn't claim to work in the rf specialty.
> Nor did you provide your experience in Amateur Radio when directly
>asked.
One can conclude that I was new to amateur radio in that I went to my first Field Day. This was before I was asked about it. So, I did provide that info BEFORE asked about it.

I did not remember saying if I had an amateur radio license.

>It is when you try to decieve people about who you are, what you
>are, etc.
I do not try to deceive people. Not providing info is not deceiving. Your belief is not my responsibility if it is not relevant to amateur radio. For example, I could really be "Mike Coslo", not "Vipul Shah".

>It's about your
>credibility over your repeated acts of untruthfulness and misdirection.

On <very> many occasions, you responded to something other than what I was saying. I cannot believe how many times you did that. I don't believe all those times could be because you didn't understand what I was saying.

This may have been your attempt at misdirection. This may have been motivated by misunderstanding what I was saying (which I cannot believe you misunderstood so many times), <your> untruthfulness, or your dislike of my views so you give an insult.

At least Jim, N2EY, is courteous. Sometimes, even when I don't deserve it.

> Now you are not telling the truth about how you refused all that
>information and how, since we now "know" who you are that your previous
>obfuscation is now "OK".

Please note that it was not my intention to post anonymously. I noticed some of the clubs, Hamfests, and Field Day did not provide the experience I was looking for in both the technical and social aspects. I had an interest in the amateur radio hobby and wanted to change the hobby for the better.

1997. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 13:13:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306010513.ce0053f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68147

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<nGdCa.35020$Vf5.586@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com>...
> Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
> time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets through
> when nothing else will!
>
> End of story.

I been tuning around, yeah the HF phonies are definitely suffering a
hold on ham radio for awhile, this flare is a real gooder. Can't say
that there are a helluva lot of long-path JAs on 40 CW though.

>
> 73 de KR4AJ

w3rv

1998. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 14:20:11 UTC
From: Rene <delete_rene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bbd22m$7vejh$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68148

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> schreef in bericht
news:WEmCa.738$NF5.357632@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Merl Turkin" <Terk@astroburp.net> wrote in message
> news:nvlCa.3$eo.4435@news.uswest.net...
> > On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
> >
> > > Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> > > activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a
good
> > > time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
> > > through when nothing else will!
> > >
> > > End of story.
> > >
> > > 73 de KR4AJ
> >
> >
> > Kind of like PSK31 huh?
>
> Not everyone is set up for PSK31 or they feel typing on the keyboard makes
> it no different from the internet.
>
> However, so far PSK31 has yet to prove that it will gain and keep a
> significant number of adherents. It may or may not be a "flash in the
pan".
> Look at how little packet there is today compared to its heyday. The same
> holds true for other modes. Each was popular at one time but now has only
a
> very modest usage. It's rather like they were the "flavor of the month".

Packet on HF proved to be not as reliable as other digimodes.

Packet on VHF/UHF proved to be used for downloading software, which is
better taken care of using an internet connection, so it will become
extinct. Over here in the Netherlands, packet on 2 meters/70cm is mainly
used for APRS and AX-25 mail.

PSK proved - along with modes like MFSK-16 - to be reliable for its intended
use: that is, making 100% contacts using minimal bandwith (PSK31) or
difficult conditions (MFSK-16).

One cannot compare modes to another... in the end, only phone will
survive...

Rene

1999. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 16:01:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NrpCa.886$NF5.381201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68149

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030601085345.00862.00000623@mb-m18.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >>It could also be that schools do not always have practical projects.
Also,
> >>many
> >>schools do not have any rf courses in their curriculum.
> >
> > I was right...He got his "EE" from "K-Tel".
>
> I don't know about K-Tel University, but I've looked at several colleges.
Even
> the few that have rf lab facilities available have few rf courses
available
> each semester. Most colleges do not have rf courses at all.
>
> I chose to leave EE at the end of April. I had a choice to continue in EE,
or
> do something that is more stable and pays more. My parents advised me
that the
> other field would be better. Even though I spent years in school for EE, I
will
> do that other field instead.
>
> > And now you need to learn ABOUT Amateur Radio.
>
> Originally I planned to learn a lot about amateur radio. Now that I am not
an
> EE, I do not plan that. Now my plan has been reduced to being a utility
Ham.
> Perhaps learning about ARPS, how to order pizza over amateur radio, using
> repeater directories, and other amateur radio communications. I don't see
any
> other point for an ex-EE.
>

You really need to study the history of amateur radio a lot more thoroughly.
Many of the major technical advances were made by people WITHOUT any degrees
or any college training. They simply pursued their technical investigations
on their own in the directions that their interest took them. Just because
you chose to not continue studying EE, does not mean than you cannot be
technical. The two have no need to be tied together. If you choose to
limit yourself to being what you call a "utility ham," then it is exactly

that, your choice, and don't gripe and groan about not having opportunities to explore the technical aspects of ham radio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2000. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 16:08:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3ypCa.888$NF5.382196@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68150

"Rene" <delete_rene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in message
news:bbd22m$7vejh$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de...
>
> [snip]
> One cannot compare modes to another... in the end, only phone will
> survive...
>
> Rene
>
>

I doubt that only phone will survive. There is evidence that CW usage continues to increase. Participation in CW contests, for example, has increased 20% in the last year alone (see articles on the ARRL site).

A number of people that I know who have taken the plunge and upgraded by passing the morse code requirement have been bitten by the bug and operate almost exclusively CW.

Up until this current flair wreaked havoc with everything, the CW portions of 15, 20, and 40 had a lot of activity.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2001. channel 27.555

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 16:50:48 UTC
From: xganon <remailer@xganon.com>
Message-ID: <d0217e1a0675372e9dee33446a03e184@xganon.com>
Source record: 68151
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This is a good channel. I made many good contacts on this channel today. I use a president with a d104 and a foxy made amp. 420 aka rolling thunder in the stone.

This post was anonymized at http://www.xganon.com

XGANON is sponsord by
http://www.pca.net
For all your computer needs!

2002. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 17:42:05 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbddum$c8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68152

Merl Turkin wrote:
> On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
>
>
>>Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
>>activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
>>time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
>>through when nothing else will!
>>
>>End of story.
>>
>>73 de KR4AJ
>
>
>
> Kind of like PSK31 huh?

YOU didn't get the memo: PSK31 is for digi-twits and internuts. Real
hams pound out that straight key CW until their fists BLEED. All others
are wusses. Real hams also blow their own glass for their vacuum tubes.

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"Unthinking respect for authority is the greatest enemy of truth."
-Albert Einstein, authority

2003. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 18:06:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601140601.14837.00000378@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68153

In article <nGdCa.35020$Vf5.586@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
<djfinn2@bellsouth.net> writes:

>Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
>activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
>time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets through
>when nothing else will!

Ya left off two words, Dan. It should read:

"Sometimes, CW gets through when nothing available else will!"

73 de Jim, N2EY

2004. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 18:33:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDA4730.3080408@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68154

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Merl Turkin" <Terk@astroburp.net> wrote in message
> news:nvlCa.3$eo.4435@news.uswest.net...
>
>>On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
>>>activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
>>>time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
>>>through when nothing else will!
>>>
>>>End of story.
>>>
>>>73 de KR4AJ
>>
>>
>>Kind of like PSK31 huh?
>
>
> Not everyone is set up for PSK31 or they feel typing on the keyboard makes
> it no different from the internet.

Who thinks that? Just because it's done on the computer doesn't mean
it's "the internet". Its as valid a form as RTTY, or any other Non-CW mode.

> However, so far PSK31 has yet to prove that it will gain and keep a
> significant number of adherents. It may or may not be a "flash in the pan".

Well, the frequencies seem to be getting more crowded as time goes on.

> Look at how little packet there is today compared to its heyday. The same
> holds true for other modes. Each was popular at one time but now has only a
> very modest usage. It's rather like they were the "flavor of the month".

Packet has a number of reasons for going out of favor. Speed is
probably the biggest. We can do what packet does via the internet much
more efficiently.

Perhaps PSK31 will fall out of favor. It doesn't seem to be heading
that way though.

And I hope I don't sound too snobbish, but there seems to be a better -
or at least more polite class on PSK31 than other modes. That includes
CW, although CW is fairly close.

> PSK31 could go the same way. On the other hand, CW is still the most
> popular and heavily used of all the digital modes (yes it is digital even
> though not requiring a computer). Check out the various surveys on ARRL to
> get a feel for how much each of the various modes is used.

You are correct that there are more CW users than PSK31 users. So if a ham were called upon to participate in an emergency net using PSK31, the messages would almost certainly get through in a similar fashion to CW Morse.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2005. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 18:44:42 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0306011044.5e0b8710@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68155
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb> wrote

>
> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>

Of course you could.

de Hans, Kilo zero single H single B

2006. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 19:54:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EDA5A02.3020703@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68156

Dan Finn wrote:

>Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
>activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
>time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets through
>when nothing else will!
>
>
Though the modes JPL uses with its deep space probes would do even
better yet.

So it's a flare, that explains why I can't hear out of town AM MW BC
stations the
last few nights.

>
>
>

2007. Re: channel 27.555

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 19:55:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EDA5A35.1090400@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68157
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

xganon wrote:

>This is a good channel. I made many good contacts on this channel today. I use a president with a d104 and a foxy made amp. 420 aka rolling thunder in the stone.
>
>
>
This registers at around an S5 on my troll meter.......

2008. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 22:29:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601182918.06694.00000574@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68158

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/1/03 7:53 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030601085345.00862.00000623@mb-m18.aol.com>

>>>It could also be that schools do not always have practical projects. Also,
>>>many
>>>schools do not have any rf courses in their curriculum.
>>
>> I was right...He got his "EE" from "K-Tel".
>
>I don't know about K-Tel University, but I've looked at several colleges.

He's jerking my leg, right...?!?!

>I chose to leave EE at the end of April.

Thank-God for that.

>I had a choice to continue in EE, or
>do something that is more stable and pays more.

It pays more if you're good at it. Obviously you weren't.

>My parents advised me that the other field would be better.

What other field, and what qualifies your parents to know better about ANY
occupational field...???

>Even though I spent years in school for EE, I will do that other field
instead.

As I said.........

>> And now you need to learn ABOUT Amateur Radio.
>
>Originally I planned to learn a lot about amateur radio. Now that I am not an
>EE, I do not plan that.

Why? I am not an EE and I undoubtedly know more about electronics than
you ever hoped to.....And will undoubtedly know more than you will EVER know
about Amatuer Radio.

>Now my plan has been reduced to being a utility Ham.

When were you ever anything BUT a "utility ham", Vippy?

>Perhaps learning about ARPS, how to order pizza over amateur radio, using
>repeater directories, and other amateur radio communications. I don't see any

>other point for an ex-EE.

Then why don't you take me up on my offer and submit your Amateur call for cancellation and just get a GMRS license...or better yet set up a MURS base and mobile?

You are obviously useless in the Amateur service.

Steve, K4CAP

2009. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 22:35:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601183532.25052.00000356@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 68159

In article <d22b54c3.0305280815.6174bdbb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> The fast vacuum relays can switch as fast as a few mS. Trouble is, they are
>> only good for a few million operations. Lessee, at 30 wpm, one minute of
>> "PARIS" is 520 operations. A million operations takes less than 2000 hours
>> of transmitting at 30 wpm.
>
>You can't be serious with this one, you did this tongue-in-cheek
>right?!

.....ze barracuda iz rairely caught on a line beacauz he recognizes a waide variety of baitz.....

>
>2000 hours, pounding brass for 40 hours per week for an entire year??

No, 80 hours per week becuz you're listening half the time (if you're not, what's the point of QSK?)

>Even it was ever done on the ham bands what's the big deal about
>swapping out a couple relays once a year?

At only $35/pop. Chump change compared to, say, 3-500Zs.
>

>> For the pileups and contests its a different
>> game, particularly if you're holding a freq.
>
>I dunno how ya came up with this one but there is no difference
>whatsoever, the QSK speed selected by the op is the speed he/she is
>comfortable with and applies across the board. Unless you know
>somebody who jiggles the speed when moving from shooting the breeze to
>NTS or contesting for instance.

Sure do.
>
>My point is and has been that over time the former quest for very high
>QSK has lost favor because it's downsides exceed the value of what
>little if any advantage it has.
>
Among the contest/DX folks, anyway.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2010. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 22:39:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601183913.06694.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68160

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/1/03 7:55 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030601085535.00862.00000624@mb-m18.aol.com>

>>> Now I am no longer an EE.
>>
>>We have no evidence that you ever were a EE.
>
>Okay, so I must have planned that so that one day I could say I am no longer
>an
>EE. Good plan.

You do seem to enjoy putting fragile parts of your anatomy out for public
view only to let them get run over by your own silly mistruths, Vipul.

>>>They don't teach you automechanics in EE.
>>
>>No kidding? They don't teach astronomy in art class either.
>
>Yes, but they require literature courses or other liberal arts courses and
>that
>has nothing to do with EE (or reality).

It does if you expect a college degree.

>>> Amateur radio could give you a practical
>>> application of EE, but doesn't.
>>
>>Then you aren't paying attention.
>
>Yes, I am paying attention. Ham radio is an operator-focused hobby, allowing
>for antennas.

No, you ae NOT paying attention...Anyone else want to tell him what
"K-Tel" is famous for? (I am STILL rolling on the floor ! ! !)

Steve, K4CAP

2011. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-01 23:06:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601190608.06694.00000585@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68161

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/1/03 8:09 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030601090919.00862.00000626@mb-m18.aol.com>

>I did not remember saying if I had an amateur radio license.

That was not the point.

And yes, you did. Then you refused to answer any questions about it.

>I do not try to deceive people.

Well, you're doing a good job for not trying.

>Not providing info is not deceiving. Your
>belief is not my responsibility if it is not relevant to amateur radio. For
>example, I could really be "Mike Coslo", not "Vipul Shah".

It is when you attempt to "bull" someone into thinking you are something
you are not.

And you could not be Mike Coslo. Mike's posts are direct, clear and
easily understood. Yours are not.

>>It's about your
>>credibility over your repeated acts of untruthfulness and misdirection.
>
>On <very> many occasions, you responded to something other than what I was
>saying. I cannot believe how many times you did that. I don't believe all
>those times could be because you didn't understand what I was saying.

The "lack of understanding" is directly due to your inability to
effectively express yourself....Or at least express yourself without insulting
or demeaning people.

>This may have been your attempt at misdirection. This may have been motivated
>by misunderstanding what I was saying (which I cannot believe you
>misunderstood
>so many times), <your> untruthfulness, or your dislike of my views so you
>give
>an insult.

I think you need to see how many people are directing such allegations at
who, Vippy.

>At least Jim, N2EY, is courteous. Sometimes, even when I don't deserve it.

Jim tolerates insults and idiots better than I do. I will be open minded
and polite up until about the third or fourth insult, then after that, it's
gloves off.

I gave you a bit more than three or four.

>Please note that it was not my intention to post anonymously.

"not my intention to post anonymously"..?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

>I noticed some of
>the clubs, Hamfests, and Field Day did not provide the experience I was
>looking
>for in both the technical and social aspects. I had an interest in the
>amateur
>radio hobby and wanted to change the hobby for the better.

You don't "change" things by making wild and outlandish statements like
calling people names, insulting thier dietary habits or suggesting they are
cultists.

Care to try again?

Steve, K4CAP

2012. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:20:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601202035.07772.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68162

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>I don't know about K-Tel University, but I've looked at several colleges.
>
> He's jerking my leg, right...?!?!

>Anyone else want to tell him what
>"K-Tel" is famous for? (I am STILL rolling on the floor ! ! !)

I don't get it. What is "K-Tel"?

>>I had a choice to continue in EE, or
>>do something that is more stable and pays more.
>
> It pays more if you're good at it. Obviously you weren't.

You are wrong about better EEs being paid more. I was paid fairly high as a Test Engineer. The economy is very bad right now and even some that had 5 yrs experience in design had to drop out and take a retail job. Once your are out of the EE field in this country, rarely can you come back, regardless of how good you are.

This new opportunity, although less glamorous, pays alot more than a typical EE job.

> Why? I am not an EE and I undoubtedly know more about electronics than
>you ever hoped to.

I sincerely doubt that. I worked in the EE field. Also, I was working on taking grad courses before I decided to leave the EE field.

>And will undoubtedly know more than you will EVER know
>about Amatuer Radio.

Thats possible.

>When were you ever anything BUT a "utility ham", Vippy?

True, but when was the typical Ham not a utility Ham?

2013. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:41:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Q2xCa.1291$NF5.448180@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68164

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EDA4730.3080408@adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Merl Turkin" <Terk@astroburp.net> wrote in message
> > news:nvlCa.3$eo.4435@news.uswest.net...
> >
> >>On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> >>>activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a
good
> >>>time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
> >>>through when nothing else will!
> >>>
> >>>End of story.
> >>>
> >>>73 de KR4AJ
> >>
> >>
> >>Kind of like PSK31 huh?
> >
> >
> > Not everyone is set up for PSK31 or they feel typing on the keyboard
makes
> > it no different from the internet.
>
> Who thinks that? Just because it's done on the computer doesn't mean
> it's "the internet". Its as valid a form as RTTY, or any other Non-CW
mode.
>

I did not say it was not valid nor did I say that it means it is the internet. What I am saying is that some don't find it interesting because of the aspect of typing on the keyboard. It simply doesn't feel like radio to that particular individual. Such people feel the same about the other non-CW digital modes. I tried RTTY and packet and found them uninteresting because of that. I'm not saying this is good or bad. Just saying that there are many reasons why CW will continue to live and be the digital mode of choice for a significant portions of hams.

Basically the point I am trying to make is that those who tout the favored digital mode of the moment are overstating their case. Yes PSK31 is no doubt a good mode but it's not for everyone. Each mode has advantages and disadvantages both in technical aspects and user aspects. To say that any

mode is "better" or is the "best" simply means that the person making this statement is only looking at it under the circumstances that favor that mode. Change the circumstances and another mode becomes the "better" or "best" mode.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2014. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:41:56 UTC
From: K3UD <k3ud@charter_.net>
Message-ID: <010620031941566525%k3ud@charter_.net>
Source record: 68163

In article
> Not gonna go there, Bill!
>
> But your observation still has lots to think about. If someone thought the old
> Extra was easier, then the thing to do was take it before April 15, 2000, and
> use the CSCE after that date. If someone the old Extra was harder, the thing
> to
> do was take the new test soon after April 15 2000.
>
> But it's been over three years.....
>
> Some possibilities:
>
> 1) Lots of Advanceds don't care about getting an Extra
> 2) Lots of Advanceds are inactive (SK being the extreme case)
> 3) Lots of Advanceds haven't gotten the word yet.
>
> Thoughts?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

This is an interesting question.

It seems that many Advanced class operators really do not care to upgrade. It could be that they have no need for the additional privileges granted to the Extra class, or, as proposed when the rules changed in 2000, many Advanced feel that this is the one class of license that "proves" they have passed a CW test that was much faster than the now required 5 WPM.

Personally, I was an Advanced for 31 years and never had the desire to upgrade as everything I was doing or wanted to do in ham radio was covered with the privileges conferred by the Advanced class license. I really don't know what motivated to decide to go to a testing session at Murray State University and take the Extra, but I walked in cold and missed one question. (39 years as a ham counted for some technical and practical learning experience I guess)

73
George
K3UD

2015. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:47:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDA9EC7.9050904@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68165

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>>I did not attempted to keep my name anonymous. I just didn't volunteer my
>>>name.
>>
>
>> Nor did you provide it when directly asked.
>
> Correct. But, I did not hide it either.

Not much difference there.

>> Nor did you provide your callsign when directly asked.
>
> Correct.

And therein lies the big question. Why?

>> Nor did you provide your technical background when directly asked.
>
> I may have said I was an EE. I didn't claim to work in the rf specialty.

You did. But we're still not sure about what your EE means.

<some snippage>
>
> I did not remember saying if I had an amateur radio license.

Yup. You wrote it in the thread I was telling you to reference in a
previous post

>
>>It is when you try to decieve people about who you are, what you
>>are, etc.
>
> I do not try to deceive people. Not providing info is not deceiving. Your
> belief is not my responsibility if it is not relevant to amateur radio. For
> example, I could really be "Mike Coslo", not "Vipul Shah".

Good one Vipul! It would be pretty strange for us to be having so many
discussions though.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2016. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:49:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <TaxCa.3470$la6.342@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 68166

Thanks, Jim. Nice to see a level head just when I began to worry that this
was going to become a religious argument. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030601140601.14837.00000378@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <nGdCa.35020$Vf5.586@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
> <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> writes:
>
> >Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> >activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
> >time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
through
> >when nothing else will!
>
> Ya left off two words, Dan. It should read:
>
> "Sometimes, CW gets through when nothing available else will!"
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.486 / Virus Database: 284 - Release Date: 5/29/03

2017. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:52:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601205206.06805.00000490@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68167

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/1/03 7:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030601202035.07772.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com>

>>>I don't know about K-Tel University, but I've looked at several colleges.
>>
>> He's jerking my leg, right...?!?!
>
>>Anyone else want to tell him what
>>"K-Tel" is famous for? (I am STILL rolling on the floor ! ! !)
>
>I don't get it. What is "K-Tel"?

I figured as much...

"K-Tel" is one of those mass-marketing agencies that sell all sorts of "merchandise" such as the "Veg-A-Matic", "Sewing Magic", "Buttoneer", etc etc etc. on late night infomercials or those long-winded, 120dB commercials during the late-late movie.

It is an American idiom that if you got it from "K-Tel" it was cheap and of poor quality. "K-Tel" was famous for the "$19.95 specials" on 3 AM Infomercials. ("But wait...that's not all...!")

>>>I had a choice to continue in EE, or
>>>do something that is more stable and pays more.
>>
>> It pays more if you're good at it. Obviously you weren't.
>
>You are wrong about better EEs being paid more. I was paid fairly high as a
>Test Engineer. The economy is very bad right now and even some that had 5 yrs
>experience in design had to drop out and take a retail job.

Whooopie dooo! Welcome to the market driven economy, Vipul!

And I am not wrong about "good EE's" getting paid more.

>Once your are out
>of the EE field in this country, rarely can you come back, regardless of how
>good you are.

More lame assertions, Vipul. I know quite a few EE's who are in and out of the business for those same market driven reasons, and only those who CHOOSE to not go back to the field were ever "out" permanently.

Ask your RantBuddy, Lennie the Lame Anderson. He's published his "CV" in this forum before, and it's peppered with various jobs held (however teniously) for periods of a few months to a few years. His present retirement is due more to smart investing than it ever was due to his skills as a technician.

>This new opportunity, although less glamorous, pays alot more than a typical
>EE
>job.

And this opportunity would be.....? ? ? (Waiting to see how long it takes Vippy to answer THIS question...)

>> Why? I am not an EE and I undoubtedly know more about electronics than
>>you ever hoped to.
>
>I sincerely doubt that. I worked in the EE field.

Whooopie dee. I spent 20 years doing Avionics, both as a line technician, an IMD level technician, and Advanced Avionics Systems instructor. I also did DECM and AECM maintenence in addition to instructing both repair technicians and USMC pilots in electronic counter measures techniques and applications. I was fully qualified on the F4B, F4N, F4J, OV-10A, OV-10D, UH-1N, AH1-J, CH53A, D and E.

And you were an EE for...A month?

>Also, I was working on taking
>grad courses before I decided to leave the EE field.

You were "working on taking grad courses?"...ROTFLMAO!

>>And will undoubtedly know more than you will EVER know
>>about Amatuer Radio.
>
>Thats possible.

That's reality.

>>When were you ever anything BUT a "utility ham", Vippy?
>
>True, but when was the typical Ham not a utility Ham?

Please provide us with the generally accepted (not your own) deifinition of "the typical Ham", Vippy. By what accepted standards are you trying to make this comparison?

Steve, K4CAP

2018. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:55:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601205536.06805.00000491@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68168

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/1/03 7:47 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EDA9EC7.9050904@adelphia.net>

>> I do not try to deceive people. Not providing info is not deceiving. Your
>> belief is not my responsibility if it is not relevant to amateur radio. For
>> example, I could really be "Mike Coslo", not "Vipul Shah".
>
> Good one Vipul! It would be pretty strange for us to be having so many
>discussions though.

I dunno, Mike. I can envision this guy having some long and meaningless conversations with shadows and "Peppy the Hand Puppet"

73

Steve, K4CAP

2019. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 00:57:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAA13D.9000306@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68169

Vshah101 wrote:

> Ohio State has rf courses, by the way. One of the few colleges that offer rf
> courses.

As does Penn State.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2020. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 01:00:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbe7kh$n83$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68170

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Q2xCa.1291$NF5.448180@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EDA4730.3080408@adelphia.net...
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > "Merl Turkin" <Terk@astroburp.net> wrote in message
> > > news:nvlCa.3$eo.4435@news.uswest.net...
> > >
> > >>On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> > >>>activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a
> good
> > >>>time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
> > >>>through when nothing else will!
> > >>>
> > >>>End of story.
> > >>>
> > >>>73 de KR4AJ
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>Kind of like PSK31 huh?
> > >
> > >
> > > Not everyone is set up for PSK31 or they feel typing on the keyboard
> makes
> > > it no different from the internet.
> >
> > Who thinks that? Just because it's done on the computer doesn't mean
> > it's "the internet". Its as valid a form as RTTY, or any other Non-CW
> mode.
> >
>
> I did not say it was not valid nor did I say that it means it is the
> internet. What I am saying is that some don't find it interesting because
> of the aspect of typing on the keyboard. It simply doesn't feel like
radio
> to that particular individual. Such people feel the same about the other
> non-CW digital modes. I tried RTTY and packet and found them
uninteresting
> because of that. I'm not saying this is good or bad. Just saying that
> there are many reasons why CW will continue to live and be the digital

mode
> of choice for a significant portions of hams.
>
> Basically the point I am trying to make is that those who tout the favored
> digital mode of the moment are overstating their case. Yes PSK31 is no
> doubt a good mode but it's not for everyone. Each mode has advantages and
> disadvantages both in technical aspects and user aspects. To say that any
> mode is "better" or is the "best" simply means that the person making this
> statement is only looking at it under the circumstances that favor that
> mode. Change the circumstances and another mode becomes the "better" or
> "best" mode.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I think what Dee is trying to say is that CW operation is a hands on
situation. More like personal commo.

Come to think of it, I have PSK and the other stuff and I do still prefere
CW.

Dan/W4NTI

2021. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 01:05:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6pxCa.1292$NF5.451867@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68171

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bbe7kh$n83$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> I think what Dee is trying to say is that CW operation is a hands on
> situation. More like personal commo.
>
> Come to think of it, I have PSK and the other stuff and I do still prefere
> CW.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Something like that. Somehow I just don't feel as "involved" when I am
using a keyboard as when I work voice or CW.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2022. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 01:45:48 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <g%xCa.829013$Zo.171264@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 68172

>
> One cannot compare modes to another... in the end, only phone will
> survive...
>
> Rene

Huh???? Could you elaborate on the logic you used to get to this earth shaking conclusion? I think that the statement is flawed because we all know that in time we will be telepathic and consequently averbal. I have gained this insight from watching numerous repeats of all forms of Star Trek.

73 Tom Popovic KI3R a strict adherent to the phrase... CW does not always get through.

2023. Re: channel 27.555

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 02:02:44 UTC
From: Frank <k3eko@netscape.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAB044.5060307@netscape.net>
Source record: 68173
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

HO HO!

Robert Casey wrote:
> xganon wrote:
>
>> This is a good channel. I made many good contacts on this channel
>> today. I use a president with a d104 and a foxy made amp. 420 aka
>> rolling thunder in the stone.
>>
>>
>>
> This registers at around an S5 on my troll meter.......
>

2024. Re: channel 27.555

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 02:15:00 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0306011815.39efd154@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68174
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

xganon <remailer@xganon.com> wrote in message
news:<d0217e1a0675372e9dee33446a03e184@xganon.com>...
> This is a good channel. I made many good contacts on this channel today. I use a
president with a d104 and a foxy made amp. 420 aka rolling thunder in the stone.
>
>
>
> ---
> This post was anonymized at http://www.xganon.com
>
> XGANON is sponsord by
> http://www.pca.net
> For all your computer needs!
> ---

"sponsord"? WTF?
Spells like Georgie-girl hiding behind yet another NIC.

2025. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 02:29:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306011829.1a5a8a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68175

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030601183532.25052.00000356@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0305280815.6174bdbb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> The fast vacuum relays can switch as fast as a few mS. Trouble is, they are
> >> only good for a few million operations. Lessee, at 30 wpm, one minute of
> >> "PARIS" is 520 operations. A million operations takes less than 2000 hours
> >> of transmitting at 30 wpm.
> > >
> > >You can't be serious with this one, you did this tongue-in-cheek
> > >right?!
> >
> > ......ze barracuda iz rairely caught on a line beacauz he recognizes a waide
> > variety of baitz.....

. . . #@!*~!&^@#!} . . .

> > >
> > >2000 hours, pounding brass for 40 hours per week for an entire year??
> >
> > No, 80 hours per week becuz you're listening half the time (if you're not,
> > what's the point of QSK?)

I *said* pounding brass for 40 hours a week, i.e., transmitting. I did
not say pounding brass AND listening for 40 hours a week.

> > >Even it was ever done on the ham bands what's the big deal about
> > >swapping out a couple relays once a year?
> >
> > At only $35/pop. Chump change compared to, say, 3-500Zs.

Something like that. 0.002 cents per TRANSMITTING minute.

>
> >> For the pileups and contests its a different
> >> game, particularly if you're holding a freq.
> > >
> > >I dunno how ya came up with this one but there is no difference
> > >whatsoever, the QSK speed selected by the op is the speed he/she is
> > >comfortable with and applies across the board. Unless you know
> > >somebody who jiggles the speed when moving from shooting the breeze to
> > >NTS or contesting for instance.
> >
> > Sure do.

Therapy fodder.

> >
> >My point is and has been that over time the former quest for very high
> >QSK has lost favor because it's downsides exceed the value of what
> >little if any advantage it has.
> >
> Among the contest/DX folks, anyway.

I ain't changed the TS-50 T/R timing since that nite which live
forever in the annals of RRAP infamy and I din miss a helluva lot of
dits then did I?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2026. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 02:50:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDABB8D.4030800@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68176

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 6/1/03 7:47 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3EDA9EC7.9050904@adelphia.net>
>
>
>>>I do not try to deceive people. Not providing info is not deceiving. Your
>>>belief is not my responsibility if it is not relevant to amateur radio. For
>>>example, I could really be "Mike Coslo", not "Vipul Shah".
>>
>> Good one Vipul! It would be pretty strange for us to be having so many
>>discussions though.
>
>
> I dunno, Mike. I can envision this guy having some long and meaningless
> conversations with shadows and "Peppy the Hand Puppet"

HA! Good one, Steve. After a crappy weekend, I needed that. I wonder
how many arguments the puppet wins?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2027. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 02:58:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDABD71.3030004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68177

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EDA4730.3080408@adelphia.net...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>>"Merl Turkin" <Terk@astroburp.net> wrote in message
>>>news:nvlCa.3$eo.4435@news.uswest.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
>>>>>activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a
>>>>
>> good
>
>>>>>time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
>>>>>through when nothing else will!
>>>>>
>>>>>End of story.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de KR4AJ
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Kind of like PSK31 huh?
>>>
>>>
>>>Not everyone is set up for PSK31 or they feel typing on the keyboard
>>
>> makes
>
>>>it no different from the internet.
>>
>>Who thinks that? Just because it's done on the computer doesn't mean
>>it's "the internet". Its as valid a form as RTTY, or any other Non-CW
>
> mode.
>
>
> I did not say it was not valid nor did I say that it means it is the
> internet. What I am saying is that some don't find it interesting because

> of the aspect of typing on the keyboard. It simply doesn't feel like radio
> to that particular individual. Such people feel the same about the other
> non-CW digital modes. I tried RTTY and packet and found them uninteresting
> because of that. I'm not saying this is good or bad. Just saying that
> there are many reasons why CW will continue to live and be the digital mode
> of choice for a significant portions of hams.
>
> Basically the point I am trying to make is that those who tout the favored
> digital mode of the moment are overstating their case. Yes PSK31 is no
> doubt a good mode but it's not for everyone. Each mode has advantages and
> disadvantages both in technical aspects and user aspects. To say that any
> mode is "better" or is the "best" simply means that the person making this
> statement is only looking at it under the circumstances that favor that
> mode. Change the circumstances and another mode becomes the "better" or
> "best" mode.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I don't really disagree with what you say, Dee. But you chose to reply after the second post. (the PSK31 retort) That shows you probably didn't have a problem with the first one.

Even that I don't have a problem with. Whatever your favorite mode, go for it.

But with PSK31 being my favorite mode, perfectly suited for me, I felt compelled to reply. It IS a really good mode. Like it or not, it is comparable in "getting through" with CW. And I'll bet you a cup of coffee it will be around for a good while.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2028. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 03:04:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDABF0B.6000908@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68178

K3UD wrote:
> In article
>
>>Not gonna go there, Bill!
>>
>>But your observation still has lots to think about. If someone thought the old
>>Extra was easier, then the thing to do was take it before April 15, 2000, and
>>use the CSCE after that date. If someone the old Extra was harder, the thing
>>to
>>do was take the new test soon after April 15 2000.
>>
>>But it's been over three years.....
>>
>>Some possibilities:
>>
>>1) Lots of Advanceds don't care about getting an Extra
>>2) Lots of Advanceds are inactive (SK being the extreme case)
>>3) Lots of Advanceds haven't gotten the word yet.
>>
>>Thoughts?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
> This is an interesting question.
>
> It seems that many Advanced class operators really do not care to
> upgrade. It could be that they have no need for the additional
> privileges granted to the Extra class, or, as proposed when the rules
> changed in 2000, many Advanced feel that this is the one class of
> license that "proves" they have passed a CW test that was much faster
> than the now required 5 WPM.

I know a few who don't upgrade because they do indeed want to prove
they passed a higher speed Morse code test. Seems a bit strange to me,
but whatever.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2029. Re: channel 27.555

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 03:06:05 UTC
From: Papa Doc <313@8mile.com>
Message-ID: <taCdnakbu5K8IkejXTWcqA@comcast.com>
Source record: 68179
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c5ecbb69.0306011815.39efd154@posting.google.com...
> xganon <remailer@xganon.com> wrote in message
news:<d0217e1a0675372e9dee33446a03e184@xganon.com>...
> > This is a good channel. I made many good contacts on this channel today.
I use a president with a d104 and a foxy made amp. 420 aka rolling thunder
in the stone.
> >
> >
> >
> > ---
> > This post was anonymized at http://www.xganon.com
> >
> > XGANON is sponsord by
> > http://www.pca.net
> > For all your computer needs!
> > ---
>
> "sponsord"? WTF?
> Spells like Georgie-girl hiding behind yet another NIC.

Scared of your own shadow?

2030. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 03:21:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601232115.04349.00000309@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68180

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/1/03 9:50 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EDABB8D.4030800@adelphia.net>

>HA! Good one, Steve. After a crappy weekend, I needed that. I wonder
>how many arguments the puppet wins?

Depends on which one is the puppet, I guess...!

73

Steve, K4CAP

2031. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 03:32:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vzzCa.1306$NF5.480512@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68181

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EDABD71.3030004@adelphia.net...
> I don't really disagree with what you say, Dee. But you chose to reply
> after the second post. (the PSK31 retort) That shows you probably didn't
> have a problem with the first one.
>
> Even that I don't have a problem with. Whatever your favorite mode, go
> for it.
>
> But with PSK31 being my favorite mode, perfectly suited for me, I felt
> compelled to reply. It IS a really good mode. Like it or not, it is
> comparable in "getting through" with CW. And I'll bet you a cup of
> coffee it will be around for a good while.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Oh I don't have a problem believing that PSK31 is comparable in getting through. Nor do I doubt that it will be around awhile. Afterall there is still noticeable activity in the granddaddy of computer digital modes (RTTY). I just happen to think that, as with other computer digital modes, it is unlikely to achieve and maintain the popularity level of CW. That doesn't make one superior to the other, just different.

And I think it is important to at least be aware of the various possibilities even if an area doesn't happen to pique one's curiosity a great deal. For example, although I am not interested in PSK31 for myself, I spent half an hour one day with our local PSK31 guru learning about it's capabilities, advantages and disadvantages just so that I could have that basic awareness of this aspect of the hobby.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2032. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 03:34:06 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbegje$2n2$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 68182

garigue wrote:

> >
> > One cannot compare modes to another... in the end, only phone will
> > survive...
> >
> > Rene
>
> Huh???? Could you elaborate on the logic you used to get to this earth
> shaking conclusion?

The logical end to that line of logic is that we should all be talking here on digital voice! Not gonna happen.

> I think that the statement is flawed because we all
> know that in time we will be telepathic and consequently averbal. I have
> gained this insight from watching numerous repeats of all forms of Star
> Trek.

You be a difinitely superior life form!

>
>
> 73 Tom Popovic KI3R a strict adherent to the phrase... CW does not always
> get through.

Aw, heck... but then, neither does anything else!

2033. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 03:40:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030601234041.04044.00000989@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68183

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> And this opportunity would be.....? ? ? (Waiting to see how long it takes
>Vippy to answer THIS question...)

I can assure you that I do have something. And it does pay more. Alot more.

I won't tell what it is until (at most) about six months. Perhaps sooner,
depending on certain things.

This could be some kind of bet. Would you like to make a bet?

2034. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 03:59:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDACBDE.8010603@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68184

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>>And this opportunity would be.....? ? ? (Waiting to see how long it takes
>>Vippy to answer THIS question...)
>
>
> I can assure you that I do have something. And it does pay more. Alot more.
>
> I won't tell what it is until (at most) about six months. Perhaps sooner,
> depending on certain things.

Oh good grief! Good luck in whatever you are doing. Just for that, I
won't tell you what color my eyes are!

You play a strange game Vipul. I doubt anyone here really cares all
that much about you or your job or your license or whatever. Only in
your strange little game of "I've got a secret". And that is only
because it is so downright odd to act that way.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2035. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 04:23:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602002311.04313.00000321@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68185

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/1/03 10:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EDACBDE.8010603@adelphia.net>
>
>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>
>>
>>>And this opportunity would be.....? ? ? (Waiting to see how long it takes
>>>Vippy to answer THIS question...)
>>
>>
>> I can assure you that I do have something. And it does pay more. Alot more.
>>
>> I won't tell what it is until (at most) about six months. Perhaps sooner,
>> depending on certain things.
>
> Oh good grief! Good luck in whatever you are doing. Just for that, I
>won't tell you what color my eyes are!
>
> You play a strange game Vipul. I doubt anyone here really cares all
>that much about you or your job or your license or whatever. Only in
>your strange little game of "I've got a secret". And that is only
>because it is so downright odd to act that way.

Ditto.

I think it's getting close to "Write This Putz Off As Some Kid Playing
With Daddy's Toys" time.

Whatever his new profession, I sure hope it doesn't involve table dancing.
I'd go into cardiac arrest laughing so hard.

Steve, K4CAP

2036. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 04:26:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602002624.04313.00000322@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68186

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/1/03 10:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030601234041.04044.00000989@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>> And this opportunity would be.....? ? ? (Waiting to see how long it takes
>>Vippy to answer THIS question...)
>
>I can assure you that I do have something. And it does pay more. Alot more.

So you're a drug pusher now? A pimp?

>I won't tell what it is until (at most) about six months.

Perhaps you need me to help you along again, Vipul?

>Perhaps sooner, depending on certain things.

Like what? Your parents giving you permisssion?

>This could be some kind of bet. Would you like to make a bet?

How about if I just get pictures and put them on the web?

Steve, K4CAP

2037. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 06:06:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAE9CF.9358581E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68187

N2EY wrote:
>
> >Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3ED53692.205DCA11@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> >> Ask Jim about his beloved diesel Rabbit.
> > >
> > >Well, Jim? I always enjoy a good automotive tale.
> >
> > Back in late '79, after enduring the gas shortages and the make-do pollution
> > controls of that era, I ordered a new diesel Rabbit. Made in Westmoreland, PA,...
(snipped)

> Well, you asked for a story...

Now THAT is quite a tale. Jim W9VNE used to drive around in a Rabbit
which had the passenger seat removed. In its place was a homemade
plywood console with a transceiver and keyer. He ran up and down I-75
running mobile CW. He even had me use a chassis punch to knock out a
hole for a big honking ball mount for his mobile antenna.

My '73 Charger featured an Alda 103 with a WB4VVF Accu-memory keyer and,
since I'm a lefty, a steel shelf fixed to the driver's side door.
Velcro held the paddle to the shelf and I rested my elbow on the door's
armrest.

> >> > I don't think you're being fair to yourself in setting your
> >> > hyptothetical even though we know that two ops aren't really going to
> >> > have the same operating skills. One guy might be a whiz at handling
> >> > rapid fire QSOs but he might be on the wrong band.
> >>
> >> Yew are absolutely right there. I'll tellya how bad that can get.
> >> Within the club there are well-known differences amongst the guest ops
> >> who run in the multi-multis. You'll find "classified ads" in the
> >> reflector like "W3ABC needs two runners for the CQ phone." Runners &
> >> pouncers, different critters.
> > >
> > >The fellows who fly solo from their home stations or as guest ops from a
> > >big station end up being the best ops because they must learn to run as
> > >well as search and pounce if they are going to have competitive scores.
> >
> > Most of all they gotta learn when to run and when to pounce.

...and when to be on which band.

> >> > To make your scenario slightly better, the guy
> >> > with the MP would have his rig rise about a foot-and-a-half off the
> >> > table with keying from the nearby Omni VI+ when the receiver of the MP
> >> > folded up. Things might even out though: The guy with the Omni would
> >> > have to deal with the key clicks from the MP :)
> >>
> >> I doubt it. Copied-pasted from from another e-mailed missive I
> >> recieved:
> >>
> >> w3rv: "The Ten-Tec Omni 6+ supposedly has a rcvr which noticeably
> >> better than any of the FT-1000 series and any of the big Icoms."
> >>
> >> Response from MP owner: "I'm not convinced of this claim. My
> >> neighbor, K3WU has one of these rigs and his signal is all over the
> >> place! Lot's of harmonics and very hard keying. He hears less well
> >> than I do, much less better."
> >>
> >> . . . so there . . !
> >
> >Let's look at the possible flaws in the guy's statement:
> >
> >Lots of harmonics and very hard keying (Ten-Tec is known for neither of
> >these). Could it be that the guy's MP is overloading and going
> >non-linear in the presence of strong signals from a nearby Omni VI?
>
> Probably. 'Specially if the MP is running with the AGC on and RF gain turned
> up.....

Parry and thrust!

> >"He hears less well than I do...". How do we know this? Is the guy who
> >owns the Omni VI a good op? Are his antennas in the same league?
>
> Or does he have to endure the MP's key clicks?

Touche' !

> >> > > Puts the AGC discussion solidly to bed.
> >> >
> >> > I'm interested in what Jim has to say about it.
> >>
> >> Doan matter, he could never bring hisself to use the AGC on cw. No
> >> matter what.
>
> Not at all. I use it sometimes. Most of the time I turn it off, though. My main
> point is that from the beginning of the transceiver era until recently most low
> and middle end rigs did not let you turn the AGC off.

...and even some high end rigs didn't have a way to disable the AGC.

> >We take these things in very small steps. One day you'll look around
> >and he'll be a convert.
>
> That reminds me, I gotta change the threshold resistor in the K2....

No place to mount a pot?

Dave K8MN

2038. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 06:09:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAEA93.ACD38FDD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68188

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >If I were to have a club,
> >> I would get more people using the equipment.
> > >
> > >A cattle prod would be more efficient than a club.
> >
> No, that would be more useful for traditional Ham radio clubs.

...for ensuring that members do only what you believe they should be
doing?

> > >Or it could mean that the man was at Ohio State to play volleyball and
> > >that his EE degree was a gift.
> >
> In that case, he made more productive use of his time and learned more useful
> skills.

...and managed to piss away a free college education. His volleyball
days are over and he was never a professional player. Your comments
about "more useful skills" fall flat.

Dave K8MN

2039. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 06:10:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAEAB8.5BDF620F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68189

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >>> How far will a Ham chase me?
> >>
> >>...depends on what you've said to him.
> >
> > A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire point
> >sighted!
>
> Don't forget. I lived among Hams for a weekend. No one wanted to hunt me down.
> In fact, I got re-invited. Now who is the smart Ham?

Here's a hint: It isn't you.

Dave K8MN

2040. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 06:15:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAEBBE.CBCF7D0C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68190

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >>It could also be that schools do not always have practical projects. Also,
> >>many
> >>schools do not have any rf courses in their curriculum.
> >
> > I was right...He got his "EE" from "K-Tel".
>
> I don't know about K-Tel University, but I've looked at several colleges. Even
> the few that have rf lab facilities available have few rf courses available
> each semester. Most colleges do not have rf courses at all.
>
> I chose to leave EE at the end of April. I had a choice to continue in EE, or
> do something that is more stable and pays more. My parents advised me that the
> other field would be better. Even though I spent years in school for EE, I will
> do that other field instead.
>
> > And now you need to learn ABOUT Amateur Radio.
>
> Originally I planned to learn a lot about amateur radio. Now that I am not an
> EE, I do not plan that. Now my plan has been reduced to being a utility Ham.

So "utility hams" (whatever they are) don't need to know much, huh?

> Perhaps learning about ARPS, how to order pizza over amateur radio, using
> repeater directories, and other amateur radio communications.

Sounds like you have at least several busy days ahead of you.

> I don't see any
> other point for an ex-EE.

Of that, I have no doubt.

Dave K8MN

2041. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 06:21:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAED59.C9EEDA6D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68191

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Yes, but if you invited someone to Field Day, who would find contests fun?
> > >
> > >Probably the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you at bowling
> > >or the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you as you are
> > >fishing. Maybe it'd be the same person who would enjoy watching you
> > >paint an entire portrait or the one who would find watching you mount
> > >stamps in an album to be exciting.

> Yes, those are good examples. Contesting is about as much fun as those events.

You've established by your comments here that you don't know very much
at all about radio contesting. We have yet to learn if you know
anything about the other activities listed. The activities can be quite
enjoyable if you are a participant. They'd likely be quite boring if
you were a spectator. Ask Leonard Anderson for details about the role
of spectator in amateur radio.

> >...and you still haven't understood, despite numerous corrections of
> >your mistake, that "amateur radio" and "ham radio" are one and the same.
>
> Are you having an "identity crisis"?

Your failure to understand the terms "ham radio" and "amateur radio" do
not result in an identity problem for me.

> >> Now I am no longer an EE.
> > >
> > >We have no evidence that you ever were a EE.
> >
> > Okay, so I must have planned that so that one day I could say I am no longer an
> > EE. Good plan.

There is no evidence that you've planned much of anything.

> >>They don't teach you automechanics in EE.
> > >
> > >No kidding? They don't teach astronomy in art class either.
> >
> > Yes, but they require literature courses or other liberal arts courses and that
> > has nothing to do with EE (or reality).

That's called an education (really).

> >> Amateur radio could give you a practical
> >> application of EE, but doesn't.
> >
> >Then you aren't paying attention.
>
> Yes, I am paying attention. Ham radio is an operator-focused hobby, allowing
> for antennas.

An operator-focused hobby?

Sure amateur radio allows for antennas. Radio is always much tougher
without antennas.

Dave K8MN

2042. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 06:28:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAEED3.CC04E0F2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68192

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3ED8972D.1A0F793D@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> > > w3rv: "The Ten-Tec Omni 6+ supposedly has a rcvr which noticeably
> > > better than any of the FT-1000 series and any of the big Icoms."
> > >
> > > Response from MP owner: "I'm not convinced of this claim. My
> > > neighbor, K3WU has one of these rigs and his signal is all over the
> > > place! Lot's of harmonics and very hard keying. He hears less well
> > > than I do, much less better."
> > >
> > > . . . so there . . !
> >
> > Let's look at the possible flaws in the guy's statement:
> >
> > Lots of harmonics
>
> He's a multi-multi, has other kW rigs operating in the same room on
> harmonically-related bands. Has outboard bandpass filters between all
> xcvr T/R relays and the rcvr inputs. Plus there's another upstream
> bank of bandpass filters on the lines between the outputs of the amps
> and the antennas. If the guy, who is a bit over a mile away from the
> Omni is hearing the Omni's harmonics they're there. Loudly it seems.
> That area is contest kilowatt alley, harmonics draw a lotta
> "displeasure" in that neighborhood.

That'd be the first account of Omni VI harmonics of which I've heard.

> > and very hard keying (Ten-Tec is known for neither of
> > these). Could it be that the guy's MP is overloading and going
> > non-linear in the presence of strong signals from a nearby Omni VI?
>
> He's smart enough to sort that out.

I'll have to take your word.

> > "He hears less well than I do...". How do we know this? Is the guy who
> > owns the Omni VI a good op? Are his antennas in the same league?
>
> On 160 & 80 yes. 40 & up no.

If they're comparable on 160 and 80m and the Omni VI doesn't hear as
well, you're either hearing about an Omni VI with problems or you're
hearing a whopper.

> > > Doan matter, he could never bring hisself to use the AGC on cw.
> No
> > > matter what.
> >
> > We take these things in very small steps. One day you'll look around
> > and he'll be a convert.
>
> All we've managed to accomplish is to stiffen his resolve to never run
> CW with the AVC on. Ever. Come hell or high water.

He's put this one to bed.

> > > Yeah, we still even have trolley cars here by golly. Unfortunately
> > > taking public transit to Lew Turk's takes an hour and a half one way
> > > but only ten minutes by driving. Ya can die of thirst in an hour and a
> > > half.
> >
> > You'll be so busy operating that you won't have time for all that. Look
> > at all the additional loot you'll save!
>
> There exists the possibility that I might move in with one of 'em in
> my old age and pay her NOTHIN'. Would save me a bucket of money. The
> one who owns my 3/4 acre FD site. Backs on a wooded golf club which
> screams for the addition of beverages amongst the trees. Known as an
> area having very good ground condx. Already has the concrete pad for a
> Rohn 25 tower which was installed by a former property owner/ham. That
> would work.

Perhaps a little cottage in the back with a bed, fridge, TV and hamshack
cold be arranged for Pop.

Dave K8MN

2043. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 06:29:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDAEF2D.9480CC3D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68193

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >How many children do you know who have been in amateur radio for forty
> >years and who are retired?
>
> They are called "Hams".

You're an insulting little bastard, aren't you?

Dave K8MN

2044. Re: Some Interesting Licensing Statistics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 11:12:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306020312.1e3bc70f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68194

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3EDABF0B.6000908@adelphia.net>...
> K3UD wrote:
> > In article
> >
> >>Not gonna go there, Bill!
> >>
> >>But your observation still has lots to think about. If someone thought the old
> >>Extra was easier, then the thing to do was take it before April 15, 2000, and
> >>use the CSCE after that date. If someone the old Extra was harder, the thing
> >>to
> >>do was take the new test soon after April 15 2000.
> >>
> >>But it's been over three years.....
> >>
> >>Some possibilities:
> >>
> >>1) Lots of Advanceds don't care about getting an Extra
> >>2) Lots of Advanceds are inactive (SK being the extreme case)
> >>3) Lots of Advanceds haven't gotten the word yet.
> >>
> >>Thoughts?
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> >
> > This is an interesting question.
> >
> > It seems that many Advanced class operators really do not care to
> > upgrade. It could be that they have no need for the additional
> > privileges granted to the Extra class, or, as proposed when the rules
> > changed in 2000, many Advanced feel that this is the one class of
> > license that "proves" they have passed a CW test that was much faster
> > than the now required 5 WPM.

Problem is, they're wrong on at least two counts:

1) 13 wpm isn't much faster than 5 wpm. It's faster, but not "much
faster".
2) The mere possession of an Advanced doesn't prove that the holder
passed 13 wpm.
>
> I know a few who don't upgrade because they do indeed want to prove
> they passed a higher speed Morse code test. Seems a bit strange to me,
> but whatever.

In 1990, FCC made it possible to get any class of US amateur radio license with only 5 wpm code. All anyone needed was a medical waiver, which consisted of a simple letter from any MD or DO stating that the person seeking the waiver had more-than-average trouble learning Morse. So there have been 5 wpm Generals, Advanceds and Extras for 13 years now - longer than the license term. Thank the dead king of Jordan for that bit of historic trivia.

If anybody wants to know my code skills, I don't rely on some old test or license document. I just show 'em.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"Who made you king? I didn't vote for you!"

2045. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 11:19:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306020319.3cc24f1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68195

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of June 1, 2003:

Novice - 34,282 (decrease of 15,047)
Technician - 254,815 (increase of 49,421)
Technician Plus - 68,320 (decrease of 60,540)
General - 140,962 (increase of 28,285)
Advanced - 83,410 (decrease of 16,372)
Extra - 104,995 (increase of 25,255)
Total - 685,794 (increase of 11,002)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2046. Re: channel 27.555

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 12:05:13 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0306020405.23b21071@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68196
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Papa Doc" <313@8mile.com> wrote in message news:<taCdnakbu5K8IkejXTWcqA@comcast.com>...
> "Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c5ecbb69.0306011815.39efd154@posting.google.com...
> > xganon <remailer@xganon.com> wrote in message
> news:<d0217e1a0675372e9dee33446a03e184@xganon.com>...
> > > This is a good channel. I made many good contacts on this channel today.
> I use a president with a d104 and a foxy made amp. 420 aka rolling thunder
> in the stone.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > ---
> > > This post was anonymized at http://www.xganon.com
> > >
> > > XGANON is sponsord by
> > > http://www.pca.net
> > > For all your computer needs!
> > > ---
> >
> > "sponsord"? WTF?
> > Spells like Georgie-girl hiding behind yet another NIC.
>
> Scared of your own shadow?

I don't have to crawl out of a bottle or hide behind several dozen
NICs to post here, Georgie-girl! What are > you < scared of?

I own you, Georgie-girl. You have to respond to everything I post.
LOL!

2047. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 12:44:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDB46AD.8090301@psu.edu>
Source record: 68198

Dave Heil wrote:
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>
>>
>>>How many children do you know who have been in amateur radio for forty
>>>years and who are retired?
>>
>>They are called "Hams".
>
>
> You're an insulting little bastard, aren't you?

I have to confess, I got a good laugh out of that line.

I'm starting to develop a new theory. Two actually.

Theory 1:

Our friend Vipul is one of the trollers in this newsgroup. Although an actual person exists by this name, Our Vipul is not that person.

Theory 2:

Vipul is just a lonely guy, and posts these missives in order to get some attention. Kind of like a three year old who constantly breaks things because they have figured out it is a way to get some craved interaction with the adults. Bad attention, but attention nonetheless.

For the most part, I see this odd "I'll tell you one thing" and some argument, then "I didn't say that", then I'll tell you another thing", then more of the same. Not a good debate technique. But as long as we are willing to pay attention, like harried parents, we provide the attention he wants so badly.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2048. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 12:56:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDB4988.2000102@psu.edu>
Source record: 68199

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 6/1/03 10:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3EDACBDE.8010603@adelphia.net>
>>
>>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>And this opportunity would be.....? ? ? (Waiting to see how long it takes
>>>>Vippy to answer THIS question...)
>>>
>>>
>>>I can assure you that I do have something. And it does pay more. Alot more.
>>>
>>>I won't tell what it is until (at most) about six months. Perhaps sooner,
>>>depending on certain things.
>>
>> Oh good grief! Good luck in whatever you are doing. Just for that, I
>>won't tell you what color my eyes are!
>>
>> You play a strange game Vipul. I doubt anyone here really cares all
>>that much about you or your job or your license or whatever. Only in
>>your strange little game of "I've got a secret". And that is only
>>because it is so downright odd to act that way.
>
>
> Ditto.
>
> I think it's getting close to "Write This Putz Off As Some Kid Playing
> With Daddy's Toys" time.

Yeah, I'm starting to think along the same lines. Best way to find out
is to ignore him. I'd wager in that happened, his posts would rachet up
in insult level real quick, in an attempt to preserve the attention.

> Whatever his new profession, I sure hope it doesn't involve table dancing.
> I'd go into cardiac arrest laughing so hard.

I hear the tips are good.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2049. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 13:04:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDB4B71.7080205@psu.edu>
Source record: 68200

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> garigue wrote:
>
>
>>>One cannot compare modes to another... in the end, only phone will
>>>survive...
>>>
>>>Rene
>>
>>Huh???? Could you elaborate on the logic you used to get to this earth
>>shaking conclusion?
>
>
> The logical end to that line of logic is that we should all be talking here
> on digital voice! Not gonna happen.

Isn't there a bandwidth problem with digi-voice?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2050. Quote

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 13:44:18 UTC
From: American <Patriot@NoBureaucrats.net>
Message-ID: <bbfkbj$6kn$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68251

"It is not that big government liberals are stupid. It is just
that they know so much that isn't so."

----Ronald Reagan

2051. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 14:02:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbfle2$8k0$0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 68252

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> .
>
> > PSK31 could go the same way. On the other hand, CW is still the most
> > popular and heavily used of all the digital modes (yes it is digital even
> > though not requiring a computer). Check out the various surveys on ARRL to
> > get a feel for how much each of the various modes is used.
>
> You are correct that there are more CW users than PSK31 users. So if a
> ham were called upon to participate in an emergency net using PSK31, the
> messages would almost certainly get through in a similar fashion to CW
> Morse.

This debate has no end, nor should it. That's what makes the world turn, as they say.

But there are technological obstacles to the use of modes which demand complex hard/software, and problems come in many and varied forms.
The old saw that "simpler is more reliable under austere conditions" is the reason why I believe that CW has a long and useful future.

I experienced one example of this factor not long ago. I was an early and frequent user of PSK31 and some of the other digital modes. A year and a half ago I bought a new laptop computer and used it on PSK31, Hellschrieber and a couple others. The laptop came with Windoze ME installed, but included an upgrade CD for XP. Being 'software-cautious'
I used the original ME OS for a year or so, until ME finally became so garbled and troublesome that I finally decided to do the XP upgrade, having finally reluctantly concluded maybe that wasn't caving in to the selfish, filthy-rich knomes at Microshaft.

Long story shorter, XP and it's NT kernal works great - except that now the sound card won't run PSK modes nor any other ham soundcard program I have! Whatever computer trickery I've learned so far has had no positive effect on the beast.

So once again, here I sit, relegated to the sole use of CW as my portable digital mode! It's completely trouble free and available for instant use.
All that is required is a little self-starter self-training.

Simpler may not be better but it's at least available.

Dick W0EX

2052. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 14:14:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbfm38aco0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 68253

Vito wrote:

>
> I agree. But that begs the question "Why does CW need special CW-only
> bands to protect it from SSB/other modes?".

It's not the mode, its the power levels used. If CW fans used high most of the time as do many SSB ops they could easily hold their own and I guarantee that the SSB ops would experience more frustration from the QRM than the CW ops would.

But since most all CW operations are conducted at low power levels, as are most other digital modes, it' makes good sense to separate the modes into sub-bands. Keeps down massive conflict among the various modes users.
I certainly hope our regulators never cave in to the few magpies who insist on "here are your bands, have a good day". Total chaos would follow, until some major reorientation of ham radio occurred. It might not even survive in any identifiable form.

Dick

2053. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 14:16:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbfm82aco1@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 68254

Merl Turkin wrote:

> On Sat, 31 May 2003 22:40:29 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:
>
> > Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> > activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
> > time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets
> > through when nothing else will!
> >
> > End of story.
> >
> > 73 de KR4AJ
>
> Kind of like PSK31 huh?

Most of the time. But CW isn't subject to phase distortion as is PSK31. I have observed times when only the CW IdDer on a PSK31 signal was readable, and the PSK signal would not print.

2054. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 14:23:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbfmljavf0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 68255

Dave Heil wrote:

> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn
> >
> > >How many children do you know who have been in amateur radio for forty
> > >years and who are retired?
> >
> > They are called "Hams".
>
> You're an insulting little bastard, aren't you?

I'm convinced that "stupid" fits even better.

2055. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 14:28:02 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbfmtiavf1@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 68256

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > garigue wrote:
> >
> >
> >>>One cannot compare modes to another... in the end, only phone will
> >>>survive...
> >>>
> >>>Rene
> >>
> >>Huh???? Could you elaborate on the logic you used to get to this earth
> >>shaking conclusion?
> >
> >
> > The logical end to that line of logic is that we should all be talking here
> > on digital voice! Not gonna happen.
>
> Isn't there a bandwidth problem with digi-voice?

Not on rrap! That was my unclearly-stated meaning.

2056. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 14:30:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbfn1uavf2@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 68257

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

Should have read:

If CW fans used high power levels most of the
^^^^^

> time as do many SSB ops they could easily hold their own

2057. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 14:33:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbfn70avf3@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 68258

Well, so much for the "hordes of engineers and other techies" waiting in
the wings for the code to fade away so they wouldn't have to jump
through all those nasty hoops to get into ham radio.......

N2EY wrote:

> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of June 1, 2003:
>
> Novice - 34,282 (decrease of 15,047)
> Technician - 254,815 (increase of 49,421)
> Technician Plus - 68,320 (decrease of 60,540)
> General - 140,962 (increase of 28,285)
> Advanced - 83,410 (decrease of 16,372)
> Extra - 104,995 (increase of 25,255)
> Total - 685,794 (increase of 11,002)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2058. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 15:42:20 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDB705C.2ED4D4AD@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68197

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> Yep, 20 meters and 40 meters, not much sideband today. Too much solar
> activity. But on the lower bands, CW activity was chaotic. It was a good
> time to get a refresh of the mode. Like the old saying goes, CW gets through
> when nothing else will!
>
> End of story.

I agree. But that begs the question "Why does CW need special CW-only
bands to protect it from SSB/other modes?".

73, K3DWW

2059. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 16:22:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDB79E2.2030802@psu.edu>
Source record: 68259

Dick Carroll; wrote:
> Well, so much for the "hordes of engineers and other techies" waiting in
> the wings for the code to fade away so they wouldn't have to jump
> through all those nasty hoops to get into ham radio.......

If there is one thing I have learned in life, its that you just *can't*
make things easy enough for some people.

They always have a new excuse waiting in the wings. Kids, wife, dog,
phase of the moon, whatever.

There is no point in trying to acommodate this type, nothing works. If
you somehow manage to take away their last excuse, you'll just irritate
them.

They simply do not want the license badly enough.

As my hero Yogi Berra noted" If they don't want to come to the game,
there's no way you're gonna stop 'em".

- Mike KB3EIA -

2060. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 16:38:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDB7D92.30303@psu.edu>
Source record: 68260

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>.
>>
>>
>>>>PSK31 could go the same way. On the other hand, CW is still the most
>>>>popular and heavily used of all the digital modes (yes it is digital even
>>>>though not requiring a computer). Check out the various surveys on ARRL to
>>>>get a feel for how much each of the various modes is used.
>>
>> You are correct that there are more CW users than PSK31 users. So if a
>>ham were called upon to participate in an emergency net using PSK31, the
>>messages would almost certainly get through in a similar fashion to CW
>>Morse.
>
>
>
>
> This debate has no end, nor should it. That's what makes the world turn, as they
> say.
>
> But there are technological obstacles to the use of modes which demand complex
> hard/software, and problems come in many and varied forms.
> The old saw that "simpler is more reliable under austere conditions" is the reason
> why I believe that CW has a long and useful future.

Agreed! The simplicity of the mode is a major part of it's attraction.
Some may call it cliche, but to be able to assemble a working radio out
of junk parts in a dire emergency and use it to get yourelf out of a jam
is just about as cool a thing as I can imagine.

My only complaint in this thread was that my main mode got dissed. I'm
sure all the CW affecionado's can appreciate that!

>
> I experienced one example of this factor not long ago. I was an early and
> frequent user of PSK31 and some of the other digital modes. A year and a half ago I
> bought a new laptop computer and used it on PSK31, Hellschrieber and a couple
> others. The laptop came with Windoze ME installed, but included an upgrade CD for
> XP. Being 'software-cautious'
> I used the original ME OS for a year or so, until ME finally became so

> garbled and troublesome that I finally decided to do the XP upgrade, having finally
> reluctantly concluded maybe that wasn't caving in to the selfish, filthy-rich
> knomes at Microshaft.
>
> Long story shorter, XP and it's NT kernal works great - except that now the sound
> card won't run PSK modes nor any other ham soundcard program I have! Whatever
> computer trickery I've learned so far has had no positive effect on the beast.

Gack! I hear more horror stories about that system. My boy has it on
his computer, and it "tailors" his internet experience - to the point
that when trying to download a new version of Netscape, that Netscape's
site insists his machine in a Mac, and *will not* let him see any
download pages but those for Macintosh. Incredulous, we went to the same
site on my computer, and I could see both. I also have spent some
serious time fixing other peoples XP computers. and on and on. It is
also non-secure to the point of ridiculousness.

I won't buy another PC until a new functioning OS is produced. If my
machines get too slow, I'll get a MAC and run my ham programs on my old
laptop.

In the meantime, think "Windows 2000, Windows 2000"

- Mike KB3EIA -

2061. Re: Quote

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 19:28:02 UTC
From: Frank <k3eko@netscape.net>
Message-ID: <3EDBA542.4050404@netscape.net>
Source record: 68261

Amen, brother!

American wrote:
> "It is not that big government liberals are stupid. It is just
> that they know so much that isn't so."
>
> ----Ronald Reagan
>
>
>

2062. Re: Unmanned station / telemetry question...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 19:46:42 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bbg9j2$i6k$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 68262

David Harper <achilles03@hotmail.com> wrote:
>I'm currently studying to get a tech's license in AR for a project I'm
>working on involving an airborne balloon transmitting morse code.
>From what I've read, only repeaters are allowed as unmanned stations.

That's not true. The thing you want to do is called "automatic control" in Part 97, and there are a number of different types of stations in Subpart C of Part 97 (i.e. the 97.2nn sections) which are allowed to operate under automatic control. The problem is to find one of these sections that sounds enough like your intended application to allow you to defend your choice in the unlikely event that someone questions you about it.

>My question is, what about location-oriented telemetry? I'm sure they
>don't fall under the 'telecommand' type of transmission, as aren't
>coming from a controller to a controlled device. Instead, it's an
>uncontrolled device transmitting to a(ny) listener. Do you have to
>get a permit or waiver to do this type of radio telemetry?

One-way transmissions of "telemetry" are generally okay (see 97.111) but finding a section which allows automatic control of a station broadcasting CW telemetry is the bit that is more challenging. If the station was operated at 1.25 meter or shorter wavelengths you might get away with calling the station an "auxilliary station" a la 97.201, though your [a(ny)] above stretches this a bit since auxilliary stations are supposed to transmit point-to-point only. An "automatically controlled digital station", as in 97.221, might be perfect for this if the mode was an "RTTY and data emission", but I'm not sure CW qualifies so you'd need to get another opinion on that. You might get away with calling the station a "beacon station", running under 97.203, but you would want to see how guilty you feel after reading the definition of a beacon station in section 97.3 before concluding this. And, with any of these, there is also the issue that even automatically controlled stations are supposed to have a way to turn the transmitter off if necessary, something which may add complexity to your design depending on how dangerously you want to live.

There aren't really any permits or waivers which allow you to do something in the ham bands not allowed by Part 97. Instead of deciding exactly what you want to do and then looking for a section of Part 97 which allows it, however, what you might do instead is to pick one of the sections which permits automatic control and tailor the design of the apparatus you attach to the balloon to look enough like that section that you'll be able to defend the design with a straight face on the off chance the FCC asks about it.

Dennis Ferguson

2063. Re: Unmanned station / telemetry question...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 21:07:54 UTC
From: achilles03@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <fef44ceb.0306021307.2faf9e29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68263

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030531200059.14936.00000660@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Unmanned station / telemetry question...
> >From: achilles03@hotmail.com (David Harper)
> >Date: 5/31/03 3:48 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <fef44ceb.0305311248.73c899e7@posting.google.com>
> >
> >I'm currently studying to get a tech's license in AR for a project I'm
> >working on involving an airborne balloon transmitting morse code.
> >From what I've read, only repeaters are allowed as unmanned stations.
>
> Hi Dave and welcome to Amateur Radio.
>
> >My question is, what about location-oriented telemetry? I'm sure they
> >don't fall under the 'telecommand' type of transmission, as aren't
> >coming from a controller to a controlled device. Instead, it's an
> >uncontrolled device transmitting to a(ny) listener. Do you have to
> >get a permit or waiver to do this type of radio telemetry?
>
> Nope. As long as your telemetry ID's once every ten minutes as required
> by Part 97 (the FCC's rules and regulations for Amateur Radio), you are "OK".
>
> There ARE "band plans", or mutually agreed upon conventions, that "divide"
> many of the bands into certain types of activities. Obviously you don't want
> your telemetry in the middle of a busy repeater input or output, both to ensure
> you get uncorrupted data, but also to avoid interfering with other users of the
> spectrum.
>
> Don't despair, there is more than enough spectrum for all users!
>
> >Thanks in advance for any insight anyone has to offer.
>
> Stop by some time and let us know how it's going.
>
> 73
>
> Steve Robeson, LPN
> Amateur Radio call K4CAP

Thanks for the info! However, I'm still debating what frequency and
power output I'd need. I want to be able to hear CW when it's
transmitting from only 5,000 ft and up to 40 miles away. I believe
this would be line of sight...

My first "guess" is to use the 6m band with a power output of atleast 1 watt. Does anyone have any better suggestions of advice to offer? Cost and weight is another issue... hopefully, whatever transmitter I chose would ideally be under 1/4 lbs.

Thanks in advance for any responses...
Dave

2064. Re: channel 27.555

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 21:19:31 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EDBBF63.1050501@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68264
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Frank wrote:

> HO HO!
>
That's what Santa Claus said at the house of ill repute.......

2065. Re: Unmanned station / telemetry question...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 22:00:00 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <71f28845e6674ff2583313093a5d1226.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 68265

"David Harper" <achilles03@hotmail.com> wrote

> My question is, what about location-oriented telemetry? I'm sure they
> don't fall under the 'telecommand' type of transmission, as aren't
> coming from a controller to a controlled device. Instead, it's an
> uncontrolled device transmitting to a(ny) listener. Do you have to
> get a permit or waiver to do this type of radio telemetry?

Hi Dave,

Amateur radio has a system called "APRS" which does exactly what you describe. Do a web search on APRS and you will find a wealth of information on it. This system which was first develped by hams is now embedded in commercial products like OnStar and other various flavors of AVL systems.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2066. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 22:17:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <d2QCa.892$BM5.110@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 68266

Thanks for the reminder. I'm almost in my 90 days to renew my ticket. I *almost* was going for a vanity callsign, but they are raising (or raised) the rates. Heck, I thought as a former call holder (I did find the original ticket in an *old* wallet), I might be able to get WN2CJV :) That ought to go over well on the repeaters :))

73 gang!
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0306020319.3cc24f1b@posting.google.com...
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of June 1, 2003:
>
> Novice - 34,282 (decrease of 15,047)
> Technician - 254,815 (increase of 49,421)
> Technician Plus - 68,320 (decrease of 60,540)
> General - 140,962 (increase of 28,285)
> Advanced - 83,410 (decrease of 16,372)
> Extra - 104,995 (increase of 25,255)
> Total - 685,794 (increase of 11,002)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.486 / Virus Database: 284 - Release Date: 5/29/03

2067. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 22:40:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602184005.14248.00000298@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68267

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 6/2/03 7:56 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EDB4988.2000102@psu.edu>

>>Whatever his new profession, I sure hope it doesn't involve table
>dancing.
>> I'd go into cardiac arrest laughing so hard.
>
>I hear the tips are good.

Yeah, they weren't too bad...

(winkwink...gigglegiggle!)

73

Steve, K4YZ

2068. Re: Unmanned station / telemetry question...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-02 22:48:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602184834.14248.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68268

>Subject: Re: Unmanned station / telemetry question...
>From: achilles03@hotmail.com (David Harper)
>Date: 6/2/03 4:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <fef44ceb.0306021307.2faf9e29@posting.google.com>

>Thanks for the info! However, I'm still debating what frequency and
>power output I'd need. I want to be able to hear CW when it's
>transmitting from only 5,000 ft and up to 40 miles away. I believe
>this would be line of sight...

Six meters would be a bad call for this. Even with only 1 watt of power, frequencies above 222Mhz would be the more appropriate choice for what you're doing.

>Cost and weight is another issue... hopefully, whatever transmitter I
>chose would ideally be under 1/4 lbs

Have you considered the Hamtronics boards?

www.hamtronics.com

73

Steve, K4CAP

2069. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 00:24:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602202410.25052.00000384@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 68269

In article <d2QCa.892$BM5.110@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Thanks for the reminder.

Yer welcome!

> I'm almost in my 90 days to renew my ticket.

I suspect that one reason for the wild fluctuations in licnese numbers is folks missing the 90 day window and having to renew in the grace period. .

>I
>*almost* was going for a vanity callsign, but they are raising (or raised)
>the rates. Heck, I thought as a former call holder (I did find the original
>ticket in an *old* wallet), I might be able to get WN2CJV :) That ought to
>go over well on the repeaters :))

COOL!

One of the reasons I kept this 2 land callsign all these years in 3 land is to remind me of the Finger Lakes region, the canal towns, and the Hudson valley. If you hear any Drumlins on the air, say hello for me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2070. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:13:29 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602221329.09800.00000554@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68270

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>> And this opportunity would be.....? ? ? (Waiting to see how long it takes
>>>Vippy to answer THIS question...)
>>
>>I can assure you that I do have something. And it does pay more. Alot more.
>
> So you're a drug pusher now? A pimp?
>
>>I won't tell what it is until (at most) about six months.
>
> Perhaps you need me to help you along again, Vipul?
>
>>Perhaps sooner, depending on certain things.
>
> Like what? Your parents giving you permisssion?
>
>>This could be some kind of bet. Would you like to make a bet?
>
> How about if I just get pictures and put them on the web?
>
>Steve, K4CAP

I can see that I am outmatched. I withdraw my bet.

2071. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:14:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602221410.01631.00000373@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68271

In article <3EDB705C.2ED4D4AD@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>But that begs the question "Why does CW need special CW-only
>bands to protect it from SSB/other modes?".

Vito,

The only CW-only subbands in US amateur radio are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1 MHz. The non-phone parts of the HF bands are not CW-only - they are all wide open to all authorized data modes that meet the bandwidth and data rate requirements.

One good reason for those non-phone subbands is that narrow and wide modes don't often share spectrum well. The narrow mode users, with their selective receivers, can coexist much closer together than the wide mode users.

Another good reason is to encourage the use of spectrum-efficient modes. Five to ten CW QSOs can fit in the spectrum space needed for just one SSB QSO. PSK31 is just as narrow if not narrower. Why reward modes that use more spectrum?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2072. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:15:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602221508.09800.00000556@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68272

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>
>> >>> How far will a Ham chase me?
>> >>
>> >>...depends on what you've said to him.
>> >
>> > A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire
>point
>> >sighted!
>>
>> Don't forget. I lived among Hams for a weekend. No one wanted to hunt me
>down.
>> In fact, I got re-invited. Now who is the smart Ham?
>
>Here's a hint: It isn't you.
>
>Dave K8MN

Looks like I am the smart one in the above situation. Why do you dis-agree?

2073. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:18:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602221843.09800.00000559@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68273

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Yes, I am paying attention. Ham radio is an operator-focused hobby,
>allowing
>> for antennas.
>
>An operator-focused hobby?
>
>Sure amateur radio allows for antennas. Radio is always much tougher
>without antennas.

Similarly, boating is much tougher without oars.

2074. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:19:58 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602221958.09800.00000560@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68274

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo

>> I dunno, Mike. I can envision this guy having some long and
>meaningless
>> conversations with shadows and "Peppy the Hand Puppet"
>
>
> HA! Good one, Steve. After a crappy weekend, I needed that. I wonder
>how many arguments the puppet wins?

None.

2075. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:24:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602222442.09800.00000562@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68275

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>I hear the tips are good.
>
> Yeah, they weren't too bad...
>
> (winkwink...gigglegiggle!)

I don't want to sink down to your level, usually I don't...

But where did you get those tips? Dancing at an old folks home?

2076. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:26:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602222601.09800.00000563@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68276

From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie

>> Vshah101 wrote:
>> >
>> > From: Dave Heil k8mn
>> >
>> > >How many children do you know who have been in amateur radio for forty
>> > >years and who are retired?
>> >
>> > They are called "Hams".
>>
>> You're an insulting little bastard, aren't you?
>
> I'm convinced that "stupid" fits even better.
>

I apologize for that remark.

2077. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:28:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602222806.09800.00000564@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68277

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>I'm starting to develop a new theory. Two actually.
>
>Theory 1:
>
>
> Our friend Vipul is one of the trollers in this newsgroup. Although an
>actual person exists by this name, Our Vipul is not that person.
>
>Theory 2:
>
> Vipul is just a lonely guy, and posts these missives in order to get
>some attention. Kind of like a three year old who constantly breaks
>things because they have figured out it is a way to get some craved
>interaction with the adults. Bad attention, but attention nonetheless.
>
>
> For the most part, I see this odd "I'll tell you one thing" and some
>argument, then "I didn't say that", then I'll tell you another thing",
>then more of the same. Not a good debate technique. But as long as we
>are willing to pay attention, like harried parents, we provide the
>attention he wants so badly.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

You are the one that asked the question "What's worse?". You started it.

2078. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 02:59:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030602225930.09800.00000566@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68278

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>> Well, so much for the "hordes of engineers and other techies" waiting in
>> the wings for the code to fade away so they wouldn't have to jump
>> through all those nasty hoops to get into ham radio...

They can't wait for something they don't know exists. Most people have never heard of Ham radio. I never heard of it until I happened to meet someone that was a Ham that invited me to a Hamfest.

2079. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 04:21:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbh7of$9i6$0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 68279

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > Well, so much for the "hordes of engineers and other techies" waiting in
> > the wings for the code to fade away so they wouldn't have to jump
> > through all those nasty hoops to get into ham radio.......
>
> If there is one thing I have learned in life, its that you just *can't*
> make things easy enough for some people.
>

So true!

>
> They always have a new excuse waiting in the wings. Kids, wife, dog,
> phase of the moon, whatever.
>
> There is no point in trying to acommodate this type, nothing works. If
> you somehow manage to take away their last excuse, you'll just irritate
> them.

...into having to make up a new one!

>
>
> They simply do not want the license badly enough.
>

Sez it all.

>
> As my hero Yogi Berra noted" If they don't want to come to the game,
> there's no way you're gonna stop 'em".

Yep. and "When you come to a fork in the road, take it!"

2080. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 04:33:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbh8et$bn4$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 68280

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> In the meantime, think "Windows 2000, Windows 2000"

My son-in-law is a civil engineer working for a consulting company which has a couple hundred offices nationwide, and he told me they use Windows 2000 exclusively. Must be something to that advice. Unfortunately I don't have it and don't feel inclined to drop another C note on yet one more OS.

Dick

2081. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 09:35:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306030135.25246de8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68281

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EDAEED3.CC04E0F2@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> If they're comparable on 160 and 80m and the Omni VI doesn't hear as
> well, you're either hearing about an Omni VI with problems or you're
> hearing a whopper.

I've known the guy since 1950 something, he's not into whoppers. The
Omni could very well be boogered though. Lotta guys have no idea that
they're pumping garbage signals until somebody gets up their butt.

> > There exists the possibility that I might move in with one of 'em in
> > my old age and pay her NOTHIN'. Would save me a bucket of money. The
> > one who owns my 3/4 acre FD site. Backs on a wooded golf club which
> > screams for the addition of beverages amongst the trees. Known as an
> > area having very good ground condx. Already has the concrete pad for a
> > Rohn 25 tower which was installed by a former property owner/ham. That
> > would work.
>
> Perhaps a little cottage in the back with a bed, fridge, TV and hamshack
> cold be arranged for Pop.

Something along those lines. With cable TV and a high-speed connection
of course. I'll need space for my lathe, etc. I build "stuff". I've
already threatened 'em with it. Drew a uniform "Oh NO, not Pop-pop!"
response.

Son-in-law sed "S--t, we'd have to have this place rezoned to
industrial if he moved in here".

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2082. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 10:37:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDC7A66.9A4D36A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68282

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >Vshah101 wrote:
> >>
> >> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >>
> >> >>> How far will a Ham chase me?
> >> >>
> >> >>...depends on what you've said to him.
> >> >
> >> > A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire
> >point
> >> >sighted!
> >>
> >> Don't forget. I lived among Hams for a weekend. No one wanted to hunt me
> >down.
> >> In fact, I got re-invited. Now who is the smart Ham?
> >>
> >Here's a hint: It isn't you.

> Looks like I am the smart one in the above situation. Why do you dis-agree?

I've been reading your comments here for some time. In all that time, I
haven't seen a post where you appear to be "the smart one". In fact,
you typically come across as a screwball.

Dave K8MN

2083. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 10:49:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDC7D9A.C13603BE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68283

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EDAEED3.CC04E0F2@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >
> > If they're comparable on 160 and 80m and the Omni VI doesn't hear as
> > well, you're either hearing about an Omni VI with problems or you're
> > hearing a whopper.
>
> I've known the guy since 1950 something, he's not into whoppers. The
> Omni could very well be boogered though. Lotta guys have no idea that
> they're pumping garbage signals until somebody gets up their butt.

Could be that one of the Omni VI's bandpass filter relays is not
functioning. That could result in the hearing problem and harmonics.

> > > There exists the possibility that I might move in with one of 'em in
> > > my old age and pay her NOTHIN'. Would save me a bucket of money. The
> > > one who owns my 3/4 acre FD site. Backs on a wooded golf club which
> > > screams for the addition of beverages amongst the trees. Known as an
> > > area having very good ground condx. Already has the concrete pad for a
> > > Rohn 25 tower which was installed by a former property owner/ham. That
> > > would work.
> >
> > Perhaps a little cottage in the back with a bed, fridge, TV and hamshack
> > cold be arranged for Pop.
>
> Something along those lines. With cable TV and a high-speed connection
> of course. I'll need space for my lathe, etc. I build "stuff". I've
> already threatened 'em with it. Drew a uniform "Oh NO, not Pop-pop!"
> response.

You've got the right idea! I have tools but not like my neighbor's wood
shop. He has a planer, a joiner, a shaper, table saws, cut off saws,
power miters, power planers and the like. I needed some replacement oak
flooring recently and we went to his "oak pile". Within the space of a
half-hour, I had all the stuff I needed.

> Son-in-law sed "S--t, we'd have to have this place rezoned to
> industrial if he moved in here".

Your response would be, "So?"

Dave K8MN

2084. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 12:56:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603085605.13794.00000596@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68284

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/2/03 9:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030602221329.09800.00000554@mb-m16.aol.com>

>I can see that I am outmatched. I withdraw my bet.

Probably the first wise thing you've done in a while.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2085. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 12:58:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603085803.13794.00000597@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68285

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/2/03 9:18 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030602221843.09800.00000559@mb-m16.aol.com>

>Similarly, boating is much tougher without oars.

Oh?

I spent a great deal of time on several vessles, none of which had oars
and all of which moved rather smartly without them.

Steve, K4CAP

2086. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 12:58:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603085845.13794.00000598@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68286

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/2/03 9:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030602222442.09800.00000562@mb-m16.aol.com>

>I don't want to sink down to your level, usually I don't...
>
>But where did you get those tips? Dancing at an old folks home?

Ya go where the money is, Vippy.

Steve, K4CAP

2087. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 13:00:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603090046.13794.00000599@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68288

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/2/03 9:19 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030602221958.09800.00000560@mb-m16.aol.com>

>>> I dunno, Mike. I can envision this guy having some long and
>>meaningless
>>> conversations with shadows and "Peppy the Hand Puppet"
>>
>>
>> HA! Good one, Steve. After a crappy weekend, I needed that. I wonder
>>how many arguments the puppet wins?
>
>None.

Two questions:

(1) Does this mean you HAVE arguments with Peppy The Hand Puppet?

(2) Who decides who won?

Steve, K4CAP

2088. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 13:06:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603090606.13794.00000601@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68289

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/2/03 9:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030602222806.09800.00000564@mb-m16.aol.com>

>> For the most part, I see this odd "I'll tell you one thing" and some
>>argument, then "I didn't say that", then I'll tell you another thing",
>>then more of the same. Not a good debate technique. But as long as we
>>are willing to pay attention, like harried parents, we provide the
>>attention he wants so badly.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>You are the one that asked the question "What's worse?". You started it.

But does that mean you HAD to provide several examples of just HOW worse
it could be?

That's like the idiot who was stopped by the cops, asked if he was
intoxicated, and who responds "Not as much as I could have been if I smoked
this pot in my pocket..."

Steve, K4CAP

2089. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 13:07:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603090717.13794.00000602@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68290

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/2/03 9:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030602225930.09800.00000566@mb-m16.aol.com>

>They can't wait for something they don't know exists. Most people have never
>heard of Ham radio. I never heard of it until I happened to meet someone that
>was a Ham that invited me to a Hamfest.

Rumour has it that there's a "John Doe" contract on the head of the guy
who did it, too......

Steve, K4CAP

2090. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 13:24:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbi7hr$p5m$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 68291

Dave Heil wrote:

> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn
> >
> > >Vshah101 wrote:
> > >>
> > >> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > >>
> > >> >>> How far will a Ham chase me?
> > >> >>
> > >> >>...depends on what you've said to him.
> > >> >
> > >> > A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire
> > >point
> > >> >sighted!
> > >>
> > >> Don't forget. I lived among Hams for a weekend. No one wanted to hunt me
> > >down.
> > >> In fact, I got re-invited. Now who is the smart Ham?
> > >
> > >Here's a hint: It isn't you.
>
> > Looks like I am the smart one in the above situation. Why do you dis-agree?
>
> I've been reading your comments here for some time. In all that time, I
> haven't seen a post where you appear to be "the smart one". In fact,
> you typically come across as a screwball.

I still think he's Cootie Boy. If not, definitely a clone.

2091. Re: Hey Jim N2EY!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 14:08:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306030608.69dc9e00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68295

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3ED8A484.E5C6E7E9@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > Common sense. You got your money's worth. There are churners out there
> > though.
>
> I know a number of those guys. They buy the latest, use it for several
> months and then buy the next "latest".

K3WW the guy who came home from Dayton with an Orion is a churner but
with a twist. From what I'm told of his habits he'll be among the
first to buy any new competition-grade xcvr if it looks like it has
possibilities. He'll then take it into battle and if he likes it he'll
keep it and run it's ears off for years. However if whatever rig
he's been using is better than the new rig he'll dump the new rig he
just bought ASAP and cheerfully eat the loss. He's sunk a lotta
dollars into his breed of "users reviews". His opinion of the Orion
will probably be indicated by whether of not he unloads it following
the CQs or if he uses it in the ARRLs too.

> > the crud with a 940 it can't be done except maybe in the case of a
> > Sherwood R-4C on 160 & 80. The front end shows the K2 folk how the big
> > boys can play the BDRs game when they choose to do so. And it was
> > designed well over twenty years ago.
>
> I think Goose uses 'em because they are a "known", he and his crew are
> familiar with them, he finds them reliable,he knows much about repairing
> them and he has several parts units sitting around.

They're very easy to learn. Sit down. Scan panel. Operate. Jim used my
940 and two minutes after he parked himself in front of it he was
fine. Goose is gonna need beaucoup parts rigs and all the bench smarts
he pull up as time goes on though. No thanks.

> > Then I'm gonna offload it. Superb radio but it's full of creaky old
> > point-to-point wiring, parts are quickly becoming unavailable, etc.
> > It's time.
>
> Yep. It is worth it to get the thing repaired so you can get some cash
> out of it toward your Orion *grin*.

I should be able to squeeze $700 out of the 940. What I do with the
$700 is pure conjecture at this point except that it'll somehow get
plowed back into ham radio. Ditto the meatball 75S-3B but I might keep
the R4B, it ain't worth selling but it is a very nice backup rcvr.

I'm on a jihad to dump everything I gathered up before, say, 1995. All of it. I have cubic yards of old CRAP going back to the '50s, WW2 and in one case a rcvr which looks like it's outta the 1920s. Maybe it's a TX, dunno. Nice woodwork whatever it is. Want a mint 0-260 vac 30 amp 1ï¿½ Variac? Only weighs 150 pounds. Has a reddio knob and a half, a real two-hander. Also have the 7.5 kVA pole pig plate xfmr which goes with the Variac which is not feathers either. The pair ran stone cold feeding a pair of 4-1000As. Back a piece.

> On FD, there's always a chance that I'll get caught with my pants down
> but it won't be because of a broken rig. If Bert's '1000MP "Field and
> Stream" breaks, I'll happily haul the Paragon out.

. . put it on the table alongside the Field from the gitgo. Has to do with warding off evil spirits, etc.

> > You've done well. I've seen the .JPGs of your "modest" antenna farm. I
> > only wish!
>
> The stuff pleases me 'cuz I get out well but BIG 40m yagis and four
> squares on 80m and even 160m are becoming more common.

I guess but they're not exactly garden variety, you're still in the "top 5%". When I get into a pileup with that crowd (YOU GUYS)I go away and peck my way up the band for 15 minutes or so and let 'em finish obliterating their particular 10 Khz of band and each other whilst I'm elswhere bagging even more weak DLs. Then I go back down the band and snipe the goodie after the horde has rumbled off to the next spots callout. My two most memorable catches using this technique were TT8AF and VR6TC, both on 40 CW when they were lonesome and calling CQ. Dropped my call on both only once.

> A friend of mine
> in Indiana is agonizing over buying either a 2 element or a 3 element
> 40m yagi. The 3 element costs a lot more money. I've advised him to
> grab the 2 element yagi because thusfar, he has been a vertical or
> dipole user. The 2 element yagi at height is going to out perform
> verticals and dipoles by a wide margin and most of hamdom is still using
> verticals and dipoles.

The 2 el. is also a lot lighter, easier to put up & maintain and doesn't put as much wind load on the tower, mast & rotator. Unless the 3 el. is a quite long boom version the difference in performance won't be noticeable. Putting up a 3 el. 40 is four times more of a pain in the ass than is putting up a 2 el. 40. I agree, he'll think he died and went to heaven with any 40m 2 el. rotary loudenboomer.

> I figure I'm good for another decade of climbing.

That'll be about right, I've noticed that about the time the Social Insecurity checks start to flow thru ham mail slots the climbing belts start to collect dust.

> What I don't do is
> digging. I hire the local grave digger (yes, this area has a fellow who
> still digs graves by hand). He does fine with rectangular holes but has
> trouble with simple trenches. The one I had him dig for burial of
> coaxial cable and control cables for the higher tower was crooked as a
> dog's hind leg.

Hee! Can't folow a snap line eh? I think I'd have enjoyed that. Since
it wasn't my trench.

> I did the other myself after loosening the dirt with a
> garden tiller.

Thatsa a good idea. The guys around here who live in the woods don't
bother with much digging. They'll bury enough to get from the house to
the far edge of whatever lawn they might have then they just dump it
on the surface thru the brush to the towers. N3RS must have 10-12 runs
of one inch hardline snaked thru the woods behind his place. Ya watch
where yer feet are in his back forty or ya land on yer butt.

> > You need to do that. From where you are W3LPL should be the first stop
> > ya make. He's a pile of contesting history by himself. You'd enjoy a
> > visit to N3RS. His Telrex 3 el 40 is 150 feet above a 150 foot cliff
> > and looms over the PA turnpike two minutes before the Downingtown
> > interchange headed East. There are others. Let me know when the urge
> > overcomes you.
>
> Frank is the friend and former co-worker of my pal K3FK, who was posted
> in Helsinki with me in the mid-nineties. I was invited to an open house
> there in '2000 but I couldn't make it with shuttling back and forth
> between Washington and here.

That's a shame and one helluva commute. I dunno if he has the biggest
multi-multi in the country but he's gotta be close. I've never heard
how he makes his daily bread but he ain't or wasn't no GS-11 beltway
paper shuffler.

> The station was superb. The operators were, in Ville's view, poor. He
> noted constant CQing with little listening and said that he was standing
> by and copying callsigns when the operator was doing the QRZ? number.
> Of course Ville has probably been number one in the world in CQ WW CW
> than anyone else.

OK, doesn't take much to figger out what general area he visited. A
lotta that bunch ain't too swift but there are reasons for that. Which
discussion I'm not taking into a public place like this.

> > Unassisted is certainly an option. I gotta at least try operating
> > assisted, maybe I'll like it, maybe I won't. I'm OK with operating
> > unassisted because my scores have always lopsided, higher mults/q's
> > ratio than average. I'm not a big-time runner but I usually did well
> > with the mults.
>
> That's typical of the low power/small antenna guy. Starting a run and

> holding a frequency are extremely tough under those circumstances.

Even when I had a decent station running was a hit & miss proposition. Call CQ nobody answers. Work some LZ who had been calling CQ and five guys tail end him and call me. Then five more. And all of a sudden yer "rate" is 200/hr. Three minutes later yer rate drops to zilch and ya go back to sniping. Ya deal with it.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2092. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 14:16:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603101601.13794.00000603@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68296

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>Date: 6/3/03 8:24 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bbi7hr$p5m$0@208.207.71.149>

>I still think he's Cootie Boy. If not, definitely a clone.

At least Vippy can usually spell correctly!

Steve, K4CAP

2093. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 14:16:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030603101659.06400.00000446@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 68297

In article <e79dbd9b.0306011044.5e0b8710@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) writes:

>Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb> wrote
>
>>
>> If one had 2 Q's in their callsign, could you say KA1K Double Q ?
>>
>
>Of course you could.
>
>de Hans, Kilo zero single H single B

Hansl:

When did you change your call sign to K0SHSB?

73 de Larry, Kilo Three Lima Tango

If you're a DX'er: Kilowatt Number Three London Tangiers

If you're a No-Code Tech or a 75-meter SSB user: Kicking Three Loud Tigers

-=- ---== -=-- =

2094. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 15:56:59 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDCC54B.7DD2CE2B@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68287

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> My son-in-law is a civil engineer ...

My wife's cousin is a civil engineer and her son a mechanical engineer working for the Navy. The latter claims that the difference between the disciplines is that civil engineers build targets whilst ....(c:

Thanks for answering my question and 73,
K3DWW

2095. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 16:35:22 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDCCE4A.53F3F9E3@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68292

N2EY wrote:
>
> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:
>
> >... "Why does CW need special CW-only
> >bands to protect it from SSB/other modes?".
>
> Vito,
>
> The only CW-only subbands in US amateur radio are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1
> MHz. The non-phone parts of the HF bands are not CW-only - they are all wide
> open to all authorized data modes that meet the bandwidth and data rate
> requirements.

Yes; sorry, I got wrapped up in the thread's title. You are of course
correct.
>
> One good reason for those non-phone subbands is that narrow and wide modes
> don't often share spectrum well. The narrow mode users, with their selective
> receivers, can coexist much closer together than the wide mode users.

Not disagreeing given most rigs but seems to me that RF-selective
receivers coupled with "sound card" AF filter technology could allow
narrow mode users to effortlessly "squeeze" between SSB QSOs and that an
SSB rig with notch filters like found in PC sound cards could eliminate
any narrow-band QRM, allowing both modes to coexist on the same band.
>
> Another good reason is to encourage the use of spectrum-efficient modes. Five
> to ten CW QSOs can fit in the spectrum space needed for just one SSB QSO. PSK31
> is just as narrow if not narrower. Why reward modes that use more spectrum?

The flaw in 'efficiency' is time - at least for manual CW. Except for
the gifted, most of us talk far faster than we can copy code or even
type so, while it takes a fraction of the spectrum to send a givin
amount of info via CW, it takes a lot more time, and the two balance
out.
73, K3DWW

2096. Why Is It?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 16:42:29 UTC
From: Tom Jefferson <tj@amercontsfreedom.org>
Message-ID: <bbij59$i6l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68299

Why is it that Big Government Liberals believe the NRA is bad because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while the ACLU is good because it supports certain parts of the Constitution?

Tom Jefferson

2097. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 16:42:39 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDCCFFF.61B05C4D@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68293

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > The old saw that "simpler is more reliable under austere conditions" is the
> > reason why I believe that CW has a long and useful future.
>
> Agreed! The simplicity of the mode is a major part of it's attraction.
> Some may call it cliche, but to be able to assemble a working radio out
> of junk parts in a dire emergency and use it to get yourelf out of a jam
> is just about as cool a thing as I can imagine.

I heartily agree from a "hobby" standpoint but the problem with Morse
for emergency use if that few people likely to hear your signal will be
able to copy Morse, and that will only get worse. That's why I advocate
tap-code ... for its simplicity.
73, K3DWW

2098. Re: Quote {OT}

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 17:04:27 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDCD51B.E6E8F@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68294

American wrote:
>
> "It is not that big government liberals are stupid. It is just
> that they know so much that isn't so."
>
> ----Ronald Reagan

Speaking of things that aren't so, Reagan was not conservative in any true sense nor did he shrink government. He was a big government borrow-and-spend Republican. The difference between him and his "big government liberals" is that he borrowed $billions to make government even bigger and more intrusive then went home leaving Democrats to raise taxes to pay for it. Funny how "liberals" turned Reagan's huge deficit into a surplus and now a "conservative", is plunging us back into debt. Orwell's doublespeak has indeed become the language of our politics.

K3DWW

2099. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 17:14:33 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDCD779.AB7EA037@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68298

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Well, so much for the "hordes of engineers and other techies" waiting in
> the wings for the code to fade away so they wouldn't have to jump
> through all those nasty hoops to get into ham radio.......
>

Sometimes time is of the essence in history and we're too late. Hoards of people were attracted to radio 25 years ago and IMHO the "techies" among them would have transferred that interest to amateur radio but for having to learn what had already become an archaic hobby mode. By the time no-code licenses appeared the "hordes of techies" had moved on to newer things. Sic semper something ...

73, K3DWW

2100. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 18:44:48 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbiqb0vpd0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 68300

Vito wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > Well, so much for the "hordes of engineers and other techies" waiting in
> > the wings for the code to fade away so they wouldn't have to jump
> > through all those nasty hoops to get into ham radio.......
> >
>
> Sometimes time is of the essence in history and we're too late. Hoards
> of people were attracted to radio 25 years ago and IMHO the "techies"
> among them would have transferred that interest to amateur radio but for
> having to learn what had already become an archaic hobby mode. By the
> time no-code licenses appeared the "hordes of techies" had moved on to
> newer things. Sic semper something ...

Vito, your argument sounds good, but experience just doesn't bear it out. I've never known anyone who really wanted to get into ham radio that couldn't do it, although I certainly concede that there probably have been some. But what I experiencd and have so often seen is that most of those folks just don't want to do it badly enough to avoid being "put off" by such things as learning and practicing Morse code. The people who really want to wouldn't think of being disuaded by such a thing.

As for it's archiac attributes, that view is definitely held only by persons who never became even modestly proficient at its use (and I know there are always exceptions). But anyone who has done so clearly understands the communications capabilities involved, and the simplicity of it all-even though some of them deny it. There is so little overhead needed beyond the necessary selftraining.

2101. Re: Why Is It?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 20:20:03 UTC
From: Taliesin MacAran <taliesin@cox.nospam.net>
Message-ID: <Tp7Da.353941$vU3.165213@news1.central.cox.net>
Source record: 68201

Because Big Government Liberals are stupid.

Talie

"Tom Jefferson" <tj@amercontsfreedom.org> wrote in message
news:bbij59$i6l$0@pita.alt.net...
> Why is it that Big Government Liberals believe the NRA is bad
> because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
> the ACLU is good because it supports certain parts of the
> Constitution?
>
> Tom Jefferson
>
>
>
>

2102. 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 21:27:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbj3qdtaq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68202
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB038
ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3

ZCZC AG38
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 38 ARLB038
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT June 3, 2003
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB038
ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3

The new five-channel 60-meter domestic secondary amateur allocation becomes available to US Amateur Radio operators at midnight local time on July 3. The FCC Report and Order granting the allocation was published June 3 in the Federal Register. Federal government users are primary in the 5 MHz band.

The FCC has granted amateurs use of five 2.8 kHz-wide channels with center frequencies of 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373 and 5405 kHz. The channels will be available to General and higher class licensees. The only permitted mode will be upper-sideband USB phone, and 50 W ERP is the maximum power allowed.

Users of the 60-meter channels should set their carrier frequency 1.5 kHz lower than the channel center frequency. ARRL suggests restricting transmitted audio bandwidth to 200 Hz on the low end and 2800 Hz on the high end for a total bandwidth of 2.6 kHz. ARRL recommends that amateurs considering modifying existing amateur equipment for operation on 60 meters contact the equipment's manufacturer for advice.
NNNN
/EX

2103. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 21:29:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603172945.21783.00000350@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68203

>Subject: Re: Serious question:
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 6/3/03 9:16 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030603101659.06400.00000446@mb-m10.aol.com>

>>
>>de Hans, Kilo zero single H single B

>When did you change your call sign to K0SHSB?

...and did you have to pay extra for the extra letters...?!?!

>If you're a DX'er: Kilowatt Number Three London Tangiers
>
>If you're a No-Code Tech or a 75-meter SSB user: Kicking Three Loud Tigers

If you'e a retired Marine...

Kissed Three Ladies Tenderly

=)

Steve, Kissed Four Cute American Pixies

2104. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 21:44:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306031344.1d71b286@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68204

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EDC7A66.9A4D36A@earthlink.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn
> >
> > >Vshah101 wrote:
> > >>
> > >> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > >>
> > >> >>> How far will a Ham chase me?
> > >> >>
> > >> >>...depends on what you've said to him.
> > >> >
> > >> > A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire
> point
> > >> >sighted!
> > >>
> > >> Don't forget. I lived among Hams for a weekend. No one wanted to hunt me
> down.
> > >> In fact, I got re-invited. Now who is the smart Ham?
> > >
> > >Here's a hint: It isn't you.
> >
> > Looks like I am the smart one in the above situation. Why do you dis-agree?
> >
> I've been reading your comments here for some time. In all that time, I
> haven't seen a post where you appear to be "the smart one". In fact,
> you typically come across as a screwball.

Typicallly he comes off to me like the Putz in new underwear.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2105. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-03 22:50:35 UTC
From: Frank <k3eko@netscape.net>
Message-ID: <3EDD263A.4060705@netscape.net>
Source record: 68205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thanks for the update, Dan!

73

Frank K3EKO

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB038
> ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3
>
> ZCZC AG38
> QST de W1AW
> ARRL Bulletin 38 ARLB038
> From ARRL Headquarters
> Newington CT June 3, 2003
> To all radio amateurs
>
> SB QST ARL ARLB038
> ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3
>
> The new five-channel 60-meter domestic secondary amateur allocation
> becomes available to US Amateur Radio operators at midnight local
> time on July 3. The FCC Report and Order granting the allocation was
> published June 3 in the Federal Register. Federal government users
> are primary in the 5 MHz band.
>
> The FCC has granted amateurs use of five 2.8 kHz-wide channels with
> center frequencies of 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373 and 5405 kHz. The
> channels will be available to General and higher class licensees.
> The only permitted mode will be upper-sideband USB phone, and 50 W
> ERP is the maximum power allowed.
>
> Users of the 60-meter channels should set their carrier frequency
> 1.5 kHz lower than the channel center frequency. ARRL suggests
> restricting transmitted audio bandwidth to 200 Hz on the low end and
> 2800 Hz on the high end for a total bandwidth of 2.6 kHz. ARRL
> recommends that amateurs considering modifying existing amateur
> equipment for operation on 60 meters contact the equipment's
> manufacturer for advice.
> NNNN
> /EX
>
>

2106. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 00:28:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603202826.20212.00000423@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68208

In article <3EDAED59.C9EEDA6D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>
>> >> Yes, but if you invited someone to Field Day, who would find contests
>> >> fun?
>> >
>> >Probably the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you at bowling
>> >or the same kind of person who would enjoy watching you as you are
>> >fishing. Maybe it'd be the same person who would enjoy watching you
>> >paint an entire portrait or the one who would find watching you mount
>> >stamps in an album to be exciting.

There are people who enjoy playing golf, and people who enjoy watching others
play golf, and people who enjoy doing both. Same principle.
>
>> >>They don't teach you automechanics in EE.
>> >
>> >No kidding? They don't teach astronomy in art class either.
>>
>> Yes, but they require literature courses or other liberal arts courses and
>> that has nothing to do with EE (or reality).
>
>That's called an education (really).

It's the difference between schooling and education. A degree is supposed to
indicate a level of education, not just schooling.
>
>> >> Amateur radio could give you a practical
>> >> application of EE, but doesn't.
>> >
>> >Then you aren't paying attention.

The descriptions you and W3RV give of serious contest stations are perfect
examples. There may not be a lot of homebrewing of transceivers at those
stations but there's a lot of practical examples of electrical engineering
there.
>>
>> Yes, I am paying attention. Ham radio is an operator-focused hobby,
>> allowing for antennas.
>
>An operator-focused hobby?

Of course. Our licenses are primarily for operating, not building. Anybody can build a radio station, for any frequency, mode or power level desired. No license required if it's on your own property and you pay for it yourself, though a building permit may be needed for the antennas.

But if you want to operate a station that exceeds Part 95 limitations, you need a license.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2107. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 00:28:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603202827.20212.00000424@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68206

In article <3ED8F762.7000800@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> Here's a tip: Many Field Day groups need help during set-up and take-down.
>> Volunteer to help with those things and leave the operating to others.
>
> And HOW! If Vipul would like some instant acceptance,
>all he would have
>to do is help put up and tear down the Field day stations at his local
>club.

Extra hands always appreciated. Particularly at take-down.

>Our club has a pretty involved operation, and we can always use
>some more help.

One of the best Field Day-ers I know is a good friend who never actually
operates an FD station. He shows up early, brings all sorts of useful goodies
and tools, helps set up, runs errands, socializes when the setups are running
(but not with the ops!), then goes home and gets a good night's sleep. On
Sunday he shows up and helps take down and put away. And he's been doing it for
years. 0

>That might help me not use up so many calories over the
>weekend.
>
You and me both!
>>
>>>>You're forgetting the most important point: The only way to KNOW what the
>>>>capabilities of a station are is to actually operate it.
>>>
>>>Yes, thats standard Ham radio hype.
>>
>> No, it's a fact.
>
>
> HAR! I missed that comment of his, Jim.

It shows his lack of understanding.

>The entire idea of putting up a
>station, something which Vipul professes to like doing, is so that it
>can get a good signal on the air. I would submit that a beautiful setup
>can be made that will radiate virtually nothing.

Sure. Been there done that.

I remember one year at a two-transmitter setup. The station I was involved with (the CW tent, naturally) used a homebrew trap inverted V with the apex at 35 feet. Across the field, the 'phone station had a brand-new-in-the-box commercially made "Carolina Windom" strung up between two trees - maybe 45-50 feet up. Both stations had 100-watt middle-level HF transceivers (Kenwood TS-450s, as I recall). The CW station was working at least 3 stations for every one the 'phone guys were working. Somebody got another antenna (G5RV? vertical?) for the 'phone station, and their results improved mightily.

>So how does Vipul
>suggest that we test out his station setups?
>
Exactly!

It's like building the race cars, taking them to Indy, and then deciding the winner based on who got their car to the track first.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2108. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 00:28:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030603202829.20212.00000425@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68207

In article <3EDCCE4A.53F3F9E3@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:
>>
>> >... "Why does CW need special CW-only
>> >bands to protect it from SSB/other modes?".
>>
>> Vito,
>>
>> The only CW-only subbands in US amateur radio are 50.0-50.1
>> and 144.0-144.1
>> MHz. The non-phone parts of the HF bands are not CW-only - they are all
>> wide
>> open to all authorized data modes that meet the bandwidth and data rate
>> requirements.
>
>Yes; sorry, I got wrapped up in the thread's title. You are of course
>correct.

For the most part, it seems to me that the narrow modes coexist pretty well.

>> One good reason for those non-phone subbands is that narrow and wide >>
modes
>> don't often share spectrum well. The narrow mode users, with their
>> selective
>> receivers, can coexist much closer together than the wide mode users.
>
>Not disagreeing given most rigs but seems to me that RF-selective
>receivers coupled with "sound card" AF filter technology could allow
>narrow mode users to effortlessly "squeeze" between SSB QSOs and that an
>SSB rig with notch filters like found in PC sound cards could eliminate
>any narrow-band QRM, allowing both modes to coexist on the same band.

Maybe. OTOH such an approach increases the complexitry of equipment required
but offers no real advantages that I can see. Experience has shown that, in
general amateur practice, signals coexist better with similar signals - CW
against CW, SSB against SSB, etc.
>>
>> Another good reason is to encourage the use of spectrum-efficient modes.
>> Five
>> to ten CW QSOs can fit in the spectrum space needed for just one SSB QSO.
>> PSK31
>> is just as narrow if not narrower. Why reward modes that use more spectrum?

>
>The flaw in 'efficiency' is time - at least for manual CW.

Not really - see below.

>Except for
>the gifted, most of us talk far faster than we can copy code or even
>type so, while it takes a fraction of the spectrum to send a givin
>amount of info via CW, it takes a lot more time, and the two balance
>out.

I disagree. For one thing, in my experience, most people can reach 30-35 wpm with code if they actually use the mode regularly. There are exceptions, of course. "Gifted" doesn't start until around 50 wpm. Typing/reading speeds are usually even faster. Plus with a send buffer, a slow typist can be preparing a response while receiving the other station's transmission.

Add to this the fact that CW and other digital modes can take full advantage of abbreviations and prosigns, and the effective communication rate easily doubles.

Yes, people talk faster, but most people's speech is full of pauses, redundancies and other delays. End result is that actual information flow via the spoken word is far slower than the mere wpm would indicate.

Do 'phone ops spend 1/5 to 1/10 as much time on the air as CW ops? Only that way would there be a balance.

Also, if the information being transmitted is to be written down (such as a formal message), the maximum speed is limited by how fast the receiving op can write or type. Most people have a hard time writing longhand legibly above about 25 wpm.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2109. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 01:57:26 UTC
From: Herb <Fwankie@FwankieBARF.net>
Message-ID: <bbjjlq$g3b$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68209
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hey Dan,

Isn't that a hoot? Stumpjumper Nr 9 is trying to
suck up to you!

Go away Fwankie! and get a license!

Herb, 14313

"Frank" <k3eko@netscape.net> wrote in message
news:3EDD263A.4060705@netscape.net...
> Thanks for the update, Dan!
>
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > SB QST @ ARL $ARLB038
> > ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3
> >
> > ZCZC AG38
> > QST de W1AW
> > ARRL Bulletin 38 ARLB038
> > From ARRL Headquarters
> > Newington CT June 3, 2003
> > To all radio amateurs
> >
> > SB QST ARL ARLB038
> > ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3
> >
> > The new five-channel 60-meter domestic secondary amateur allocation
> > becomes available to US Amateur Radio operators at midnight local
> > time on July 3. The FCC Report and Order granting the allocation was
> > published June 3 in the Federal Register. Federal government users
> > are primary in the 5 MHz band.
> >
> > The FCC has granted amateurs use of five 2.8 kHz-wide channels with
> > center frequencies of 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373 and 5405 kHz. The
> > channels will be available to General and higher class licensees.
> > The only permitted mode will be upper-sideband USB phone, and 50 W
> > ERP is the maximum power allowed.
> >

> > Users of the 60-meter channels should set their carrier frequency
> > 1.5 kHz lower than the channel center frequency. ARRL suggests
> > restricting transmitted audio bandwidth to 200 Hz on the low end and
> > 2800 Hz on the high end for a total bandwidth of 2.6 kHz. ARRL
> > recommends that amateurs considering modifying existing amateur
> > equipment for operation on 60 meters contact the equipment's
> > manufacturer for advice.
> > NNNN
> > /EX
> >
> >
>

2110. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 01:57:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030603215743.28806.00000537@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68210

In article <20030603172945.21783.00000350@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>If you're a DX'er: Kilowatt Number Three London Tangiers
>>
>>If you're a No-Code Tech or a 75-meter SSB user: Kicking Three Loud Tigers
>
> If you'e a retired Marine...
>
> Kissed Three Ladies Tenderly

Steve:

I prefer Kissing Three Lovley Tarts, or Kissing Three Lady Texans!
(Not YOU, Kim -- so don't get your hopes up!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

2111. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 02:38:53 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns938FE5BCC353DAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@65.100.3.61>
Source record: 68211

```
>> locomotives and MU cars?). I c
>> answer.
> Youse guys are the hardcore railfans
> 'amateur'. Har.
> Ya got me, what does it mean?

F means Front. Kind of silly isn't it?
```

2112. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 04:06:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604000622.08632.00000686@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68212

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>But does that mean you HAD to provide several examples of just HOW worse
>it could be?

Thats a good one, Steve.

2113. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 04:09:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604000926.08632.00000687@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68213

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Ya go where the money is, Vippy.

Thats right. Believe me, I felt cheapened more in the EE profession that anything.

2114. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 04:12:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604001201.08632.00000688@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68214

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>
>> >>> How far will a Ham chase me?
>> >>
>> >>...depends on what you've said to him.
>> >
>> > A smart Ham would have gotten ahead of him and already had a fire
>point
>> >sighted!
>>
>> Don't forget. I lived among Hams for a weekend. No one wanted to hunt me
>down.
>> In fact, I got re-invited. Now who is the smart Ham?
>
>Here's a hint: It isn't you.

Actually I looked back on this and I see my error. You are right, I am not the smart one. I truly had a good time there and I should be happy about that. I sincerely want to apologize about that.

2115. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 04:14:56 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604001456.08632.00000689@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68215

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

Dave Heil said that radios are not much use without antennas

>>Similarly, boating is much tougher without oars.
>
> Oh?
>
> I spent a great deal of time on several vessles, none of which had oars
>and all of which moved rather smartly without them.

The point I was trying to make is the hobby is about radio, not <primarily
about> antennas. Do you understand the analogy?

2116. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 04:32:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604003206.08632.00000691@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68216

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>It's the difference between schooling and education. A degree is supposed to
>indicate a level of education, not just schooling.

Education is so stuck in its methods, that it cannot see common sense. And they make you take so many worthless courses and leave no time left for worthwhile knowledge.

Too much <traditional> education is not good for you. One person told me that some of the dumbest people he worked with had advanced degrees and some of the smartest people had no college degree.

In the future, I will forbid my children to go to school as much as it is allowed. I will do some research on home-schooling.

>There are people who enjoy playing golf, and people who enjoy watching others
>play golf, and people who enjoy doing both. Same principle.

With contesting, you keep adding the number of contacts. I like to accomplish things. Kind of like when I'm in a boring EE class. I can't wait until its over. Contesting goes against my nature.

2117. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 04:40:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604004028.08632.00000692@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68217

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Most people have never
>>heard of Ham radio. I never heard of it until I happened to meet someone
>that
>>was a Ham that invited me to a Hamfest.
>
> Rumour has it that there's a "John Doe" contract on the head of the guy
>who did it, too......
>

This person is no longer in this country. He left the country to marry some girl he met online. He told me he had plans to stay in that country and work over there. So, there is no truth to that "rumour".

2118. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 04:49:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604004935.08632.00000695@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68218

From: Vito vito@crosslink.net

>I heartily agree from a "hobby" standpoint but the problem with Morse
>for emergency use if that few people likely to hear your signal will be
>able to copy Morse, and that will only get worse. That's why I advocate
>tap-code ... for its simplicity.

I don't know if thats really a problem. There could be secret Morse code transmissions throughout society. Most people would not recognize them and ignore them.

A select group of individuals from all professions would have the common bond of real time Morse code recognition. Messages can be sent and secret meetings held to discuss issues relating to this activity. I can see some signs of this trend right now.

They live...

2119. Re: Quote {OT}

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 05:01:45 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bblucl$b1mrd$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68239

In Michigan we have/had a similar person.... John Engler! Raised a form a tax 50% which affected the lower-middle-class and lower class people the hardest! (the sales tax for Michigan)

In the same turn, he cut taxes in some other places, but forgot one critical point, that you also need to cut spending as well!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EDCD51B.E6E8F@crosslink.net...
> American wrote:
> >
> > "It is not that big government liberals are stupid. It is just
> > that they know so much that isn't so."
> >
> > ----Ronald Reagan
>
> Speaking of things that aren't so, Reagan was not conservative in any
> true sense nor did he shrink government. He was a big government
> borrow-and-spend Republican. The difference between him and his "big
> government liberals" is that he borrowed $billions to make government
> even bigger and more intrusive then went home leaving Democrats to raise
> taxes to pay for it. Funny how "liberals" turned Reagan's huge deficit
> into a surplus and now a "conservative", is plunging us back into debt.
> Orwell's doublespeak has indeed become the language of our politics.
>
> K3DWW

2120. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 05:03:46 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bblucn$b1mrd$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68240

Still wish I could find some "funny phonetics" for my callsign.... The "X"
makes that one a challenge.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> >If you're a DX'er: Kilowatt Number Three London Tangiers
> >
> >If you're a No-Code Tech or a 75-meter SSB user: Kicking Three Loud
Tigers
>
> If you'e a retired Marine...
>
> Kissed Three Ladies Tenderly
>
> =)
>
> Steve, Kissed Four Cute American Pixies
>
>

2121. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 05:08:01 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bbluco$b1mrd$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68241

What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have to do with amateur radio??

Ryan KC8PMX
"Independant Voter and Proud Of It! Use your own mind, instead of being a blind faith follower!"

"Tom Jefferson" <tj@amercontsfreedom.org> wrote in message news:bbij59$i6l$0@pita.alt.net...
> Why is it that Big Government Liberals believe the NRA is bad
> because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
> the ACLU is good because it supports certain parts of the
> Constitution?
>
> Tom Jefferson
>
>
>
>

2122. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 09:37:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDDBDBA.995AF51B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68219

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> Dave Heil said that radios are not much use without antennas
>
> >>Similarly, boating is much tougher without oars.
> >
> > Oh?
> >
> > I spent a great deal of time on several vessles, none of which had oars
> >and all of which moved rather smartly without them.
>
> The point I was trying to make is the hobby is about radio, not <primarily
> about> antennas. Do you understand the analogy?

Amateur radio can't be about radios without being about antennas. Even the best transceiver doesn't perform without an antenna. The better the antenna(s), the better the system. Additionally, the better the feedline, the better the system.

Martti OH2BH has for years touted his Micro-DB theory. If you have a 500w amplifier, obtain one which develops 1 KW. If you have RG-213 cable, replace it with 1/2 inch hardline. If your yagi has three elements, replace it with one using four elements. If it is 60 feet high, add enough tower to make it 80 feet high. Any of these things taken separately doesn't offer much in the way of improvement. Do them all and you're looking at a real improvement in system effeciency.

Of course those things are pretty extreme. Let's take it from the Little Pistol perspective. If you have only a 100w transceiver, add a 500w amplifier. If your antenna is a dipole at 30 feet, replace it with a yagi at 40 feet. If your feedline is RG-58, replace it with RG-213. The improvements you'll see are just as real as in the first scenario.

Now, is amateur radio primarily about radio or is it primarily about antennas? Perhaps it is primarily about feedline. Would you like to revise your analogy?

Dave K8MN

2123. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 09:55:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDDC20D.56AE3853@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68220

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >It's the difference between schooling and education. A degree is supposed to
> >indicate a level of education, not just schooling.
>
> Education is so stuck in its methods, that it cannot see common sense.

...or you are so stuck in your methods that you can't see common sense.

> And they
> make you take so many worthless courses and leave no time left for > worthwhile
knowledge.

As a new "blank slate" student, how are you able to determine what knowledge is worthwhile? How do you determine what knowledge you'll find useful later in life? Is it better to take only courses which you think you'll need for a job or is it better to take a broad variety of courses so that you'll have a base of knowledge which could take you through variety of jobs?

> Too much <traditional> education is not good for you.

And you know this because?

> One person told me that
> some of the dumbest people he worked with had advanced degrees and some of the
> smartest people had no college degree.

Here's a tip for you, Vipul. A university diploma is not a measure of intelligence. It is confirmation that you have successfully completed the courses required for obtaining a degree.

One of the sharpest individuals I ever met served with me in Vietnam. After leaving the military he became extremely wealthy selling ocean front real estate in South Carolina. His favorite line was, "Why do I need to go to college? I have friends who went to college. If I wanna know something, I'll call 'em up and ask 'em".

> In the future, I will forbid my children to go to school as much as it is
> allowed. I will do some research on home-schooling.

Just as you'd like to dictate what hams should be doing at club meetings and what they should be eating.

> >There are people who enjoy playing golf, and people who enjoy watching others
> >play golf, and people who enjoy doing both. Same principle.

>
> With contesting, you keep adding the number of contacts. I like to >accomplish things.

Just as important as adding contacts is the working of multipliers.
There is a strategic plan to being successful in contesting. In
addition to the plan, an operator needs a knowledge of propagation, must
develop good operating skills and needs the most efficient station
system possible.

Kind of like when I'm in a boring EE class. I can't wait until its
> over.

You should really listen to that fellow who told you about some of the
dumbest people he'd worked with having advanced degrees...

>Contesting goes against my nature.

Nobody will force you to become a contester. No one will force you to
learn morse code. No one will force you to pay attention to those
boring EE lectures.

Dave K8MN

2124. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 10:09:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604060915.07482.00000744@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68221

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/3/03 11:09 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030604000926.08632.00000687@mb-m24.aol.com>

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>Ya go where the money is, Vippy.
>
>Thats right. Believe me, I felt cheapened more in the EE profession that
>anything.

Maybe because you weren't doing it right.

Steve, K4CAP

2125. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 10:10:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604061047.07482.00000745@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68222

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/3/03 11:14 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030604001456.08632.00000689@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>Dave Heil said that radios are not much use without antennas
>
>>>Similarly, boating is much tougher without oars.
>>
>> Oh?
>>
>> I spent a great deal of time on several vessles, none of which had oars
>>and all of which moved rather smartly without them.
>
>The point I was trying to make is the hobby is about radio, not <primarily
>about> antennas. Do you understand the analogy?

Not when I can can show that it it inadequate.

Steve, K4CAP

2126. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 10:12:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604061238.07482.00000746@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68223

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/3/03 11:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030604004028.08632.00000692@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>Most people have never
>>>heard of Ham radio. I never heard of it until I happened to meet someone
>>that
>>>was a Ham that invited me to a Hamfest.
>>
>> Rumour has it that there's a "John Doe" contract on the head of the guy
>>who did it, too......
>>
>
>This person is no longer in this country. He left the country to marry some
>girl he met online. He told me he had plans to stay in that country and work
>over there. So, there is no truth to that "rumour".

You followed his lead the first time...what are the chances we can get you
to do it again?

Steve, K4CAP

2127. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 15:15:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbl2do$87u$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

SJ 9 was just a youngun when he was sucked in by the likes of W4FQF and his bunch. Cut him some slack.

As for FQF ... Im still waiting to see his obit so I can complete my 'project'.

Dan/W4NTI

"Herb" <Fwankie@FwankieBARF.net> wrote in message news:bbjjlq$g3b$0@pita.alt.net...
> Hey Dan,
>
> Isn't that a hoot? Stumpjumper Nr 9 is trying to
> suck up to you!
>
> Go away Fwankie! and get a license!
>
> Herb, 14313
>
> "Frank" <k3eko@netscape.net> wrote in message
> news:3EDD263A.4060705@netscape.net...
> > Thanks for the update, Dan!
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Frank K3EKO
> >
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > SB QST @ ARL $ARLB038
> > > ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3
> > >
> > > ZCZC AG38
> > > QST de W1AW
> > > ARRL Bulletin 38 ARLB038
> > > From ARRL Headquarters
> > > Newington CT June 3, 2003
> > > To all radio amateurs
> > >
> > > SB QST ARL ARLB038
> > > ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3
> > >
> > > The new five-channel 60-meter domestic secondary amateur allocation
> > > becomes available to US Amateur Radio operators at midnight local

> > > time on July 3. The FCC Report and Order granting the allocation was
> > > published June 3 in the Federal Register. Federal government users
> > > are primary in the 5 MHz band.
> > >
> > > The FCC has granted amateurs use of five 2.8 kHz-wide channels with
> > > center frequencies of 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373 and 5405 kHz. The
> > > channels will be available to General and higher class licensees.
> > > The only permitted mode will be upper-sideband USB phone, and 50 W
> > > ERP is the maximum power allowed.
> > >
> > > Users of the 60-meter channels should set their carrier frequency
> > > 1.5 kHz lower than the channel center frequency. ARRL suggests
> > > restricting transmitted audio bandwidth to 200 Hz on the low end and
> > > 2800 Hz on the high end for a total bandwidth of 2.6 kHz. ARRL
> > > recommends that amateurs considering modifying existing amateur
> > > equipment for operation on 60 meters contact the equipment's
> > > manufacturer for advice.
> > > NNNN
> > > /EX
> > >
> > >
> >
>
>

2128. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 15:55:12 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EDE1660.8E22D58A@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68224

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Vito, your argument sounds good, but experience just doesn't bear it out. I've
> never known anyone who really wanted to get into ham radio that couldn't do
> it, although I certainly concede that there probably have been some. But what
> I experiencd and have so often seen is that most of those folks just don't
> want to do it badly enough to avoid being "put off" by such things as learning
> and practicing Morse code. The people who really want to wouldn't think of
> being disuaded by such a thing.

I agree, IF one want's it badly enough. But 100's if not 1000's chose an
alternate path to satisfy their interest in communicating even tho that
path was illegal. With the sunspot cycle at an all time peak it was
easier to do most of what we do on by simply buying a "linear" and
strapping the PLL in their CB. Misguided? You bet! But with a tad of
"Elmering" a lot more of the best and brightest might have become hams
but for the code barrier.
>
> As for it's archiac attributes, that view is definitely held only by persons
> who never became even modestly proficient at its use (and I know there are
> always exceptions). But anyone who has done so clearly understands the
> communications capabilities involved, and the simplicity of it all-even though
> some of them deny it. There is so little overhead needed beyond the necessary
> self training.

Yes, but the exact same can be said for Latin. I hope to have the time
to regain/improve my proficiency in both when I retire.

73, K3DWW

2129. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 17:06:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDE270A.2060100@psu.edu>
Source record: 68226

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>
>>It's the difference between schooling and education. A degree is supposed to
>>indicate a level of education, not just schooling.
>
>
> Education is so stuck in its methods, that it cannot see common sense. And they
> make you take so many worthless courses and leave no time left for worthwhile
> knowledge.

You have a bit of a point there.

> Too much <traditional> education is not good for you. One person told me that
> some of the dumbest people he worked with had advanced degrees and some of the
> smartest people had no college degree.

The nature of higher education is a pyramid form. Those who aspire to
the top, eg a doctorates, forsake a broad knowledge base for a
specialized area. This doesn't mean that a person is an idiot, or not
blessed with common sense. It is just specialization in action.

> In the future, I will forbid my children to go to school as much as it is
> allowed. I will do some research on home-schooling.

I shudder.

>>There are people who enjoy playing golf, and people who enjoy watching others
>>play golf, and people who enjoy doing both. Same principle.

> With contesting, you keep adding the number of contacts. I like to accomplish
> things.

Me too. And I like contesting. I'm competing against other hams and
myself, trying to better my scoers from previous years. I'a
accomplishing lots of things.

> Kind of like when I'm in a boring EE class. I can't wait until its
> over. Contesting goes against my nature.

I suppose you'll ignore this question as you often ignore pointed
questions, but here goes:

1. Why on earth are you here? You don't like hams, you don't like EE.
(whatever your defintion-you don't seem to like it)

You profess to "like accomplishing things"

So you post your missives, and accomplish nothing due to your undisguised dislike of us and what we do.

The only way in which you can be considering any of your "work" here to be accomplishing anything is if that work is indeed as a troll, and your purpose here is simply to irritate and annoy.

2. Are you a TROLL, Vipul?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2130. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 17:36:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDE2E2C.1080206@psu.edu>
Source record: 68227

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>> In the meantime, think "Windows 2000, Windows 2000"
>
>
> My son-in-law is a civil engineer working for a consulting company which has a couple
> hundred offices nationwide, and he told me they use Windows 2000 exclusively. Must be
> something to that advice. Unfortunately I don't have it and don't feel inclined to drop
> another C note on yet one more OS.

Win 2000 is relatively secure, and can be made even more so with some
add ons which will keep the hackers and businesses out of your computer.
It is pretty stable by comparison to 98, although I don't have much
problem with Win98 SE. Problem is that 98 is getting old and support for
it will be dropped soon, and that means that if a program is written and
98 runs it, ok. But if not, it's TTC.

I never considered ME an actual OS! ;^) Seeing as how most people who
use it add a few extra prefacing descriptive terms that I won't print here.

And SP is a pretty train wreck IMO. Looks nice, but that's about it.
Most of what I do to keep my home machine sucure won't work on SP.

- mike KB3EIA -

2131. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 17:40:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDE2F04.90805@psu.edu>
Source record: 68228

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3EDCCE4A.53F3F9E3@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>... "Why does CW need special CW-only
>>>>bands to protect it from SSB/other modes?".
>>>
>>>Vito,
>>>
>>>The only CW-only subbands in US amateur radio are 50.0-50.1
>>>and 144.0-144.1
>>>MHz. The non-phone parts of the HF bands are not CW-only - they are all
>>>wide
>>>open to all authorized data modes that meet the bandwidth and data rate
>>>requirements.
>>
>>Yes; sorry, I got wrapped up in the thread's title. You are of course
>>correct.
>
>
> For the most part, it seems to me that the narrow modes coexist pretty well.
>
>
>>>One good reason for those non-phone subbands is that narrow and wide >>
>>
> modes
>
>>>don't often share spectrum well. The narrow mode users, with their
>>>selective
>>>receivers, can coexist much closer together than the wide mode users.
>>
>>Not disagreeing given most rigs but seems to me that RF-selective
>>receivers coupled with "sound card" AF filter technology could allow
>>narrow mode users to effortlessly "squeeze" between SSB QSOs and that an
>>SSB rig with notch filters like found in PC sound cards could eliminate
>>any narrow-band QRM, allowing both modes to coexist on the same band.
>
>
> Maybe. OTOH such an approach increases the complexitry of equipment required

> but offers no real advantages that I can see. Experience has shown that, in
> general amateur practice, signals coexist better with similar signals - CW
> against CW, SSB against SSB, etc.
>
>>>Another good reason is to encourage the use of spectrum-efficient modes.
>>>Five
>>>to ten CW QSOs can fit in the spectrum space needed for just one SSB QSO.
>>>PSK31
>>>is just as narrow if not narrower. Why reward modes that use more spectrum?
>>
>>The flaw in 'efficiency' is time - at least for manual CW.
>
>
> Not really - see below.
>
>
>>Except for
>>the gifted, most of us talk far faster than we can copy code or even
>>type so, while it takes a fraction of the spectrum to send a givin
>>amount of info via CW, it takes a lot more time, and the two balance
>>out.
>
>
> I disagree. For one thing, in my experience, most people can reach 30-35 wpm
> with code if they actually use the mode regularly. There are exceptions, of
> course. "Gifted" doesn't start until around 50 wpm. Typing/reading speeds are
> usually even faster. Plus with a send buffer, a slow typist can be preparing a
> response while receiving the other station's transmission.
>
> Add to this the fact that CW and other digital modes can take full advantage of
> abbreviations and prosigns, and the effective communication rate easily
> doubles.
>
> Yes, people talk faster, but most people's speech is full of pauses,
> redundancies and other delays. End result is that actual information flow via
> the spoken word is far slower than the mere wpm would indicate.

My XYL accuses me of talking at 5wpm. Maybe *thats* why I had so much
trouble learning Morse to a fast enough speed! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2132. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 17:41:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDE2F66.7000504@psu.edu>
Source record: 68229

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo
>
>
>>> I dunno, Mike. I can envision this guy having some long and
>>
>>meaningless
>>
>>>conversations with shadows and "Peppy the Hand Puppet"
>>
>>
>> HA! Good one, Steve. After a crappy weekend, I needed that. I wonder
>>how many arguments the puppet wins?
>
>
> None.

Wow! So there really is a puppet? Let him win one once on a while,
Vipul. You don't want him to get mad and stop talking to you, do you?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2133. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 18:04:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDE34C7.30505@psu.edu>
Source record: 68230

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>
>>I'm starting to develop a new theory. Two actually.
>>
>>Theory 1:
>>
>>
>> Our friend Vipul is one of the trollers in this newsgroup. Although an
>>actual person exists by this name, Our Vipul is not that person.
>>
>>Theory 2:
>>
>> Vipul is just a lonely guy, and posts these missives in order to get
>>some attention. Kind of like a three year old who constantly breaks
>>things because they have figured out it is a way to get some craved
>>interaction with the adults. Bad attention, but attention nonetheless.
>>
>>
>> For the most part, I see this odd "I'll tell you one thing" and some
>>argument, then "I didn't say that", then I'll tell you another thing",
>>then more of the same. Not a good debate technique. But as long as we
>>are willing to pay attention, like harried parents, we provide the
>>attention he wants so badly.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> You are the one that asked the question "What's worse?". You started it.

Three things:

First, my post was regarding your posting habits, not the thread. This thread has long migrated away from it's original subject matter, which was a friendly tweak towards the generalizations that some hams do, like those who say that all new hams are fools. I've tweaked many on that, as even some friends who have been hams for a long time might say something like "Any moron can get an Extra now". I'm quick to point out that I only got my Extra after it was moronized.

Second, you are allowd to post on anything you like. Likewise I can ask questions.

Third, I don't "get" your reply.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2134. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 18:09:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDE35F7.8020706@psu.edu>
Source record: 68231

William H. O'Hara, III wrote:
>>>locomotives and MU cars?). I c
>>>answer.
>>
>> Youse guys are the hardcore railfans
>> 'amateur'. Har.
>>Ya got me, what does it mean?
>
>
> F means Front. Kind of silly isn't it?

Next!

What does the "N" on Nebraska football players helmets stand for?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2135. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 20:31:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EDE573D.3040309@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68232

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>73 de Larry, Kilo Three Lima Tango
>
>If you're a DX'er: Kilowatt Number Three London Tangiers
>
That would look like "KN3LT".....

But I don't think you'd need phonetics for CW work, yes? :-)

2136. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 21:11:06 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604171106.00935.00000755@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68233

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 6/2/03 8:44 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EDB46AD.8090301@psu.edu>

>Theory 1:

>Our friend Vipul is one of the trollers in this newsgroup. Although an
>actual person exists by this name, Our Vipul is not that person.
>
>Theory 2:
>
>Vipul is just a lonely guy, and posts these missives in order to get
>some attention. Kind of like a three year old who constantly breaks
>things because they have figured out it is a way to get some craved
>interaction with the adults. Bad attention, but attention nonetheless.
>
Mike,

Both theories are correct.
>
> For the most part, I see this odd "I'll tell you one thing" and some
>argument, then "I didn't say that", then I'll tell you another thing",
>then more of the same. Not a good debate technique. But as long as we
>are willing to pay attention, like harried parents, we provide the
>attention he wants so badly.

If the behavior is
rewarded, more of
it will occur.

Just like with a child.

So the correct response
to Vshah101's behavior
is.......

2137. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 21:38:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604173832.03297.00000487@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 68234

>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 6/4/03 12:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EDE2F66.7000504@psu.edu>

>Wow! So there really is a puppet? Let him win one once on a while,
>Vipul. You don't want him to get mad and stop talking to you, do you?

We're really gonna have to get together for a couple of cold ones some
day, Mike...our sense of humor and propriety is almost exactly alike ! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2138. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 22:47:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604184726.02610.00000046@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68235

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>>> HA! Good one, Steve. After a crappy weekend, I needed that. I wonder
>>>how many arguments the puppet wins?
>>
>>
>> None.
>
>
> Wow! So there really is a puppet? Let him win one once on a while,
>Vipul. You don't want him to get mad and stop talking to you, do you?

It was just a joke. There is no puppet.

2139. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 22:58:52 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604185852.02610.00000047@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68236

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Now, is amateur radio primarily about radio or is it primarily about
>antennas? Perhaps it is primarily about feedline. Would you like to
>revise your analogy?
>

No. I get it.

2140. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 23:00:24 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604190024.02610.00000048@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68237

>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie

> I still think he's Cootie Boy. If not, definitely a clone.
>

Do you believe in reincarnation?

2141. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 23:07:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604190711.02610.00000049@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68238

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>You followed his lead the first time.
He did not lead anything. He introduced me to a Hamfest.

>what are the chances we can get you
>to do it again?

If I leave the country, I will still be a Ham. No chance of leaving the country from my new job. The manager told me I will have to work long hours. Plus problems with a co-worker slacking off that I will have to do that person's work. And he warned me I will really have to pay attention to details of other co-workers. Eating and sleeping will become less of a priority for a while. So, I will not have time to post for a while.

2142. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 23:25:06 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9390C584CDF41elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68242

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
news:bbluco$b1mrd$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:

> What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have
> to do with amateur radio??
>
>
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
> "Independant Voter and Proud Of It! Use your own mind, instead of
> being a blind faith follower!"
>
> "Tom Jefferson" <tj@amercontsfreedom.org> wrote in message
> news:bbij59$i6l$0@pita.alt.net...
>> Why is it that Big Government Liberals believe the NRA is bad
>> because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
>> the ACLU is good because it supports certain parts of the
>> Constitution?
>>
>> Tom Jefferson
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>

Unless we agreed to shoot OT posters, very little, LOL

2143. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-04 23:46:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604194602.20242.00000792@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68243

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/4/03 6:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030604190711.02610.00000049@mb-m15.aol.com>

>>You followed his lead the first time.
>He did not lead anything. He introduced me to a Hamfest.
>
>>what are the chances we can get you
>>to do it again?
>
>If I leave the country, I will still be a Ham.

I am of the opinion you were a ham before you were licensed.

>No chance of leaving the country from my new job.

No telemarketers in Delhi?

>The manager told me I will have to work long hours.

Bummer, huh?

>Plus problems with a co-worker slacking off that I will have to do that
>person's work.

Sucking up for a promotion already, huh?

>And he warned me I will really have to pay attention to details of other
>co-workers.

The company rat.

>Eating and sleeping will become less of a priority for a while.

Rest and nutrition are highly overated anyway.

>So, I will not have time to post for a while.

So there IS a God ! ! ! And it's not even my birthday!

Steve, K4CAP

2144. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 01:22:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030604212241.21428.00000344@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68246

In article <bbluco$b1mrd$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have to do
>with amateur radio??

Is there a "National Radio Association?"

73 de Larry, K3LT
Member, NRA

2145. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 01:22:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030604212242.21428.00000345@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68244

>The punishment is not proportional to the crime. I don't condone what she
>did, but to
>hear the prosecutors and reporters go on, you'd thing she's this daemon or
>something.
>Wrong… She's simply an investor who took advantage of inside knowledge -
>something
>most investors would do in a heartbeat if given the same opportunity. To add
>some
>prospective, the stock proceeds were approximately two hundred thousand
>dollars - a tiny
>faction of her wealth. (She didn't get rich off of this)

If we condone insider trading, even to the somewhat small extent that it was practiced by Miss Stewart, then we're saying it's OK for a small handful of "insiders" to reap vast fortunes by taking advantage of information which is not available to the general investing public. Is that fair?

If it is proven in open court that Martha Stewart did, indeed, profit from insider trading information, then she should be required to pay whatever price fits her crime. This would undoubtedly involve heavy fines, and a possible visit to some Club Med Minimum Security Retreat for Rich and Famous felons. The best thing for her to do would be to get it over with and out of the way ASAP, so she can get back into her studio bossing people around like the bitchy megalomaniac she is purported to be.
I, for one, enjoy her shows on The Food Network.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2146. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 01:22:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030604212243.21428.00000346@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68245

In article <bblucn$b1mrd$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Still wish I could find some "funny phonetics" for my callsign.... The "X"
>makes that one a challenge.
>
>
>
>--
>Ryan, KC8PMX

Keeps Cranking Eight Pretty Mean Xylophones?

73 de Larry, Kilowatt Three London Tare

2147. Off Topic, But Funny As !~@#$%

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 01:26:26 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604212626.05587.00000428@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68247

Jessie Jackson has just added former Chicago democratic congressman Mel Reynolds to Rainbow/PUSH Coalition's payroll.

Reynolds was among the 176 criminals excused in President Clinton's last-minute forgiveness spree. Reynolds received a commutation of his six-and-a-half-year federal sentence for 15 convictions of wire fraud, bank fraud and lies to the Federal Election Commission.

He is more notorious, however, for concurrently serving five years for sleeping with an underage campaign volunteer.

This is a first in American politics:

***An ex-congressman who had sex with a subordinate...

***Won clemency from a president who had sex with a subordinate...

***Then was hired by a clergyman who had sex with a subordinate.

His new job? Youth counselor.

IS THIS A GREAT COUNTRY OR WHAT?

2148. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 02:11:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0306050209170.969@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68248

If it's really the National Rifle Association - simple: They stand for the citizen's ability to enjoy his constitutional rights and they see amateur radio as furtherance of the First Amendment. They may be a "Second Amendment organization" but that doesn't mean that they shouldn't be vocal about a citizen's other rights when the opportunity presents itself.

On Wed, 4 Jun 2003, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have to do
> with amateur radio??
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
> "Independant Voter and Proud Of It! Use your own mind, instead of being a
> blind faith follower!"
>
> "Tom Jefferson" <tj@amercontsfreedom.org> wrote in message
> news:bbij59$i6l$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Why is it that Big Government Liberals believe the NRA is bad
> > because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
> > the ACLU is good because it supports certain parts of the
> > Constitution?

There are some instances where the NRA is good and the ACLU is bad, and the government is always bad, but sometimes necessary.

2149. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 02:12:38 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbm8um$24k$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 68249

Vito wrote:

>
> Yes, but the exact same can be said for Latin.

Well, I never learned Latin, but I have conversed with Italians on CW!

Best of luck to you on your future endeavors, Vito!

Dick

2150. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 02:24:27 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbm9kr$3st$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 68250

Mike Coslo wrote:

> William H. O'Hara, III wrote:
> >>>locomotives and MU cars?). I c
> >>>answer.
> >>
> >> Youse guys are the hardcore railfans
> >> 'amateur'. Har.
> >>Ya got me, what does it mean?
> >
> >
> > F means Front. Kind of silly isn't it?
>
> Next!
>
> What does the "N" on Nebraska football players helmets stand for?

Oh I don't know..... sometimes it's just too obvious to be clear.
first time I saw a Mexican car license on the front of a car in far southern Ca. I noticed it said "Front BC" on it. Asked my son, a longtime resident, what that was all about and turned out it was the front plate on a car from Baja California.....
I suppose it they didn't label them some folks would 'split' the set of plates onto two cars.

Dick

2151. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 02:35:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbma8r$526$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 68301

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> >The punishment is not proportional to the crime. I don't condone what she
> >did, but to
> >hear the prosecutors and reporters go on, you'd thing she's this daemon or
> >something.
> >Wrongâ☐¦ She's simply an investor who took advantage of inside knowledge -
> >something
> >most investors would do in a heartbeat if given the same opportunity. To add
> >some
> >prospective, the stock proceeds were approximately two hundred thousand
> >dollars - a tiny
> >faction of her wealth. (She didn't get rich off of this)
>
> If we condone insider trading,

When the news of this fiasco first broke I concluded right then that we'd soon see just what the little lady is made of. I said that if she was anywhere near as sharp as she portrays herself she'd very quickly call a news conference and say into the camera, "I see that my action in this matter has been misconstrued, and therefore I am giving the entire $200,000 to my favorite charity. In fact, to show that my heart's in the right place, I'm doubling it and adding an extra $100 G." The expenditure of that half million, probably about of as much concern to her as a couple hundred bucks would be to most of us, would have instantly settled the matter. She'd have had an automatic nice little income tax deduction-assuming she pays any in the first place. Instead, she has trashed her entire company and I see on TV that her stock has fallen in value some $400 million.

Smart? I don't think so.

2152. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 02:52:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030604225244.20154.00000037@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68302

>Subject: Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda
>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>Date: 6/4/03 9:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bbma8r$526$0@208.206.142.83>

>When the news of this fiasco first broke I concluded right then that we'd
>soon
>see just what the little lady is made of. I said that if she was anywhere
>near as
>sharp as she portrays herself she'd very quickly call a news conference and
>say
>into the camera, "I see that my action in this matter has been misconstrued,
>and
>therefore I am giving the entire $200,000 to my favorite charity.

I thought a similar thought about Bill Clinton years ago...The first "uh
oh" to hit the streets on him was his alleged protests at Cambridge.

I have all-along thought that if he'd had stood up, said "You're darn
right I protested the war...it was my right to do so", that even the hawks
would have to give him credit for forthrightfulness. The media would have
almost immediately dismsissed anything Genny Flowers, Paula Jones or Monica
Lewinsky had to say.

>Instead, she has trashed her entire company and I see
>on TV that her stock has fallen in value some $400 million.

Funny how the rich will do anyhting to GET rich, but then won't invest a
bit of that money (and integrity) to STAY rich.

> Smart? I don't think so.

Dittos Brother.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2153. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 03:47:00 UTC
From: scrap lumber <bobbobbob@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3edebd2f@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 68303

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030604212242.21428.00000345@mb-m23.aol.com...

> If it is proven in open court that Martha Stewart did, indeed, profit from
> insider trading information, then she should be required to pay whatever
> price fits her crime. This would undoubtedly involve heavy fines, and a
> possible visit to some Club Med Minimum Security Retreat for Rich and
> Famous felons.

Hopefully she will be swabbing stainless steel toilets
in some medium-security prision someplace.
She is nothing but another Leona Hemsley.
Hopefully someday, she dies broke in an alcohol-induced stupor.

2154. ***TWISTEDHED HUMOR SITE***

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 05:28:01 UTC
From: Hous Bin Pharteen <3mile.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <36834N481@web2news.com>
Source record: 68304

http://www.geocities.com/antitwisty/
--
Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

2155. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 12:24:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030605082408.25052.00000430@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 68305

In article <3EDE270A.2060100@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>>It's the difference between schooling and education. A degree is supposed
>>>to indicate a level of education, not just schooling.

>> Education is so stuck in its methods, that it cannot see common sense.

Which is?

>> And they
>> make you take so many worthless courses and leave no time left for
>> worthwhile knowledge.
>
Give us some examples of "worthless courses" you had to take and "worthwhile knowledge" that was crowded out.

> You have a bit of a point there.

Not really.

There is so much to know in engineering, and it changes so fast, that simply teaching engineers technology is a waste of time. What engineers need is to learn how to think about engineering, and the skills to solve engineering problems.

>> Too much <traditional> education is not good for you.

BULLSHIT!

>> One person told me that
>> some of the dumbest people he worked with had advanced degrees and some >>
of the smartest people had no college degree.

And you're out to prove him right?

Sure, there are dumb Ph.Ds and smart folks without a high school diploma. But that's not the way to bet.

Suppose you or a loved one was sick needed a complex operation. Do you want a surgical team coposed of doctors and nurses who are highly educated, certified and experienced, or ones who have the bare minimum requirements to call themselves doctors and nurses?
>
> The nature of higher education is a pyramid form. Those who aspire to
>the top, eg a doctorates, forsake a broad knowledge base for a
>specialized area. This doesn't mean that a person is an idiot, or not

>blessed with common sense. It is just specialization in action.

Exactly.
>
>> In the future, I will forbid my children to go to school as much as it is
>> allowed. I will do some research on home-schooling.
>
> I shudder.

Me, too. Normally I'm all for home schooling, but there are a few exceptions.
>
>>>There are people who enjoy playing golf, and people who enjoy watching
>>>others
>>>play golf, and people who enjoy doing both. Same principle.
>
>> With contesting, you keep adding the number of contacts. I like to
>> accomplish things.
>
> Me too. And I like contesting. I'm competing against other hams and
>myself, trying to better my scoers from previous years. I'a
>accomplishing lots of things.

Making more contacts is an accomplishment. End of story.
>
>> Kind of like when I'm in a boring EE class.

If EE class is boring, you shouldn't be in EE.

>> I can't wait until its
>> over. Contesting goes against my nature.
>
Then don't do it. But don't put down those who do.

> I suppose you'll ignore this question as you often ignore pointed
>questions, but here goes:
>
> 1. Why on earth are you here? You don't like hams, you don't like EE.
>(whatever your defintion-you don't seem to like it)

Isn't his purpose obvious, Mike?
>
> You profess to "like accomplishing things"
>
> So you post your missives, and accomplish nothing due to your
>undisguised dislike of us and what we do.

>
> The only way in which you can be considering any of your "work" here to

>be accomplishing anything is if that work is indeed as a troll, and your
>purpose here is simply to irritate and annoy.

Ya broke da code
>
> 2. Are you a TROLL, Vipul?
>
Where are the three billy goats?

2156. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 13:21:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDF43C5.1010906@psu.edu>
Source record: 68306

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: What's worse?
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 6/4/03 12:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3EDE2F66.7000504@psu.edu>
>
>
>>Wow! So there really is a puppet? Let him win one once on a while,
>>Vipul. You don't want him to get mad and stop talking to you, do you?
>
>
> We're really gonna have to get together for a couple of cold ones some
> day, Mike...our sense of humor and propriety is almost exactly alike ! ! ! !

Sounds good, Steve. I just keep coming up with this vision of the man and hand (er sock puppet) sitting in a room, glaring at each other because they are so mad they can't stand each other any more.

Wasn't that Senor Wenches (sp?) who had a skit something like that? I remember him on Ed Sullivan when I was a kid.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2157. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 13:23:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDF445E.1090400@psu.edu>
Source record: 68307

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>>> HA! Good one, Steve. After a crappy weekend, I needed that. I wonder
>>>>how many arguments the puppet wins?
>>>
>>>
>>>None.
>>
>>
>> Wow! So there really is a puppet? Let him win one once on a while,
>>Vipul. You don't want him to get mad and stop talking to you, do you?
>
>
> It was just a joke. There is no puppet.

What did you do to the puppet Vipul!!!! Don't hurt the puppet man! No matter how mad you are at it right now, things will look better if you cool off for a while. Just tell me the puppet is okay!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2158. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 13:43:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDF4910.40006@psu.edu>
Source record: 68308

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>William H. O'Hara, III wrote:
>>
>>>>>>locomotives and MU cars?). I c
>>>>>answer.
>>>>
>>>>Youse guys are the hardcore railfans
>>>>'amateur'. Har.
>>>>Ya got me, what does it mean?
>>>
>>>
>>>F means Front. Kind of silly isn't it?
>>
>> Next!
>>
>> What does the "N" on Nebraska football players helmets stand for?
>
>
> Oh I don't know..... sometimes it's just too obvious to be clear.
> first time I saw a Mexican car license on the front of a car in far southern
> Ca. I noticed it said "Front BC" on it. Asked my son, a longtime resident,
> what that was all about and turned out it was the front plate on a car from
> Baja California.....
> I suppose it they didn't label them some folks would 'split' the set of
> plates onto two cars.
>

What does the "N" on Nebraska football players helmets stand for?

The "N" stands for "Noledge"

Yeah, that's a favorite here in Lion country. Not that we have anything
to brag about lately.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2159. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 13:45:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EDF4966.5080303@psu.edu>
Source record: 68309

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <bbluco$b1mrd$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
>
>>What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have to do
>>with amateur radio??
>
>
> Is there a "National Radio Association?"

I support the right of Americans to keep and bear radios too! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2160. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 14:30:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbnk62$uf7$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 68310

Mike Coslo wrote:

> What does the "N" on Nebraska football players helmets stand for?

>
> The "N" stands for "Noledge"
>

Har! Maybe Vipul came via Nebraska????? (not really)

>
> Yeah, that's a favorite here in Lion country. Not that we have anything
> to brag about lately.....

You need Joe Paterno back!

Dick

2161. Re: Off Topic, But Funny As !~@#$%

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 14:38:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbnkjq$1e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68311

It is so pityful that its actually funny.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steven Robeson K4CAP" <k4cap@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030604212626.05587.00000428@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Jessie Jackson has just added former Chicago democratic congressman Mel
> Reynolds to Rainbow/PUSH Coalition's payroll.
>
> Reynolds was among the 176 criminals excused in President Clinton's
last-minute
> forgiveness spree. Reynolds received a commutation of his
six-and-a-half-year
> federal sentence for 15 convictions of wire fraud, bank fraud and lies to
the
> Federal Election Commission.
>
> He is more notorious, however, for concurrently serving five years for
sleeping
> with an underage campaign volunteer.
>
> This is a first in American politics:
>
> ***An ex-congressman who had sex with a subordinate...
>
> ***Won clemency from a president who had sex with a subordinate...
>
> ***Then was hired by a clergyman who had sex with a subordinate.
>
> His new job? Youth counselor.
>
> ***IS THIS A GREAT COUNTRY OR WHAT?***
>

2162. Re: Off Topic, But Funny As !~@#$%

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 16:50:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030605125031.01315.00000054@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68312

In article <20030604212626.05587.00000428@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4cap@aol.com (Steven Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Jessie Jackson has just added former Chicago democratic congressman Mel
>Reynolds to Rainbow/PUSH Coalition's payroll.

This isn't news. It happened 2-1/2 years ago.
>
>Reynolds was among the 176 criminals excused in President Clinton's
>last-minute
>forgiveness spree. Reynolds received a commutation of his six-and-a-half-year
>federal sentence for 15 convictions of wire fraud, bank fraud and lies to the
>Federal Election Commission.

He did serve some time, though. Not enough, IMHO.
>
>He is more notorious, however, for concurrently serving five years for
>sleeping with an underage campaign volunteer.
>
>This is a first in American politics:

Maybe it's a first. Probably just the first we know about.
>
>***An ex-congressman who had sex with a subordinate...
>
>***Won clemency from a president who had sex with a subordinate...
>
>***Then was hired by a clergyman who had sex with a subordinate.
>
>His new job? Youth counselor.
>
>***IS THIS A GREAT COUNTRY OR WHAT?***
>
'zactly.

See:

http://www.snopes.com/inboxer/outrage/reynolds.htm

for all the details.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2163. Re: Quote {OT}

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 17:34:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <iaLDa.673$2t3.587@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 68313

You hit the nail on the head. The Conservative groups only cut income taxes and various safety nets. The net result is that sales taxes, property taxes, and other taxes go up. Our local sales tax just went from 8% to 8.25%. At least the Democrats had a surplus.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EDCD51B.E6E8F@crosslink.net...
> American wrote:
> >
> > "It is not that big government liberals are stupid. It is just
> > that they know so much that isn't so."
> >
> > ----Ronald Reagan
>
> Speaking of things that aren't so, Reagan was not conservative in any
> true sense nor did he shrink government. He was a big government
> borrow-and-spend Republican. The difference between him and his "big
> government liberals" is that he borrowed $billions to make government
> even bigger and more intrusive then went home leaving Democrats to raise
> taxes to pay for it. Funny how "liberals" turned Reagan's huge deficit
> into a surplus and now a "conservative", is plunging us back into debt.
> Orwell's doublespeak has indeed become the language of our politics.
>
> K3DWW

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.488 / Virus Database: 287 - Release Date: 6/5/03

2164. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 21:31:03 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0306052131100.1108@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68314

On Thu, 5 Jun 2003, Mike Coslo wrote:
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > In article <bbluco$b1mrd$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> >>What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have to do
> >>with amateur radio??
> >
> > Is there a "National Radio Association?"
>
> I support the right of Americans to keep and bear radios too! ;^)

In Southern California, there was a time where repeater owners had to be armed
to protect their equipment!

The infamous 147.435 repeater had received damage from bullets being shot at
it about a decade ago.

2165. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 22:08:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbof1ifnu0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 68315

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >
> >> In the meantime, think "Windows 2000, Windows 2000"
> >
> >
> > My son-in-law is a civil engineer working for a consulting company which has a couple
> > hundred offices nationwide, and he told me they use Windows 2000 exclusively. Must be
> > something to that advice. Unfortunately I don't have it and don't feel inclined to drop
> > another C note on yet one more OS.
>
> Win 2000 is relatively secure, and can be made even more so with some
> add ons which will keep the hackers and businesses out of your computer.
> It is pretty stable by comparison to 98, although I don't have much
> problem with Win98 SE. Problem is that 98 is getting old and support for
> it will be dropped soon, and that means that if a program is written and
> 98 runs it, ok. But if not, it's TTC.
>

I used 98-SE for a few years and it did OK. I even used the latest version
of WIN95 that had USB suppport and it was much more stable than earlier versions. And in
truth, I find XP to be much more stable than any of the others
and that makes sense as the XP kernal works differently than earlier versions that allowed
the software to rule things, it remains in control- at least this is what I've read. Seems
to
work that way. I have software lockups but never any that requires rebooting the OS as
before. Just 'end task' and reload the
software pkg.

But Xp sure has lots of incompatibility issues with many software pkgs that weren't written
for XP, and some that were. For instance, I have an HP digital camera and a HP trimode
printer/scanner/copier, both supposed to be XP compatible, and when I tried to install the
software for both, each driver package tried to take over the other. Neither wants to work
when the other is installed so that it works! I've reinstalled each of them several times.
Nonsense.

> I never considered ME an actual OS! ;^) Seeing as how most people who
> use it add a few extra prefacing descriptive terms that I won't print here.

Ya can add me to that list!

> And SP is a pretty train wreck IMO. Looks nice, but that's about it.
> Most of what I do to keep my home machine sucure won't work on SP.

Haven't had an identifiable problem in that regard to date. But I use Netscape to browse, usenet, and email, not Exploder nor Outlook, and never open any attachments. Plus Norton, of course.

Got one the other day that said it was from Microsoft that insisted the recipient open an attachment for an update. Right! Plonk!

Dick

2166. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 22:21:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030605182106.03776.00000059@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68316

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> I am of the opinion you were a ham before you were licensed.

Thanks. I did build simple rf circuits before I got my license.

>>The manager told me I will have to work long hours.

Plus, he told me I have to work 7 days a week (no weekends off).

>>And he warned me I will really have to pay attention to details of other
>>co-workers.
>
> The company rat.

Stealing in this business is very common and likely, my new manager told me.
Employees and suppliers both steal.

Suppliers steal by not giving the full supplies. If 1000 boxes come in, at
least one of them may be empty. Thats stealing. Suppliers WILL steal, in this
business, if you don't check the supplies.

I have to make sure other emplyees and suppliers don't steal.

>>Plus problems with a co-worker slacking off that I will have to do that
>>person's work.
>
> Sucking up for a promotion already, huh?

No promotion for that. I am a manager there. I will do that person's work until
they <soon> hire someone else.

>>So, I will not have time to post for a while.
>
> So there IS a God ! ! ! And it's not even my birthday!

Not yet. My new hours will start soon, within a couple of weeks.

2167. Re: In Accordance with ARRL Logic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-05 23:27:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EDFD1FD.9080409@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68317

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>> What does the "N" on Nebraska football players helmets stand for?
>
>
>> The "N" stands for "Noledge"
>>
>
>
> Har! Maybe Vipul came via Nebraska????? (not really)
>
>
>> Yeah, that's a favorite here in Lion country. Not that we have anything
>>to brag about lately.....
>
>
> You need Joe Paterno back!

Zing! I'm going to use that one if you dont mind!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2168. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 00:08:54 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030605200854.03776.00000064@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68318

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>Just tell me the puppet is okay!!

You are okay, Mike.

2169. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 01:07:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030605210725.03776.00000066@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68319

From (N2EY)

>>> Education is so stuck in its methods, that it cannot see common sense.
>
>Which is?

Knowledge you can actually use, not worthless knowledge to occupy your time,
and which you will forget after the course is over.

>Give us some examples of "worthless courses" you had to take and "worthwhile
>knowledge" that was crowded out.

Worthwhile knowledge was crowded out because there was no free time left after
having to take the required courses.

Some worthless courses I had to take: literature (just to meet requirement),
biology, physics (not for electronics), linear algebra (very worthless), Pascal
(should have had C class, no one uses Pascal), probability.

Examples of worthwhile courses missed: automechanics, popular culture- movies,
music, sports, practical electronics projects.

You gain more skills with worthwhile information than worthless information.

>What engineers need is to
>learn how to think about engineering, and the skills to solve engineering
>problems.

Problem is everything is approached in one way only, sitting at a desk, when in
reality many more skills are required. By presenting information in a limited
framework, the student does NOT gain the required skills.

This affects any course, whether you take an economics course or an EE course.
(Less true of EE courses, but still true).

>>> Too much <traditional> education is not good for you.
>
>BULLSHIT!

I just showed above why. The above worthwhile course skills are not for fun.
They are examples of needed skills to do anything better.

>>> One person told me that
>>> some of the dumbest people he worked with had advanced degrees and some >>
>of the smartest people had no college degree.
>
>And you're out to prove him right?

Its something I agree with also.

>Do you want a
>surgical team coposed of doctors and nurses who are highly educated,
>certified
>and experienced, or ones who have the bare minimum requirements to call
>themselves doctors and nurses?

No, I want to see quality education. People are stuck with what we have now. If there was competition in the educational system, it could pressure schools to improve their quality. Quality in both the selection of courses, and in each course itself. Courses less controlled by politics and rationalizations an more by people knowledgeable in the subject matter.

>Normally I'm all for home schooling, but there are a few exceptions.

I need to find quality homeschooling. Also, the state may require worthless requirements like certain SAT or MCAS scores for homeschooled children. I don't want them to have to meet those worthless standards.

>Making more contacts is an accomplishment. End of story.
>>
>>> Kind of like when I'm in a boring EE class.
>
>If EE class is boring, you shouldn't be in EE.

EE is not boring. Some of the classes are. Some of what should be interesting is presented in a boring way and one can learn more at the same time.

>Ya broke da code

Unlike me- I don't do code.

> 2. Are you a TROLL, Vipul?
>>
>Where are the three billy goats?

I am not a troll. I do not live in the mountains or forest. (You don't have to read from this point down).

The History of the Trolls
by Bjï¿½rn Schulze and Trygve Torgersen
(Creators of the NyForm Trolls)

Far to the North where the winter storms whip the weather-beaten coasts, you will find a long and narrow country. Here you see dark forests with moonlit lakes, deep fjords surrounded by mighty snowcapped mountains, and long rivers and cold streams cascading down the mountainsides.

Nowadays this country is covered by snow and ice only six months a year. A long, long time ago, however, there existed a massive glacier that brooded over the entire country for thousands of years.

As the climate gradually warmed and the glacier slowly retreated to the North, man to the south of the glacier followed in its wake. Looking at this country

and finding it to be magnificent, they considered themselves to be its first inhabitants. People settled there and named it Norway.

They were themselves called "nordmenn" (Men of the North). It did not take them long, however, to realize that on this land there were various other creatures hiding out in the forests and mountainsides. People did not know what these creatures were, but they were generally believed to have supernatural powers and they came to be known as trolls.

The trolls would come out of their hiding- places only after sunset and they would disappear before the morning sun arose in the East. Direct exposure to the sun could cause them to crack, turn into stone and possibly burst. On occasion the trolls would evidently forget to hide from the sun and rock formations can today be found in various places with troll-like features.

The trolls were mostly seen on bright moonlit nights or during stormy nights that could frighten about anyone who happened to be outdoors at that time. The trolls had very distinct features. They had long crooked noses, only four fingers and toes on each limb, and most of them had long bushy tails.

Some trolls were giants and others were small. There were stories of two-headed, as well as three-headed trolls, and even a few had only one eye in the middle of their wrinkled foreheads. Others had trees and rough moss-like growth all over their heads and noses.

Although they were shaggy and rough haired and most looked frightening, they were also known to be good-natured and naive. They were so naive in fact that even sly peasant boys could, on occasion, easily trick them. Stories about such encounters are common in the fairy tales.

Most trolls lived to be hundreds of years old. However, because of the trolls' extremely shy nature, their true origin, their lifestyle or what surprises they might pull have always been a mystery. The ability to transform themselves counted among the trolls many supernatural skills.

The fairy maidens, called "Hulder", could transform into incredibly attractive young ladies. However, they could not get rid of their tails. Hunters' and farmers' sons, who were lured to the mountains by these fairies, would usually check for tails on their newfound beauties.

The wrath of the trolls was boundless. It was therefore considered very important not to make them your enemy. If a farmer did provoke a troll, his livestock might be subject to disease or harmful sickness, or worse things could happen.

On the other hand, a good relationship with the trolls could be very rewarding. Now, even in modern times it is well advised to keep a good standing with the trolls since you never know when you will meet one yourself.

The next time you go to the dark forests and the mighty mountains with their deep lakes and roaring waterfalls, just remember, they probably mean no harm. But be aware, in the twilight hours you are no longer alone. Then it is only you . . . and all the trolls!

2170. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 01:46:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030605214633.03929.00000028@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68320

In article <bbma8r$526$0@208.206.142.83>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> >The punishment is not proportional to the crime. I don't condone what she
>> >did, but to
>> >hear the prosecutors and reporters go on, you'd thing she's this daemon or
>> >something.
>> >Wrongâ€¦ She's simply an investor who took advantage of inside
knowledge -
>> >something
>> >most investors would do in a heartbeat if given the same opportunity. To
>add
>> >some
>> >prospective, the stock proceeds were approximately two hundred thousand
>> >dollars - a tiny
>> >faction of her wealth. (She didn't get rich off of this)
>>
>> If we condone insider trading,
>
> When the news of this fiasco first broke I concluded right then that we'd
>soon
>see just what the little lady is made of. I said that if she was anywhere
>near as
>sharp as she portrays herself she'd very quickly call a news conference and
>say
>into the camera, "I see that my action in this matter has been misconstrued,
>and
>therefore I am giving the entire $200,000 to my favorite charity. In fact, to
>show
>that my heart's in the right place, I'm doubling it and adding an extra $100
>G."
>The expenditure of that half million, probably about of as much concern to
>her as
>a couple hundred bucks would be to most of us, would have instantly settled
>the
>matter. She'd have had an automatic nice little income tax deduction-assuming
>she
>pays any in the first place. Instead, she has trashed her entire company and
>I see
>on TV that her stock has fallen in value some $400 million.
>
> Smart? I don't think so.

Dick:

You got your attributions wrong. That was not my quote.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2171. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 01:46:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030605214633.03929.00000029@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68321

In article <3edebd2f@snipnews.snip.net>, "scrap lumber" <bobbobbob@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> If it is proven in open court that Martha Stewart did, indeed, profit from
>> insider trading information, then she should be required to pay whatever
>> price fits her crime. This would undoubtedly involve heavy fines, and a
>> possible visit to some Club Med Minimum Security Retreat for Rich and
>> Famous felons.
>
>Hopefully she will be swabbing stainless steel toilets
>in some medium-security prision someplace.
>She is nothing but another Leona Hemsley.
>Hopefully someday, she dies broke in an alcohol-induced stupor.

How charming! Why would you wish that kind of fate on anyone?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2172. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 02:09:48 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbot5c$d88$0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 68322

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <bbma8r$526$0@208.206.142.83>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> >> >The punishment is not proportional to the crime. I don't condone what she
> >> >did, but to
> >> >hear the prosecutors and reporters go on, you'd thing she's this daemon or
> >> >something.
> >> >WrongÃ¢â□¬Â¦ She's simply an investor who took advantage of inside
> knowledge -
> >> >something
> >> >most investors would do in a heartbeat if given the same opportunity. To
> >add
> >> >some
> >> >prospective, the stock proceeds were approximately two hundred thousand
> >> >dollars - a tiny
> >> >faction of her wealth. (She didn't get rich off of this)
> >>
> >> If we condone insider trading,
> >
> > When the news of this fiasco first broke I concluded right then that we'd
> >soon
> >see just what the little lady is made of. I said that if she was anywhere
> >near as
> >sharp as she portrays herself she'd very quickly call a news conference and
> >say
> >into the camera, "I see that my action in this matter has been misconstrued,
> >and
> >therefore I am giving the entire $200,000 to my favorite charity. In fact, to
> >show
> >that my heart's in the right place, I'm doubling it and adding an extra $100
> >G."
> >The expenditure of that half million, probably about of as much concern to
> >her as
> >a couple hundred bucks would be to most of us, would have instantly settled
> >the
> >matter. She'd have had an automatic nice little income tax deduction-assuming
> >she
> >pays any in the first place. Instead, she has trashed her entire company and
> >I see

> >on TV that her stock has fallen in value some $400 million.
> >
> > Smart? I don't think so.
>
> Dick:
>
> You got your attributions wrong. That was not my quote.

Excusamundo, Larry, I just hit 'reply' and typed without rearranging anything..
I'm not sure someone before me didn't do it.

Dick

2173. Re: Serious question:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 04:41:08 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bbu5id$dj8li$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68366

That may work... not one of my favorites, but it work fit. The only one I have come up with is -P-retty -M-uch -Xtralarge!

Being 6'4"-6'5" tall and about 250-275 range, I am actually a big guy.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030604212243.21428.00000346@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <bblucn$b1mrd$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Still wish I could find some "funny phonetics" for my callsign.... The
"X"
> >makes that one a challenge.
> >
> >
> >
> >--
> >Ryan, KC8PMX
>
> Keeps Cranking Eight Pretty Mean Xylophones?
>
> 73 de Larry, Kilowatt Three London Tare
>

2174. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 04:42:25 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bbu5ie$dj8li$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68367

Senior Wensles is more how it is pronounced but I am sure my spelling is a
little off...

>
> Wasn't that Senor Wenches (sp?) who had a skit something like that? I
> remember him on Ed Sullivan when I was a kid.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2175. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 04:43:39 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bbu5if$dj8li$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68368

Nope, but I think there should be.... Give the ARRL a little competition and help keep them in check.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030604212241.21428.00000344@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <bbluco$b1mrd$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have to
do
> >with amateur radio??
>
> Is there a "National Radio Association?"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Member, NRA
>
>

2176. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 04:46:03 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bbu5ig$dj8li$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68369

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030604212242.21428.00000345@mb-m23.aol.com...
> >The punishment is not proportional to the crime. I don't condone what she
> >did, but to
> >hear the prosecutors and reporters go on, you'd thing she's this daemon
or
> >something.
> >Wrong. She's simply an investor who took advantage of inside knowledge -
> >something
> >most investors would do in a heartbeat if given the same opportunity. To
add
> >some
> >prospective, the stock proceeds were approximately two hundred thousand
> >dollars - a tiny
> >faction of her wealth. (She didn't get rich off of this)
>
> If we condone insider trading, even to the somewhat small extent that it
was
> practiced by Miss Stewart, then we're saying it's OK for a small handful
of
> "insiders" to reap vast fortunes by taking advantage of information which
is
> not available to the general investing public. Is that fair?

Nope.... just Republicanism at its finest!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2177. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 04:49:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bbu5ih$dj8li$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68370

Seems like I remember someone offering a similar wish as to intention to
ALL no-coders (regardless of the specific individual) in this newsgroup.
Do I smell hypocrisy??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >Hopefully she will be swabbing stainless steel toilets
> >in some medium-security prision someplace.
> >She is nothing but another Leona Hemsley.
> >Hopefully someday, she dies broke in an alcohol-induced stupor.
>
> How charming! Why would you wish that kind of fate on anyone?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2178. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 05:58:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030606015825.01946.00000728@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68323

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/5/03 5:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030605182106.03776.00000059@mb-m14.aol.com>

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>> I am of the opinion you were a ham before you were licensed.
>
>Thanks.

What a nerd.

>I did build simple rf circuits before I got my license.

Being a "ham" had nothing to do with radios, Vipul.

>>>The manager told me I will have to work long hours.
>
>Plus, he told me I have to work 7 days a week (no weekends off).

Sounds to me like you are settling for ANYTHING you can get...That's the
kind of job you have...It's certainly NOT a "career".

>>>And he warned me I will really have to pay attention to details of other
>>>co-workers.
>>
>> The company rat.
>
>Stealing in this business is very common and likely, my new manager told me.
>Employees and suppliers both steal.

Ahhhh...you're a drug pusher.

>Suppliers steal by not giving the full supplies. If 1000 boxes come in, at
>least one of them may be empty. Thats stealing. Suppliers WILL steal, in this
>business, if you don't check the supplies.

Yep.

>I have to make sure other emplyees and suppliers don't steal.

Do you know what you call someone who does what you are doing?

"Target".

>>>Plus problems with a co-worker slacking off that I will have to do that
>>>person's work.
>>

>> Sucking up for a promotion already, huh?
>
>No promotion for that. I am a manager there. I will do that person's work
>until
>they <soon> hire someone else.

Manager already? You don't walk in to a "managerial" job that requires
7-day a week obligation.

You're cannon fodder, Vipul. Quit now and hire in at McDonalds. At least
they have benefits and free meals.

>>>So, I will not have time to post for a while.
>>
>> So there IS a God ! ! ! And it's not even my birthday!
>
>Not yet. My new hours will start soon, within a couple of weeks.

Just the promise is enough for me.

Steve, K4CAP

2179. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 07:42:36 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <MBXDa.112574$cO3.8193601@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 68324

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bbma8r$526$0@208.206.142.83...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > >The punishment is not proportional to the crime. I don't condone what
she
> > >did, but to
> > >hear the prosecutors and reporters go on, you'd thing she's this daemon
or
> > >something.
> > >Wrong<?> She's simply an investor who took advantage of inside
knowledge -
> > >something
> > >most investors would do in a heartbeat if given the same opportunity.
To add
> > >some
> > >prospective, the stock proceeds were approximately two hundred thousand
> > >dollars - a tiny
> > >faction of her wealth. (She didn't get rich off of this)
> >
> > If we condone insider trading,
>
> When the news of this fiasco first broke I concluded right then that we'd
soon
> see just what the little lady is made of. I said that if she was anywhere
near as
> sharp as she portrays herself she'd very quickly call a news conference
and say
> into the camera, "I see that my action in this matter has been
misconstrued, and
> therefore I am giving the entire $200,000 to my favorite charity. In fact,
to show
> that my heart's in the right place, I'm doubling it and adding an extra
$100 G."
> The expenditure of that half million, probably about of as much concern to
her as
> a couple hundred bucks would be to most of us, would have instantly
settled the
> matter. She'd have had an automatic nice little income tax
deduction-assuming she
> pays any in the first place. Instead, she has trashed her entire company

and I see
> on TV that her stock has fallen in value some $400 million.
>
> Smart? I don't think so.
>

You're right! She should take lessons from Kenny-boy Lay. ;-)

73,
Clay N4AOX

2180. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 09:42:57 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <BmZDa.112597$cO3.8200335@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 68325
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

So what is the story behind the story here? Why is the FCC assigning
"channels" to the US ARS? Is this a first?
Why not just a segment or sliver from 5332 to 5405? Why dictate USB mode
only? What about CW, RTTY, Slow Scan, etc.?

I think we can overlook the "new" ARRL's recommendations on audio passband
edges with no definition of the edges. I suppose they think we all use DSP
rock wall filters in our audio now.

The same goes for ARRL encouraging the ARS to do no tinkering without
consulting the manufacturers. A few years back, rig conversion articles to
cover 60 meters would have made for several issues of QST.

73,
Clay N4AOX

The same goes for
> From ARRL Headquarters
> Newington CT June 3, 2003
> To all radio amateurs
>
> SB QST ARL ARLB038
> ARLB038 New 60-meter band becomes available July 3
>
> The new five-channel 60-meter domestic secondary amateur allocation
> becomes available to US Amateur Radio operators at midnight local
> time on July 3. The FCC Report and Order granting the allocation was
> published June 3 in the Federal Register. Federal government users
> are primary in the 5 MHz band.
>
> The FCC has granted amateurs use of five 2.8 kHz-wide channels with
> center frequencies of 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373 and 5405 kHz. The
> channels will be available to General and higher class licensees.
> The only permitted mode will be upper-sideband USB phone, and 50 W
> ERP is the maximum power allowed.
>
> Users of the 60-meter channels should set their carrier frequency
> 1.5 kHz lower than the channel center frequency. ARRL suggests
> restricting transmitted audio bandwidth to 200 Hz on the low end and
> 2800 Hz on the high end for a total bandwidth of 2.6 kHz. ARRL
> recommends that amateurs considering modifying existing amateur
> equipment for operation on 60 meters contact the equipment's
> manufacturer for advice.
> NNNN

> /EX
>
>

2181. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 10:26:45 UTC
From: kb9bvn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <93923EFB7brianiquestnet@207.217.77.22>
Source record: 68326
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, if you can't do CW here, then it must not be a real Amateur Band.

Up to now, CW was permitted in ANY ham band.

de KB9BVN

>So what is the story behind the story here? Why is the FCC assigning
>"channels" to the US ARS? Is this a first?
>Why not just a segment or sliver from 5332 to 5405? Why dictate USB
>mode only? What about CW, RTTY, Slow Scan, etc.?
>
>I think we can overlook the "new" ARRL's recommendations on audio
>passband edges with no definition of the edges. I suppose they think we
>all use DSP rock wall filters in our audio now.
>
>The same goes for ARRL encouraging the ARS to do no tinkering without
>consulting the manufacturers. A few years back, rig conversion
>articles to cover 60 meters would have made for several issues of QST.
>

2182. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 13:17:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030606091711.00935.00000831@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68327

>Subject: Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3
>From: kb9bvn@arrl.net (Scrounger)
>Date: 6/6/03 5:26 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <93923EFB7brianiquestnet@207.217.77.22>

>Well, if you can't do CW here, then it must not be a real Amateur Band.

This band was not intended to be for international communications. It was
"requested" as a domestic assignment to help fill the propagatioon void between
80 and 40 meters.

>Up to now, CW was permitted in ANY ham band.

C'mon, fellas...Like it or not, this is the way it's been headed since
April of 2000. This is the first bitter bite.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2183. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 13:26:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030606092628.00935.00000832@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68328

>Subject: Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3
>From: "Clay N4AOX" wyn@att.net
>Date: 6/6/03 4:42 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BmZDa.112597$cO3.8200335@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>

>So what is the story behind the story here? Why is the FCC assigning
>"channels" to the US ARS? Is this a first?
>Why not just a segment or sliver from 5332 to 5405? Why dictate USB mode
>only? What about CW, RTTY, Slow Scan, etc.?

This band was requested as a domestic assignment, primarily to be a propagation stop-gap between 80 and 40 meters. It was never intended to be a "DX" band or general purpose band.

>I think we can overlook the "new" ARRL's recommendations on audio passband
>edges with no definition of the edges. I suppose they think we all use DSP
>rock wall filters in our audio now.

State of the art has put the typical SSB signal at about 3Khz for over 20 years now. It shouldn't be such a stretch to keep our signals within this parameter, especially when we are limited to 50W PEP

>The same goes for ARRL encouraging the ARS to do no tinkering without
>consulting the manufacturers. A few years back, rig conversion articles to
>cover 60 meters would have made for several issues of QST.

Quite a few years ago, Clay. The typical "rig conversion" these days is a matter of a snip here or a diode removed there. The steps for same for most popular HF or V/UHF rigs are available from any number of Web sources or "hackers" guides.

After the last minute intervention of the NTIA we are lucky to have these "channels", let alone any "band" assignment.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2184. The other NRA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 13:39:43 UTC
From: "David J. Windisch" <davidw@copper.net>
Message-ID: <3ee097fc$1_2@newsfeed>
Source record: 68329

Hi, All Concerned:

Now, there's an idea. It could sorta be like the protestants declaring themselves the true religion. I may be forcibly retired in the near future. Somebody be "the other NRA" prez, I'll be GM, and I'll do everything my
way, like the passive-aggressives in the org we have now <reallybiggrin>

73, Dave, N3HE
GM, National Radidio (sic) Association

----- Original Message -----
From: "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam>
> Is there a "National Radio Association?"
>

2185. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 13:43:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbq5pr$mr2$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 68330

Clay N4AOX wrote:>

>
> You're right! She should take lessons from Kenny-boy Lay. ;-)

At least it's self-preservation. You haven't seen him indicted yet, tho we can still hope.....Poor Martha walked right into a right uppercut.

2186. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 14:04:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbq70spiu0@208.207.71.162>
Source record: 68331
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Clay N4AOX wrote:

> So what is the story behind the story here?

Well, here's my take...

> Why is the FCC assigning
> "channels" to the US ARS?

Mainly because:

1. NTIA didn't want us to get anything at 5 mc, but the really didn't think they should slap us too hard what with all our emergecncy comms work in the recent past, such as at WTC following Sept 11.'01 etc. So they gave us the very barest minimum that would satisfy the original reason for the request for an allocation at 5mc- just enough for us to be able to actually carry on emergency communications in that region. And they insisted on USB only simply so that the already-assinged users would be able to copy our transmissions to ID whatever hams were there. No matter that USB might be the poorest choice of mode under austere conditions.

> Is this a first?

In 100 years of ham radio, yes. (with the sole example of a discrete HF amateur frequecy for the state of Alaska for emergency communications)
If there's any other incidence of channelization ham radio I haven't seen it, and I've been active in ham radio for almost tha last of that hundred years.

>
> Why not just a segment or sliver from 5332 to 5405?

Chances are that the channels assigned correspond to channels appearing on the equipment of users already assigned to that part of the spectrum. That would make it easy for them to tune in hams where they mignt not be able to if our assignments were not channelized. This follows the logic above.

> Why dictate USB mode
> only? What about CW, RTTY, Slow Scan, etc.?

See above

>
>
> I think we can overlook the "new" ARRL's recommendations on audio passband
> edges with no definition of the edges. I suppose they think we all use DSP
> rock wall filters in our audio now.

I wouldn't think so. But still, no one seems to be too concerned with it either. No tolerance has been assigned, as far as I've been able to determine. Maybe they intend for us to follow the same tolerances assigned to the other users. Probably as long as hams use the correct amount of frequecy offset below the channel frequency they'll get along OK. Want to bet on it, though? That's what you'll be doing when you operate on 5 mc.

>
>
> The same goes for ARRL encouraging the ARS to do no tinkering without
> consulting the manufacturers.
>

That one looks like a non-starter. I don't see the manufacturers being anxious to hand out that information freely given that they could later become the target of accusations of fault when something goes wrong, goes wrong, goes wrong, goes wrong......
After all, they can insist that their gear wasn't designed to work on 5mhz so it may not function as designed there, and they won't guarantee the specs will hold for that frequency range.......

Dick

2187. spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 15:02:26 UTC
From: W5DXP <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3EE0AD02.2010103@ieee.org>
Source record: 68332
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.

http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A.shtml

2188. Re: Why Is It? And the NRA has what to do with Ham Radio??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 15:07:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE0AE17.7070209@psu.edu>
Source record: 68334

D. Stussy wrote:
> On Thu, 5 Jun 2003, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>>In article <bbluco$b1mrd$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>>><kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>What does the NRA, unless it is the "National Radio Association," have to do
>>>>with amateur radio??
>>>
>>>Is there a "National Radio Association?"
>>
>>I support the right of Americans to keep and bear radios too! ;^)
>
>
> In Southern California, there was a time where repeater owners had to be armed
> to protect their equipment!
>
> The infamous 147.435 repeater had received damage from bullets being shot at
> it about a decade ago.

It's a strange, strange world we live in.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2189. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 15:14:52 UTC
From: Alan <alannc44@{nospam}ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <Md2Ea.82345$jp.1450107@twister.southeast.rr.com>
Source record: 68333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

When the Commerce Department is directed to do the study you know what perspective will come out.

That's like timber companies doing studies on how best to use our national forests.

Alan
WN4HOG

--
Windsurfing Club: http://www.ibscc.org

"W5DXP" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message news:3EE0AD02.2010103@ieee.org...
> Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.
>
>
http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A.shtml
>

2190. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 15:15:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE0B018.90604@psu.edu>
Source record: 68335

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>Just tell me the puppet is okay!!
>
>
> You are okay, Mike.

Thanks, Vipul. You're okay too.

But we're all worried about the puppet.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2191. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 15:36:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE0B4E2.2000006@psu.edu>
Source record: 68336

Vshah101 wrote:
> From (N2EY)
>
>
>>>>Education is so stuck in its methods, that it cannot see common sense.
>>>
>>Which is?
>
>
> Knowledge you can actually use, not worthless knowledge to occupy your time,
> and which you will forget after the course is over.
>
>
>>Give us some examples of "worthless courses" you had to take and "worthwhile
>>knowledge" that was crowded out.
>
>
> Worthwhile knowledge was crowded out because there was no free time left after
> having to take the required courses.
>
> Some worthless courses I had to take: literature (just to meet requirement),
> biology, physics (not for electronics), linear algebra (very worthless), Pascal
> (should have had C class, no one uses Pascal), probability.

I guess you adhere to the vocational type education. Everything there
is taught on the basis of relevance. Sounds good until you realize that
you may change careers. In my working life, I have changed job skill
functions several times probably 5 times over the course of my tenure.
If I were to have only been educated in a "relevant" fashion, I would
have had a much rougher time.

There are countries where the so called relevant education is more in
evidence. Of course moving from one vocation to another is nowhere as
easy there.

None of the above classes are worthless. How do you know what you might
use in the future. It says more about you than it does the classes.

> Examples of worthwhile courses missed: automechanics, popular culture- movies,
> music, sports, practical electronics projects.

Many of these are also worthwhile. I might take exception to popular
culture, which to me celebrates ignorance.

> You gain more skills with worthwhile information than worthless information.
>

There is a truism for sure. Problem is that you don't really know when
parts of your education may be needed. Tell me what you will need 5
years from now.

>>What engineers need is to
>>learn how to think about engineering, and the skills to solve engineering
>>problems.
>
>
> Problem is everything is approached in one way only, sitting at a desk, when in
> reality many more skills are required. By presenting information in a limited
> framework, the student does NOT gain the required skills.
>
> This affects any course, whether you take an economics course or an EE course.
> (Less true of EE courses, but still true).

Where do you get your paradigms?

<some snippage>

> I am not a troll. I do not live in the mountains or forest. (You don't have to
> read from this point down).

I enjoyed the story, but applying your rules of relevance, isn't this
a worthless story? I mean it's kind of like literature.

2192. Ham radio = toast?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 16:53:56 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bbqgtn$h3f$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68340

I suspect there are some people in this here chatrum who don't even acknowledge the existence of amateur radio activity above 30MHz, but for those who aren't living in the 1920s, here is another reason for concern about VHF and above allocations.

This time it's from W himself:

"We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of U.S. spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available to support critical government functions."

http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A.shtml

Do ARRL and/or radio amateurs have an answer? Does that answer have enough zeros before the decimal point if you know what I mean wink wink nudge nudge say no more say no more?

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

2193. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 20:15:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306061215.5f6240ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68337
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bbq70spiu0@208.207.71.162>...
> Clay N4AOX wrote:

>
> > Is this a first?
>
> In 100 years of ham radio, yes. (with the sole example of a discrete HF
> amateur frequecy for the state of Alaska for emergency communications)
> If there's any other incidence of channelization ham radio I haven't seen it,
> and I've been active in ham radio for almost tha last of that hundred years.

The Alaska Emergency Freq (5167.5 mHz)is apparently "owned" by the
Alaska State Troopers. You should relate to that . . . everybody and
their cousins have access to it. Mountain S&R outfits, hams, boats &
ships, medical types, police, bush pilots, remote hunting & fishing
lodges, etc. In addition to the Troopers monitoring the freq 24/365,
so does the USCG, FAA, and the military on the gov't side.

Hamdom is not new to the concept of channelized ops. Ref: MARS & CAP
freqs.

> >
> > The same goes for ARRL encouraging the ARS to do no tinkering without
> > consulting the manufacturers.
> >
>
> That one looks like a non-starter. I don't see the manufacturers being anxious
> to hand out that information freely given that they could later become the
> target of accusations of fault when something goes wrong, goes wrong, goes
> wrong, goes wrong......
> After all, they can insist that their gear wasn't designed to work on 5mhz so
> it may not function as designed there, and they won't guarantee the specs will
> hold for that frequency range.......

It can be much worse than that. You can completely fry specific ham
xcvrs if they're diode snipped and operated in certain specific
frequency ranges outside the ham bands. That's one reason why the MARS
& CAP freqs are (always?) just outside the ham bands.

60M is not "just outside any ham band". I'd do a lot of research on
any of the published mods for my xcvrs before I got the tools out.

Smoke = $$$

>
> Dick

w3rv

2194. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 20:41:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EE0FC61.3060108@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68341

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> Sounds to me like you are settling for ANYTHING you can get...That's the
>kind of job you have...It's certainly NOT a "career".
>
>
Well, in this shjt economy, there ain't a whole lotta choice....

>>>
>>>
>>Stealing in this business is very common and likely, my new manager told me.
>>Employees and suppliers both steal.
>>
If it's just one-ies two-ies, so what? Cut 'em some slack, if they're
building homebrew
circuits at home with the stuff, some of that skill developed may get
used on the job
later.

>
>
>>Suppliers steal by not giving the full supplies. If 1000 boxes come in, at
>>least one of them may be empty. That's stealing. Suppliers WILL steal, in this
>>business, if you don't check the supplies.
>>
Whoever runs the receiving and shipping dept should find that.

>>I have to make sure other employees and suppliers don't steal.
>>
>>
>
> Do you know what you call someone who does what you are doing?
>
> "Target".
>
The morale at that place must really suck. Probably some office
politics type
infighting and backbiting too. I've seen it. Bell Labs, which had the
reputation
of being the best place to work on the planet turned out to really suck.
Nothing
but political turf wars, sabotage, and backbiting. AT&T (before it
became Lucent)
was so big that it was virtually impossible to have any impact on the
profitability

of the company. So projects were done not because it might make the company money, but because your boss thought it looked great to his boss.

Heard an urban legend about the invention of the transistor. Turns out it was
a project the boss told the guys to forget about. And it became a "bootleg" project, done after hours and hidden in supply cabinets during the day. Well,
the damn thing worked, not that it was the kind of transistor normally produced
today. But you gotta start somewheres. I doubt Bell Labs could invent another
transistor though.

>
>
>
>>>>Plus problems with a co-worker slacking off that I will have to do that
>>>>person's work.
>>>>
>>>>
>>> Sucking up for a promotion already, huh?
>>>
>>>
>>No promotion for that. I am a manager there. I will do that person's work
>>until
>>they <soon> hire someone else.
>>
>>
>
> Manager already? You don't walk in to a "managerial" job that requires
>7-day a week obligation.
>
> You're cannon fodder, Vipul. Quit now and hire in at McDonalds. At least
>they have benefits and free meals.
>
He may be right. The big bosses may need a scapegoat to blame for this mess. Bring
you in, not support your decisions, have you fail, then can you blaming the entire mess
on you.

2195. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 21:16:35 UTC
From: Rich Wood <richbwood@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bbr0bjcfl1@xuxa.iecc.com>
Source record: 68338
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.broadcasting

On Wed, 4 Jun 2003 18:39:39 GMT, HelpMarthaStewart@emedge.com.pe
wrote:

>The punishment is not proportional to the crime.

Since she hasn't even been tried there is no punishment, yet.

>Martha is being railroaded because; 1) She's Martha Stuart 2) She's a successful woman
>and 3) She's perceived in some quarters to be a bitch. She's not I've met her and know
>several people who work for her. She's a strong individual, who demands perfection.
>To bad if some people find that threatening!

I've also met her and like her. I found her to be delightful. However,
the official charges make no mention of her being a bitch. The say
things like insider trading, lying to the FBI, altering evidence and
things like that.

I think I'll start campaigns to free Bernie Ebbers of Worldcom,
Kenneth Lay of Enron, the jerks at Arthur Anderson and the stock
"analysts" who hawked stocks their internal memos derided as POS.

Rich

2196. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 21:37:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030606173748.09031.00000642@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68339

>Subject: Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 6/6/03 3:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0306061215.5f6240ad@posting.google.com>

>Smoke = $$$

I never thought of it that way, but you're 100% on-the-money! (Pun intended!)

Steve, K4CAP

2197. Re: ***TWISTEDHED HUMOR SITE***

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-06 22:39:01 UTC
From: "Rev. Benchvise K. Dingleberries" <scrotsac3936@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ee117fd@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 68342

A much better alternative: www.happytreefriends.com

2198. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 01:21:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030606212122.13706.00000626@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68343

From: Robert Casey wa2ise

>> Sounds to me like you are settling for ANYTHING you can get...That's
>the
>>kind of job you have...It's certainly NOT a "career".

>Well, in this shjt economy, there ain't a whole lotta choice...

Thanks. However, I doubt I'll ever get back to the EE field.

>>>Stealing in this business is very common and likely, my new manager told
>me.
>>>Employees and suppliers both steal.
>>>
>If it's just one-ies two-ies, so what? Cut 'em some slack,

Problem is you have to account for everything. Otherwise the amount lost can be significant. I've heard stories of significant amounts missing.

I heard one story about suppliers bringing in trucks and hiding old tires among the items. You look at the pile and it looks like the right amount. You sign that you got it. Later, as you pick up the pile you see the worthless tires.

Also, a significant amount of cash "flows" there. Some people try to hide that and take some of it. I heard something about laundry, but I don't know what he meant.

>The morale at that place must really suck. Probably some office
>politics type
>infighting and backbiting too.

Its not a fun job <for those other employees>, but someone in society must do it.

>Bell Labs, which had the
>reputation
>of being the best place to work on the planet turned out to really suck.

This is nothing like that. This is nowhere near as interesting as that. This is more of a low skill environment.

Its not anything related to the EE field. They told me that they would be paying me more than the most I made as an EE, but its not a glamorous job.

> Nothing
>but political turf wars, sabotage, and backbiting. AT&T (before it
>became Lucent)
>was so big that it was virtually impossible to have any impact on the

>profitability
>of the company.

Don't forget- the political connections were essential. I've seen poor performers that knew someone get a promotion. On the other hand, you could be very smart, but if you did not have the right connections, you would not advance.

>> You're cannon fodder, Vipul. Quit now and hire in at McDonalds. At
>least
>>they have benefits and free meals.
>>
>He may be right. The big bosses may need a scapegoat to blame for this
>mess. Bring
>you in, not support your decisions, have you fail, then can you blaming
>the entire mess
>on you.

McDonalds will not pay as much as this job so why would I go there?

I believe the manager is honest. Or else he would not have warned me that stealing is common and that its not an easy job. With a salary increase over my previous EE job, I will risk it. The manager told me to meet them after the employees were gone. I guess they did not want the other employees to see me before I start there.

I know I got the job. I can guarantee that. (Steve, K4CAP wants to be sure I will be leaving the group). For certain reasons I cannot tell you when the start date is. Then, its 7 days a week for long hours. Problem is they have just me responsible for preventing theft on two shifts. (Each shift is 8 hours). I don't know how I will be able to accomplish that.

2199. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 01:37:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030606213710.13706.00000627@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68344

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>I guess you adhere to the vocational type education.

No, not just vocational. A combination of technical (for example EE or other major), and PRACTICAL education.

Competition in the education system, more importantly competition in the ideas of education, is the only way education will improve. And it needs change and improvement now. For some people, it just doesn't meet their needs.

>Problem is that you don't really know when
>parts of your education may be needed. Tell me what you will need 5
>years from now.

>How do you know what you might
>use in the future.

Its common sense really. Nothing that I knew that others didn't

I made a list before I started my first semester of college. I looked at the list a few years after I graduated. The list makes alot of sense now. It is the useful skills I should have had.

>Many of these are also worthwhile. I might take exception to popular
>culture, which to me celebrates ignorance.

Its about being aware, not being ignorant. Traditional education keeps you ignorant.

>Where do you get your paradigms?

I can see by your arguments that you don't understand the concept I am trying to advocate.

2200. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 01:42:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbrfub$nr9$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 68345
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alan wrote:

> When the Commerce Department is directed to do the study you know what
> perspective will come out.

The Commerce Department was the original administrator of radio in the USA. Only later was it handed off to the newly created FCC. Looks like we may be going full circle- you'll note that the FCC is mentioned as having a "consulting function" in the study. Hah! That's like they're a footnote to the whole deal.

Maybe the FCC antagonists will have their way. Can you say Billy Tauzin?

2201. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 01:53:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbrgj6$q5j$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 68346
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bbq70spiu0@208.207.71.162>...
> > Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> >
> > > Is this a first?
> >
> > In 100 years of ham radio, yes. (with the sole example of a discrete HF
> > amateur frequecy for the state of Alaska for emergency communications)
> > If there's any other incidence of channelization ham radio I haven't seen it,
> > and I've been active in ham radio for almost tha last of that hundred years.
>
> The Alaska Emergency Freq (5167.5 mHz)is apparently "owned" by the
> Alaska State Troopers. You should relate to that

Yeah, I used to be acquainted with a ham who had retired from that org. He was the guy who told me about them building all thost T^2FD antennas using Radio Shack inductive resistors as
the terminators because they worked better than non-inductive typed. But I guess they had to
put someone in charge of it.

> . . . everybody and
> their cousins have access to it. Mountain S&R outfits, hams, boats &
> ships, medical types, police, bush pilots, remote hunting & fishing
> lodges, etc. In addition to the Troopers monitoring the freq 24/365,
> so does the USCG, FAA, and the military on the gov't side.

I imagine it's a fre-for-all at times, but I doubt they'd tolerate much nonsense.
There emergency conditions can be any and all the time.

>
>
> Hamdom is not new to the concept of channelized ops. Ref: MARS & CAP
> freqs.
>

Well I guess that's one way to looking at it, but not one I'd have chosen. MARS is really a military service for which a qualification is holding a ham radio license. But it's sure not
that much like ham radio otherwise (experience talking here).

> > >
> > > The same goes for ARRL encouraging the ARS to do no tinkering without
> > > consulting the manufacturers.
> > >
> >
> > That one looks like a non-starter. I don't see the manufacturers being anxious
> > to hand out that information freely given that they could later become the
> > target of accusations of fault when something goes wrong, goes wrong, goes
> > wrong, goes wrong......
> > After all, they can insist that their gear wasn't designed to work on 5mhz so
> > it may not function as designed there, and they won't guarantee the specs will
> > hold for that frequency range.......
>
> It can be much worse than that. You can completely fry specific ham
> xcvrs if they're diode snipped and operated in certain specific
> frequency ranges outside the ham bands.

If you happen to have a rig that selects a bandpass filter following the final stage which just happens to have a resonance or the wrong sort around the 5mhz area you WILL let some of
the smoke out.

> That's one reason why the MARS
> & CAP freqs are (always?) just outside the ham bands.

Actually that goes back to the days when most hams had to depend on their
rig's frequency overlap beyond the band edges to get it to work MARS. Most had 25 to 50 khz overlap past the band edges and the MARS frequencies were deliberately installed within those
overlaps.
. MARS woulda had darn few members otherwise. The diode snip routine is more of a modern artifact.

>
>
> 60M is not "just outside any ham band". I'd do a lot of research on
> any of the published mods for my xcvrs before I got the tools out.
>
> Smoke = $$$
>

Betcha. Also seems likely some will find this out the hard way.

Dick

2202. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 02:21:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hg2zyqi.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68347
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 06 Jun 2003 10:26:45 GMT, Scrounger wrote:

>Well, if you can't do CW here, then it must not be a real Amateur Band.

It's not - it's five channels in the Fixed and Mobile Services where
amateur operators can operate om a secondary basis.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2203. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 02:36:35 UTC
From: 5 mHz HQ <hhaa@hahohafivemhz.net>
Message-ID: <bbrj36$3dq$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68348
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> It's not - it's five channels in the Fixed and Mobile Services where
> amateur operators can operate om a secondary basis.
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
Duhhhhhhhhh, No Shit Sherlock! Really?

5 mHz HQ

2204. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 02:45:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hg3320j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68349
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

[No readable article body recovered]

2205. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 04:06:41 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bbrochkqd1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 68350
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" (dixie@townsqr.com) writes:
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> Hamdom is not new to the concept of channelized ops. Ref: MARS & CAP
>> freqs.
>>
>
> Well I guess that's one way to looking at it, but not one I'd have chosen. MARS is really
a
> military service for which a qualification is holding a ham radio license. But it's sure
not
> that much like ham radio otherwise (experience talking here).
>
>
Actually, both MARS & CAP were set up, at least years ago, so ham equipment
could be used. Hence the frequencies being adjacent to the ham bands. I'd
say it's a very similar example, since when a ham engaged in such operation,
they suddenly had to fit into another radio service. That might mean
technical requirements, such as crystal control, and it obviously meant
a change in operating standards.

With this new band, the US hams are likewise expected to fit into another
service, hence the channelized operation and one mode only, though it is
indeed for ham use rather than to make use of ham skills and equipment
for another service.

Michael VE2BVW

2206. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 05:17:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607011700.09790.00000154@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68351

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 6/6/03 3:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE0FC61.3060108@ix.netcom.com>

>> Sounds to me like you are settling for ANYTHING you can get...That's
>the
>>kind of job you have...It's certainly NOT a "career".
>>
>>
>Well, in this **** economy, there ain't a whole lotta choice....

Choices are what you make them. Opportunites are what you prepared for.

>>>Stealing in this business is very common and likely, my new manager told
>me.
>>>Employees and suppliers both steal.
>>>
>If it's just one-ies two-ies, so what? Cut 'em some slack, if they're
>building homebrew
>circuits at home with the stuff, some of that skill developed may get
>used on the job
>later.

Robert...?!?! I am surprised at you! Theft is theft.

>>>Suppliers steal by not giving the full supplies. If 1000 boxes come in, at
>>>least one of them may be empty. That's stealing. Suppliers WILL steal, in
>this
>>>business, if you don't check the supplies.

>Whoever runs the receiving and shipping dept should find that.

No doubt our recently deposed "EE" is now a shiopping and receiving clerk.

>The morale at that place must really suck.

They hired Vippy. At least they have a sense of humor.

>>You're cannon fodder, Vipul. Quit now and hire in at McDonalds. At
>least
>>they have benefits and free meals.
>>
>He may be right. The big bosses may need a scapegoat to blame for this
>mess. Bring
>you in, not support your decisions, have you fail, then can you blaming
>the entire mess

>on you.

Plus he'll get to serve burgers to many, many "preety fems".

73

Steve, K4CAP

2207. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 05:25:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607012549.09790.00000158@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68352

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/6/03 8:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030606212122.13706.00000626@mb-m12.aol.com>

>>He may be right. The big bosses may need a scapegoat to blame for this
>>mess. Bring
>>you in, not support your decisions, have you fail, then can you blaming
>>the entire mess
>>on you.
>
>McDonalds will not pay as much as this job so why would I go there?

Job security. And you get to talk to "preety fems". Some of them are
even old enough to vote. The rest are on Medicare.

>I believe the manager is honest. Or else he would not have warned me that
>stealing is common and that its not an easy job.

He may have been sizing you up to see if you would play along with his
back-office dealings.

>With a salary increase over my previous EE job, I will risk it.

That's why dope smuggling is so lucrative.

>The manager told me to meet them after the
>employees were gone. I guess they did not want the other employees to see me
>before I start there.

I wouldn't be having these "back office" meetings, Vipul. Anyone who
doesn't want you to be seen talking to them has something lacernous in mind.

>I know I got the job. I can guarantee that. (Steve, K4CAP wants to be sure I
>will be leaving the group).

I don't want you to leave, Vipul. I want you to get your head out of your
butt. Your vision is clearer and the world smells nicer.

>For certain reasons I cannot tell you when the
>start date is.

We'll tell James Bond.

>Then, its 7 days a week for long hours. Problem is they have
>just me responsible for preventing theft on two shifts. (Each shift is 8
>hours). I don't know how I will be able to accomplish that.

Tell that to the troops in Iraq, then come tell me how bad your life is, Vippy.

Steve, K4CAP

2208. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 05:35:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607013530.09790.00000162@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68353

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/6/03 8:37 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030606213710.13706.00000627@mb-m12.aol.com>

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>>I guess you adhere to the vocational type education.
>
>No, not just vocational. A combination of technical (for example EE or other
>major), and PRACTICAL education.

Well, you dismiss English and literature courses as IMpractical...This
being so, how do you ever expect to get "published" in a professional journal,
Vippy?

>>How do you know what you might
>>use in the future.
>
>Its common sense really. Nothing that I knew that others didn't

In otherwords, you don't know Jack Squat. You were never an EE, I doubt
you have a college degree in ANY discipline, and you're certainly not about to
find one here.

>I made a list before I started my first semester of college. I looked at the
>list a few years after I graduated. The list makes alot of sense now. It is
>the
>useful skills I should have had.

If you don't have them now, the only person you ahve to blame is yourself.

>Its about being aware, not being ignorant. Traditional education keeps you
>ignorant.

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
! ! ! ! ! ! !

>I can see by your arguments that you don't understand the concept I am trying
>to advocate.

Perhaps it's because you are lacking in those traditional English
skills...?!?!?

Steve, K4CAP

2209. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 05:59:25 UTC
From: Rene <deleterene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bbrv00$co7k2$3@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68354

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:3ypCa.888$NF5.382196@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Rene" <delete_rene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in message
> news:bbd22m$7vejh$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de...
> >
> > [snip]
> > One cannot compare modes to another... in the end, only phone will
> > survive...
> >
> > Rene
> >
> >
>
> I doubt that only phone will survive. There is evidence that CW usage
> continues to increase. Participation in CW contests, for example, has
> increased 20% in the last year alone (see articles on the ARRL site).
>
> A number of people that I know who have taken the plunge and upgraded by
> passing the morse code requirement have been bitten by the bug and operate
> almost exclusively CW.
>
> Up until this current flair wreaked havoc with everything, the CW portions
> of 15, 20, and 40 had a lot of activity.
>

I meant that phone is the most natural way of communicating, so it will
likely survive in the end.

Rene

2210. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 12:49:17 UTC
From: Crazy George <munschNO@attglobal.net.SPAM>
Message-ID: <3ee1e055_4@news1.prserv.net>
Source record: 68355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

After the FCC was formed, Federal radio spectrum management was performed by JTAC, the Joint Technical Advisory Committee. More recently, and I forget under which president, this was formalized as the NTIA, National Telecommunications Advisory Committee. Under the Commerce Department. Reports directly to the office of President. They are responsible for Military frequency allocation, as well as all the 3 letter agencies headquartered in DC. In short, all federal government radios. The FCC continues to be the administering agency for non-federal radio. Except, they are slowly abdicating their responsibility by letting more and more 'unlicensed services grow.

--
Crazy George
Remove NO and SPAM from return address
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bbrfub$nr9$0@208.207.71.138...
>
>
> Alan wrote:
>
> > When the Commerce Department is directed to do the study you know what
> > perspective will come out.
>
> The Commerce Department was the original administrator of radio in the
USA.
> Only later was it handed off to the newly created FCC. Looks like we may
be
> going full circle- you'll note that the FCC is mentioned as having a
> "consulting function" in the study. Hah! That's like they're a footnote to
the
> whole deal.
>
> Maybe the FCC antagonists will have their way. Can you say Billy Tauzin?
>

2211. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 13:51:14 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607095114.07323.00000739@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68356

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>Well, in this **** economy, there ain't a whole lotta choice....
>
> Choices are what you make them. Opportunites are what you prepared for.

The opportunities just are not there for EE jobs.

>>McDonalds will not pay as much as this job so why would I go there?
>
> Job security. And you get to talk to "preety fems". Some of them are
>even old enough to vote.

This job is even more secure if I can handle it. If I fail in this, I probably can still go to work at McDonald's later.

There are many pretty female customers in this business, especially in summer. Flipping burgers at much less pay would not be a good plan when this job makes more than I made as an EE. Ha Ha Ha, Steve.

>He may have been sizing you up to see if you would play along with his
>back-office dealings.

They don't let employees know when a new manager comes in. They don't want work to slow down or people quitting.

They always "test" the new managers. The manager warned me that others like to "test" the new managers like they tested him.

> Tell that to the troops in Iraq, then come tell me how bad your life is,
>Vippy.

I know. I'd much rather be doing this. Less risk of injury or dying.

> They hired Vippy. At least they have a sense of humor.

They could use one, possibly two additional person(s). Its in North Shore MA area. If you need work, just let me know. I'll be the manager there.

2212. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 14:23:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607102330.18497.00000576@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 68357

In article <93923EFB7brianiquestnet@207.217.77.22>, kb9bvn@arrl.net (Scrounger) writes:

>Well, if you can't do CW here, then it must not be a real Amateur Band.

It's not a "band" at all - just 5 channels.
>
>Up to now, CW was permitted in ANY ham band.

Except the 219 MHz allocation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2213. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 15:47:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607114757.13643.00000272@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 68358

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/7/03 8:51 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030607095114.07323.00000739@mb-m22.aol.com>

>> Choices are what you make them. Opportunites are what you prepared
>for.
>
>The opportunities just are not there for EE jobs.

You're not an EE anyway, so what does it matter to YOU?

>> Job security. And you get to talk to "preety fems". Some of them are
>>even old enough to vote.
>
>This job is even more secure if I can handle it. If I fail in this, I
>probably
>can still go to work at McDonald's later.

Prabably, but not likely.

>There are many pretty female customers in this business, especially in
>summer.
>Flipping burgers at much less pay would not be a good plan when this job
>makes
>more than I made as an EE. Ha Ha Ha, Steve.

You never were an EE, Vipul, so what does it matter, Vipul?

And when you're unemployed and hungry, it amkes a LOT of sense.

>>He may have been sizing you up to see if you would play along with his
>>back-office dealings.
>
>They don't let employees know when a new manager comes in. They don't want
>work
>to slow down or people quitting.

Perhaps getting rid of the deadwood and thieves is EXACTLY what they need.

>They always "test" the new managers. The manager warned me that others like
>to
>"test" the new managers like they tested him.

I still think you're being set up. Sure sounds like it.

>> Tell that to the troops in Iraq, then come tell me how bad your life is,
>>Vippy.

>
>I know. I'd much rather be doing this. Less risk of injury or dying.

Maybe...maybe not. At least in the Armed Forces you can shoot back at
those trying to harm you.

>> They hired Vippy. At least they have a sense of humor.
>
>They could use one, possibly two additional person(s). Its in North Shore MA
>area. If you need work, just let me know. I'll be the manager there.

I'll go to Mickey D's first, thank you very much. Besides, I have
"credentials" that pretty much assure me that I have decent employment no
matter where I go. That's how you prepare for the opportunities.

Steve, K4CAP

2214. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 16:26:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607122614.21428.00000386@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68359

In article <3EDCD779.AB7EA037@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>>
>> Well, so much for the "hordes of engineers and other techies" waiting in
>> the wings for the code to fade away so they wouldn't have to jump
>> through all those nasty hoops to get into ham radio.......
>>
>
>Sometimes time is of the essence in history and we're too late. Hoards
>of people were attracted to radio 25 years ago and IMHO the "techies"
>among them would have transferred that interest to amateur radio but for
>having to learn what had already become an archaic hobby mode.

Whoa, slow down a sec, Vito.

I presume you're talking about the CB boom of the '70s?

The fact is that there were more CB users than hams as far back as 1963. By the time of the energy crisises of the '70s, the cb and freebander cultures (including such things as widespread disregard for the rules) were well established.

It should also be remembered that much of the cb craze was not driven by an interest in "radio" at all. Rather, it was an interest in evading enforcement of the unpopular 55 mph speed limit.

As for code being an "archaic hobby mode" in those days, remember during the Vietnam war years there was a shortage of qualified radiotelegraph operators (!) for the maritime services. While military use of Morse Code may have been declining, commercial maritime ships still needed qualified operators until 1997.

>By the
>time no-code licenses appeared the "hordes of techies" had moved on to
>newer things. Sic semper something ...

The history says otherwise:

Growth in the ARS stagnated through much of the '60s at about a quarter million hams. Then in the very late 1960s and all through the '70s and '80s, the number of US hams grew steadily. By 1990 there were over half a million US hams.

I knew lots of hams and cbers back in the times you are describing. In general, the vast majority of cb folks were interested in becoming hams right up to the point at which they realized:

1) Getting a ham license would mean telling "Uncle" your name, address, SSN, etc., and agreeing to allow the feds to inspect your station whenever it was in operation. IOW, getting a ham license made it easier for the feds to find you and enforce the rules.

2) Hams were really strict and "uptight" about following the rules - all of them. Staying in the bands, using callsigns, no off-color language, no letting an unlicensed person use the radio unsupervised, etc., etc. Hams wouldn't even give each other "smokey" reports, and would tell the FCC about rulebreakers!

3) You could not talk to your old cb and freeband friends on the ham bands unless they got ham licenses and ham equipment too. IOW, becoming a ham could mean giving up the old ways.

4) Ham equipment cost a lot more money than cb equipment

5) Ham equipment was more complicated to use than cb equipment

6) Ham antennas were often bigger, more complex, more costly, etc.

7) You had to take tests (written and code) to get a ham license

Yes, a few became hams, but most I knew did not. The "techies" were often the worst of the lot, buying up old "boatanchor" AM gear for modification and use on cb and freeband.

Oddly enough, most of those I knew who became hams are still active hams today. Most of those who were cb users gave it up long ago - right around when gas became cheap and plentiful again.

Don't forget that in 1975 the EIA proposed reassigning 220 to a new "Class E" cb service. FCC almost went along.

Should hams have petitioned the FCC to LOWER the requirements for a ham license in hopes of attracting these folks? That's what you're proposing.

Complete code test elimination was and is prohibited by ITU treaty, as well.

Here's a repost of some info about growth in US amateur radio. Note that growth in the '80s exceeded growth in the '60s,'70s and '90s, even though there were no code test waivers back then and all US ham licenses required a code test.

Repost starts here:

For a historical context, here are some numbers on the growth of US amateur radio in the past 30 years or so. All numbers are rounded off but are accurate to within 2%. Sources are various Callbooks and US census data.:

US Hams:

1970: 270,000
1980: 350,000
1990: 514,000
2000: 680,000

Growth Rate:

1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

Oddly enough, percentage growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test. The total net growth in the '90s was almost exactly the same as in the '80s, even though the US population was larger.

As a percentage of the total US population:

Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams
1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
1980: 227 million 350,000 0.154%
1990: 249 million 514,000 0.206%
2000: 281 million 680,000 0.242%

US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052% in the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s. So the growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2215. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 17:16:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607131602.07323.00000742@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68360

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> And when you're unemployed and hungry, it amkes a LOT of sense.

McDonalds is 35K for a manager there. Lets see. This job that pays more than I made as an EE, or a job at McDonalds. I'll stay with this job.

> Perhaps getting rid of the deadwood and thieves is EXACTLY what they
>need.

Acually, thats the nature of this job. Its a low paying job and alot of <unrecorded> cash flows there. Many would be tempted to take some, believing it would not get noticed. ANYone would steal in this type of job.

2216. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 20:25:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030607162512.12501.00000072@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68361

>Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.
>
>
>http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A
.shtml
>
Cecil,

Thanks for posting this! A true policy issue.

Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:

1) The new technology folks obviously want more VHF/UHF allocations, and ours are an obvious target. Some are protected by international treaty, but others are not.

2) Other new technology folks are bothered by Part 15 and Part 95 rules which limit their ability to radiate RF. The proposed "Power Line Communication" stuff is an example. These folks don't want allocations - they simply want to do things that will adversely impact others' use of the spectrum.

How do we fight these challenges?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2217. Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 21:05:28 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <4ac3785a203a56ccb176f0a172ec1901@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 68557

Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
CW coders.
For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
solution is Internet, not CW.

Anyway CW will be dead soon, D-DAY minus
48 hours for WRC-2003 !

2218. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 21:54:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE25FA3.8F493BC2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68362

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From (N2EY)
>
> >>> Education is so stuck in its methods, that it cannot see common sense.
> >
> > >Which is?
>
> Knowledge you can actually use, not worthless knowledge to occupy your time,
> and which you will forget after the course is over.

You're taking us down a path which will seem familiar to those who have
encountered you here. You, young Mr. Vipul Shah, the square peg of
RRAP, will decide which educational material is worthless knowledge much
as you've decided which of the amateur radio licnensing requirements are
worthless.

> >Give us some examples of "worthless courses" you had to take and "worthwhile
> >knowledge" that was crowded out.
>
> Worthwhile knowledge was crowded out because there was no free time left after
> having to take the required courses.

> Some worthless courses I had to take: literature (just to meet requirement),
> biology, physics (not for electronics), linear algebra (very worthless), Pascal
> (should have had C class, no one uses Pascal), probability.

Those don't sound like worthless courses to me, Vipul. What makes you
so special?

> Examples of worthwhile courses missed: automechanics, popular culture- movies,
> music, sports, practical electronics projects.

Some of those sound like high schools subject. Automechanics is
normally something learned in vocational school. Most people learn
about popular culture from actually listening to music, viewing films
and reading books. Numerous universities offer such courses though.
There are any number of books crammed full of practical electronics
projects--no college course needed. Simply buy the book and read it.

> You gain more skills with worthwhile information than worthless information.

...and Vipu Shah is a special kind of guy, the kind of guy who'd like to
not take required courses which he finds "worthless".

> >What engineers need is to
> >learn how to think about engineering, and the skills to solve engineering

> >problems.
>
> Problem is everything is approached in one way only, sitting at a desk, when in
> reality many more skills are required. By presenting information in a limited
> framework, the student does NOT gain the required skills.
>
> This affects any course, whether you take an economics course or an EE course.
> (Less true of EE courses, but still true).

I can envision you as an Econ student, demanding to tinker with Federal
Reserve Bank policy issues.

> >>> Too much <traditional> education is not good for you.
> >
> >BULLSHIT!
>
> I just showed above why. The above worthwhile course skills are not for fun.
> They are examples of needed skills to do anything better.

Sorry, Vipul, you didn't really "show" anything. You merely led us
through the maze that is your thinking process.

> >>> One person told me that
> >>> some of the dumbest people he worked with had advanced degrees and some >>
> >of the smartest people had no college degree.
> >
> >And you're out to prove him right?
>
> Its something I agree with also.

I'm guessing that you've already contributed far more to the idea than
you know.

> >Normally I'm all for home schooling, but there are a few exceptions.
>
> I need to find quality homeschooling.

Might I suggest looking in someone else's home?

> Also, the state may require worthless
> requirements like certain SAT or MCAS scores for homeschooled > children. I don't want
them to have to meet those worthless standards.

I guess your kids will come up short when it comes time to enter a
university. They likely will not be accepted.

Dave K8MN

2219. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-07 22:37:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hg4jkk3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68363
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 07:49:17 -0500, Crazy George wrote:

>After the FCC was formed, Federal radio spectrum management was performed by
>JTAC, the Joint Technical Advisory Committee.

I believe that you were thinking of IRAC (Interagency Radio Advisory Committee) which was made up of representatives from each Federal department and agency. The paperwork and "heavy lifting" for same was done by FCC employees assigned to that function, and its offices were in the FCC building.

It was replaced by NTIA, which started as the White House Office of Telecommunications Management before being renamed and moved into the Department of Commerce with its own staff.

My former bureau chief at the FCC was named as the head of the OTM (with the title of White House Deputy Chief of Staff) under Pres. Reagan (1985 ??), and was unceremoniously and undeservedly replaced when John Sununu became the Chief of Staff after George Bush I was sworn in (1989).

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2220. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 00:23:19 UTC
From: Crazy George <munschNO@attglobal.net.SPAM>
Message-ID: <3ee282fd_1@news1.prserv.net>
Source record: 68364
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You're right of course. I gotta quit writing these things late at night.
IRAC: Not found in any phone book in the world. I always found that
interesting.

--
Crazy George
Remove NO and SPAM from return address

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hg4jkk3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 07:49:17 -0500, Crazy George wrote:
>
> >After the FCC was formed, Federal radio spectrum management was performed
by
> >JTAC, the Joint Technical Advisory Committee.
>
> I believe that you were thinking of IRAC (Interagency Radio Advisory
> Committee) which was made up of representatives from each Federal
> department and agency. The paperwork and "heavy lifting" for same
> was done by FCC employees assigned to that function, and its offices
> were in the FCC building.
>
> It was replaced by NTIA, which started as the White House Office of
> Telecommunications Management before being renamed and moved into
> the Department of Commerce with its own staff.
>
> My former bureau chief at the FCC was named as the head of the OTM
> (with the title of White House Deputy Chief of Staff) under Pres.
> Reagan (1985 ??), and was unceremoniously and undeservedly replaced
> when John Sununu became the Chief of Staff after George Bush I was
> sworn in (1989).
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

2221. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 00:32:35 UTC
From: "H. Adam Stevens" <solo@totalaccess.net>
Message-ID: <ve5125lp7bd445@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hey folks.
Armstrong gave up and jumped; Look it up.
Live Free or Die.
I like that.
H.

"Crazy George" <munschNO@attglobal.net.SPAM> wrote in message
news:3ee282fd_1@news1.prserv.net...
> You're right of course. I gotta quit writing these things late at night.
> IRAC: Not found in any phone book in the world. I always found that
> interesting.
>
> --
> Crazy George
> Remove NO and SPAM from return address
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hg4jkk3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 07:49:17 -0500, Crazy George wrote:
> >
> > >After the FCC was formed, Federal radio spectrum management was
performed
> by
> > >JTAC, the Joint Technical Advisory Committee.
> >
> > I believe that you were thinking of IRAC (Interagency Radio Advisory
> > Committee) which was made up of representatives from each Federal
> > department and agency. The paperwork and "heavy lifting" for same
> > was done by FCC employees assigned to that function, and its offices
> > were in the FCC building.
> >
> > It was replaced by NTIA, which started as the White House Office of
> > Telecommunications Management before being renamed and moved into
> > the Department of Commerce with its own staff.
> >
> > My former bureau chief at the FCC was named as the head of the OTM
> > (with the title of White House Deputy Chief of Staff) under Pres.
> > Reagan (1985 ??), and was unceremoniously and undeservedly replaced
> > when John Sununu became the Chief of Staff after George Bush I was
> > sworn in (1989).
> >
> > ---
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

> >
> >
>
>

2222. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 02:07:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbu5pm$3cn$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 68371

N2EY wrote:

> >Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.
> >
> >
> >http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A
> .shtml
> >
> Cecil,
>
> Thanks for posting this! A true policy issue.
>
> Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:
>
> 1) The new technology folks obviously want more VHF/UHF allocations, and ours
> are an obvious target. Some are protected by international treaty, but others
> are not.
>
> 2) Other new technology folks are bothered by Part 15 and Part 95 rules which
> limit their ability to radiate RF. The proposed "Power Line Communication"
> stuff is an example. These folks don't want allocations - they simply want to
> do things that will adversely impact others' use of the spectrum.
>
> How do we fight these challenges?

Education, as always. There is no other national communications
resource that can compare to the ARS, and of course its strong suit is our
emergency communications potential. When the infrastructure is clobbered or
falls short as it is prone to do in events which cause heavy demand, hams can and
do fill the gap. That alone is more than reason enough to maintain our
allocations to the extent necessary to keep that capability-though it certainly
doesn't mean we get to keep what we now have. That isn't likely, given the lighe
usage of some of those allocations and the building demand for additional
spectrum.

So how to effect that education, who is the target, and by what means do
we get them on our side? Looks like ARRL is the obvious avenue. They're working
on it now, but one gets the haunting feeling that the effort isn't what it should
and could be. Pres. Jim Haney is doing much more than any other pres in recent
memory, but other than that, the effort doesn't seem to be
too much more than press releases and lip service, if I read it correctly.
Maybe I've missed something? And how to get them on the ball and doing what
they're supposed to be doing?

I let my ARRL membership expire the last of April, and so far I haven't got around to renewing it, though I imagine I will. Sometimes the arrogance and we-know-it-all attitude emanating from Newington seems to exceed the positive aspects, but I know that certainly isn't all there is to it.

Dick

2223. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 02:41:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE2A2A3.5000504@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68372

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Senior Wensles is more how it is pronounced but I am sure my spelling is a
> little off...

Thanks Ryan. I guess my mind was somewhere else when I thought it was
Wenches..... ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

>>Wasn't that Senor Wenches (sp?) who had a skit something like that? I
>>remember him on Ed Sullivan when I was a kid.
>>
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
>

2224. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 03:22:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <RZxEa.598$a7.272516@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68373

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030605210725.03776.00000066@mb-m14.aol.com...
> From (N2EY)
>
> [snip]
> Some worthless courses I had to take: literature (just to meet
requirement),
> biology, physics (not for electronics), linear algebra (very worthless),
Pascal
> (should have had C class, no one uses Pascal), probability.

Actually you missed the entire point of these classes. I will address the requirement of Pascal as an example. The point of that class was to teach you structured programming. The best language to do that in is Pascal as it is inherent in the language itself and you must structure your program to make it work. Once you learn good programming techniques such as structured programming, the techniques can be transfered to other programming languages even though the other languages don't require quite so much structure. Once you have learned PROGRAMMING, switching computer languages is no big deal.

If you had learned what was taught, you had a solid foundation upon which to build. There simply aren't enough hours for a college to teach a person everything. They teach a basic approach and from there it is up to you. Plus you need to keep building on the foundation the rest of your life. The school cannot do it for you.

For example, I was required to take FORTRAN as a programming language in school. Building on that, I later learned several programming languages long after I was out of college. These included Pascal, C, several variants of BASIC, QBASIC, and Visual Basic.

>
> Examples of worthwhile courses missed: automechanics, popular culture-
movies,
> music, sports, practical electronics projects.

Automechanics is a vocational school course not a college class. Since pop culture, movies, music, and sports have nothing to do with your EE major, why do you consider them worthwhile yet consider literature, biology, physics, etc worthless???

>
> [snip]
> No, I want to see quality education. People are stuck with what we have
now. If
> there was competition in the educational system, it could pressure schools

to
> improve their quality. Quality in both the selection of courses, and in
each
> course itself. Courses less controlled by politics and rationalizations an
more
> by people knowledgeable in the subject matter.

There is competition. There are many universities and colleges to choose
from. The requirements vary from one to another.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2225. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 04:18:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hg513z3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 19:23:19 -0500, Crazy George wrote:

>You're right of course. I gotta quit writing these things late at night.
>IRAC: Not found in any phone book in the world. I always found that
>interesting.

It was in the FCC Phone Book, and it was a sought-after assignment
because one got a window on how the other folks lived, so to speak.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2226. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 04:18:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hg51b44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 19:32:35 -0500, H. Adam Stevens wrote:

>Hey folks.
>Armstrong gave up and jumped; Look it up.

The main reason leading to Armstrong's depression and suicide was
his pal, David Sarnoff, stealing his patents.

Had he waited, he would have been vindicated when Sarnoff/RCA was
found liable for same shortly after and was ordered to pay
Armstrong's estate a sizeable sum.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2227. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 04:19:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608001936.04071.00000153@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68376

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/7/03 12:16 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030607131602.07323.00000742@mb-m22.aol.com>

>McDonalds is 35K for a manager there. Lets see. This job that pays more than
>I
>made as an EE, or a job at McDonalds. I'll stay with this job.

Any job pays more than what you were before, which was NOT an EE.

>> Perhaps getting rid of the deadwood and thieves is EXACTLY what they
>>need.
>
>Acually, thats the nature of this job. Its a low paying job and alot of
><unrecorded> cash flows there.

"Unrecorded cash"...?!?! In a licensed business...?!?!?

Nope...whatever you're doing, Vippy, well paid or not, it sure sounds
illegal to me. No LEGITIMATE business in the United States deals in
"unrecorded" cash.

>Many would be tempted to take some, believing it
>would not get noticed. ANYone would steal in this type of job.

Anyone with any amount of self respect would stay there any longer than to
find out what's going on then get out.

Steve, K4CAP

2228. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 04:24:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608002432.25052.00000459@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 68377

In article <20030607162512.12501.00000072@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.
>>
>>http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A
>.shtml
>>
>Cecil,
>
>Thanks for posting this! A true policy issue.

That Associated Press wire story by David Ho ran in most news-papers on 5 Jun 03. It had little substance to it, hardly more than a "filler" piece to anyone watching the US civil radio regulations.

>Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:

The article had NO "threats to amateur radio" since amateur radio wasn't even mentioned. Only three specific user groups were cited: Cellular telephony, military radio, and public safety users (police, fire). The World Radio Conference beginning shortly in Geneva was briefly mentioned in the LA Times AP article printing.

>1) The new technology folks obviously want more VHF/UHF allocations, and ours
>are an obvious target. Some are protected by international treaty, but others
>are not.

Considerable bandspace has already been vacated by the military and the changeover to DTV from NTSC TV in TV BC channel reallotment. I would suggest perusing the FCC and ITU website before trying to be a Sumner editorialist.

The bandspace free-up has been on-going for about six years now. If you have compared the "international allocations" versus those of the US on UHF and higher, you will find that very few of the UHF and higher bands of the USA are "protected by any ITU treaty." See the BIG chart in Part 2, Title 47 CFR.

>2) Other new technology folks are bothered by Part 15 and Part 95 rules which
>limit their ability to radiate RF.

Only for consumer electronics products (not mentioned by Ho's article). There is considerably MORE of non-consumer electronics such as the Part 27 bands (which reach up to 5 GHz) and the UWB devices.

One out of three Americans are cellular telephone subscribers now
according to the US Census Bureau. That is roughly 100 MILLION
cell phone users...all using the EM spectrum in a small band
centered around 1 GHz. The cellular telephone has become an
almost indespensible part of American life.

>The proposed "Power Line Communication"
>stuff is an example.

Ho's article did not mention those things, didn't even touch on the
power distribution signalling and telemetry. Neither did Ho touch
on the (approximately) 5 different high-speed digital LAN systems
using existing electric power wiring ("PowerPlug" as an example).

>These folks don't want allocations - they simply want to
>do things that will adversely impact others' use of the spectrum.

"Those folks" argue their cases rather well according to the public
files of the FCC. The ARRL has not been as persuasive as in the
past on issues directly affecting US amateur radio.

There is NO "God-given" right to amateur radio allocations,
despite what many amateur purists insist. Sad to say for so
many hams, US amateur radio could cease right now and life in
the vast majority of the USA would continue on without any
impact from that cessation. Today the number of non-amateur
radio users far outnumber the amateur users of the spectrum.

Amateurs have no more "right" than any other radio user to the
spectrum, despite what many think. Once you understand that,
the overall regulatory picture is clearer. "Those folks" are not out
there "simply to do things affecting others' use of the spectrum"...
any more than amateurs are doing things to affect non-amateur
users.

>How do we fight these challenges?

You could begin by trying to be realistic about spectrum use.
It would benefit everyone to access public information sources
(the FCC web site as primary) other than ARRL web pages.
That is far more difficult than getting encapsulated snippets
doled out by ARRL as it sees fit to publish. Your choice.

One way to begin being realistic is to understand that there has
already been a great deal of EM spectrum re-allocation going on
for half a decade in the USA. It's been public knowledge for all
that time...but few bother to check it out. There are more potential
spectrum users out there, wanting a chunk of the spectrum for
their services. Those services are likely to affect far more
American civilians' radio use than amateurs playing in ham bands..

2229. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 07:37:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbup3ihmh0@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 68378

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 6/7/03 12:16 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030607131602.07323.00000742@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
> >McDonalds is 35K for a manager there. Lets see. This job that pays more than
> >I
> >made as an EE, or a job at McDonalds. I'll stay with this job.
>
> Any job pays more than what you were before, which was NOT an EE.
>
> >> Perhaps getting rid of the deadwood and thieves is EXACTLY what they
> >>need.
> >
> >Acually, thats the nature of this job. Its a low paying job and alot of
> ><unrecorded> cash flows there.
>
> "Unrecorded cash"...?!?! In a licensed business...?!?!?
>
> Nope...whatever you're doing, Vippy, well paid or not, it sure sounds
> illegal to me. No LEGITIMATE business in the United States deals in
> "unrecorded" cash.
>
> >Many would be tempted to take some, believing it
> >would not get noticed. ANYone would steal in this type of job.
>
> Anyone with any amount of self respect would stay there any longer than to
> find out what's going on then get out.

Steve, Vippy hasn't figured out yet that he's gonna be a numbers runner for the mob.

2230. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 12:20:52 UTC
From: "H. Adam Stevens" <solo@totalaccess.net>
Message-ID: <ve6ai985o3dt49@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

At least he invented FM first.
Broadcasters (Sarnoff et al) suck.
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hg51b44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 19:32:35 -0500, H. Adam Stevens wrote:
>
> >Hey folks.
> >Armstrong gave up and jumped; Look it up.
>
> The main reason leading to Armstrong's depression and suicide was
> his pal, David Sarnoff, stealing his patents.
>
> Had he waited, he would have been vindicated when Sarnoff/RCA was
> found liable for same shortly after and was ordered to pay
> Armstrong's estate a sizeable sum.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

2231. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 12:46:49 UTC
From: Henry Kalbertson <hkw@clevlectroncomm.com>
Message-ID: <bbvb7i$vt6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68380
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jay "Boogieman" Edwards" <boogie350@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns939398E854888boogie350NOSPAMyahoo@216.168.3.44...
> As one of my town's old "pre-consolidation" afternoon drive jock's would
> have said...
>
> "Who'da thunk it"...
>
> Of six people in my job bank at work, three of us, including myself, are
> into pirate radio. THREE out of SIX!! We had never met before our jobs
were
> cut and we were placed in the job bank. One of them says he knows of
> another four people in the plant who have pirate stations running. I
> personally know of probably a dozen others as well. I've been tinkering
> with this hobby for over 20 years and never really paid much attention to
> the expansion, but to take a look around the web, it's pretty evident that
> the pirate radio movement is mushrooming... big time!
>
> Primers, tutorials and plans are easy to find. Transmitters are now easy
to
> get ahold of. A quick search through ebay's "completed items" shows
several
> dozen "suitable" transmitters have sold recently (not including cheapie
> ba1404-type "pocket" modulators for ipods, etc).
>
> There are at least 4 pirate that I know of in the Detroit area and a few
> more up north. One local pirate station was recently featured in a local
TV
> newscast, broadcasting several hundred watts of anti-government
> programming. They showed his "broadcasting compound", complete with a
Comet
> ground plane on a 75 foot tower, "No Trespassing" signs and barbed wire
> fences.
>
> With the likes of Cume-U-Less and Clear Channel taking our quality local
> stations and pasteurizing them into a satellite-fed mush suitable for
> feeding hogs, it's no suprise to me that the movement is exploding as it
> is. People are sick and tired of being bombarded with the same 200 song
> playlists and 20 minutes of commercials an hour. Stations no longer serve
> their communities, but only the intrests of the chain's stockholders. It
> seems to me that the people are telling both the media giants and the FCC
> "take this" and signing on their own stations in rebellion.
>
> More power to 'em!!

Unlicensed Low-power FM broadcasting is growing by leaps and bounds. Equipment is being sold at hamfests across the country, and one can hear discussions about the subject on VHF ham radio. Web sites which provide technical advice and technical discussions are also growing in numbers with new web sites coming on line all the time. Equipment can be purchased via the internet at hundreds of web sites. Owners and operators of such stations are being interviewed by newspapers and other media. Public demand and support for this type of operation is growing by quantum leaps. Unlicensed LPFM is not only here to stay but is growing at an unprecedented rate.

Henry Kalbertson
Richardson & Villanova Engineering Consultants
(since 1957)

2232. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 13:14:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306080514.79dcb9f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bbrgj6$q5j$0@208.207.71.138>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >
> > The Alaska Emergency Freq (5167.5 mHz)is apparently "owned" by the
> > Alaska State Troopers. You should relate to that
>
> Yeah, I used to be acquainted with a ham who had retired from that org. He was the guy who
> told me about them building all thost T^2FD antennas using Radio Shack inductive resistors as
> the terminators because they worked better than non-inductive typed. But I guess they had to
> put someone in charge of it.

Hee! Yeah, 5167.5 is a pretty wide band . . .

> > . . . everybody and
> > their cousins have access to it. Mountain S&R outfits, hams, boats &
> > ships, medical types, police, bush pilots, remote hunting & fishing
> > lodges, etc. In addition to the Troopers monitoring the freq 24/365,
> > so does the USCG, FAA, and the military on the gov't side.
>
> I imagine it's a fre-for-all at times, but I doubt they'd tolerate much nonsense.
> There emergency conditions can be any and all the time.

It's a very nasty place to get stuck, lost or messed up, ya can die
fast and ugly in their WX. An all-inclusive net makes sense where pole
lines and roads are few and far between. I keep trying to imagine what
a freq like 5167.5 would sound like in Southern California.

I remember reading an article somewhere a long time ago about the
outback VKs having a similar network. All their ranches were equipped
with HF stations and nearest civil authorities monitored the freqs.
Ranch hands carried horseback portables when they were camped in the
boondocks tending the herds. John Wayne with a reddio and a
Winchester. The Outbackers also took it to another level and used
their HF equipment for conducting on-the-air interactive three Rs
classes for the kids. As opposed to 200 mile one-way trips in yellow
buses, etc. Probably resulted in a lotta eight year old kids who were
a bit shaky academically but were pretty decent radio ops.

> > That's one reason why the MARS
> > & CAP freqs are (always?) just outside the ham bands.
>

> Actually that goes back to the days when most hams had to depend on their
> rig's frequency overlap beyond the band edges to get it to work MARS. Most had 25 to 50
khz
> overlap past the band edges and the MARS frequencies were deliberately installed within
those
> overlaps.
> . MARS woulda had darn few members otherwise. The diode snip routine is more of a modern
> artifact.

Yer right. When I was a CAP op we used Gonset Communicators on a freq
just above 148.0 mHz and a mix of USAF castoffs & ham gear on HF. Been
awhile but as I recall our sqdn. HF base station consisted of an xtal
controlled Johnson Viking and a USAF BC-348 type rcvr.

> > 60M is not "just outside any ham band". I'd do a lot of research on
> > any of the published mods for my xcvrs before I got the tools out.
> >
> > Smoke = $$$
> >
>
> Betcha. Also seems likely some will find this out the hard way.

Not me. I prefer learning from from somebody elses screwups. "Stay
tuned to yer xcvr's reflector for the 60M smoke reports" . . .

>
> Dick

w3rv

2233. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 14:40:52 UTC
From: "Jay \"Boogieman\" Edwards" <boogie350@NOSPAMyahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93946CD30B4D4boogie350NOSPAMyahoo@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 68382
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Unlicensed Low-power FM broadcasting is growing by leaps
> and bounds. Equipment is being sold at hamfests across the
> country, and one can hear discussions about the subject on
> VHF ham radio. Web sites which provide technical advice and
> technical discussions are also growing in numbers with new web
> sites coming on line all the time. Equipment can be purchased
> via the internet at hundreds of web sites. Owners and operators
> of such stations are being interviewed by newspapers and other
> media. Public demand and support for this type of operation is
> growing by quantum leaps. Unlicensed LPFM is not only here
> to stay but is growing at an unprecedented rate.

It seems more people are willing to take the risk in running an "illegal" transmitter nowdays, but for those who are still shy on the idea, there was once a discussion somewhere regarding a "two channel, repeater approach" to micropower broadcasting for those who fear FCC punishment.

One transmitter originates the programming, then is picked up and retransmitted on a second frequency, and this is repeated infinitely across the vicinity until all nulls and gaps are covered by both frequencies. The repeaters would simply be something like an inexpensive digital radio feeding an inexpensive transmitter. The whole works could be built into a watertight ammo can and could be totally self contained. All it would need is a little tweaking and a fresh battery now and then. If I'm not mistaken, this is being tried in a couple areas already.

It certainly can't compare in terms of quality to a single transmitter covering the entire area at a higher power, but it *would* work if someone does not want to risk running a large TX fron their home. It would be a multipath nightmare, but it would work to "bend the rules" and have a larger coverage area "legally".

It would, however, require the cooperation of others in the community as far as locating transmitters is concerned.

Of course, it would be much easier (and certainly preferable) to simply build a link and run a larger TX at a different location.

2234. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 15:24:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608112407.22953.00000997@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68383

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>You, young Mr. Vipul Shah, the square peg of
>RRAP, will decide which educational material is worthless

Traditional education is fine for you. I won't allow it for my children. I will look into homeschooling and charter schools.

Even charter schools don't go far enough. Also, homeschoolers still have to meet minimum SAT or MCAS scores. This is unfair to those that don't believe in those things.

>much
>as you've decided which of the amateur radio licensing requirements are
>worthless.

Yes, code is worthless.

>Those don't sound like worthless courses to me, Vipul.

I never used them again in EE or anywhere else. If those classes were cut, I would still "learn how to think" in the remaining classes. More so, if the subject matter <and methods> are useful.

>What makes you
>so special?

I want quality education.

>...and Vipu Shah is a special kind of guy, the kind of guy who'd like to
>not take required courses which he finds "worthless".

Education is expensive, and time consuming.

>> This affects any course, whether you take an economics course or an EE
>course.
>> (Less true of EE courses, but still true).
>
>I can envision you as an Econ student, demanding to tinker with Federal
>Reserve Bank policy issues.

There should be enough course offerings to take quality courses and not be stuck with lower quality courses. Also, courses should be evaluated on their usefulness.

Also, allow private educational companies to offer courses that compete with schools and offer credit for them. The same college credit you would get from your college. Most people take required non-major courses for credits. However, if <requirement meeting> course was offered, but with practical applications

and non-traditional methods (not just sitting at a desk), many would chose to learn something.

>Sorry, Vipul, you didn't really "show" anything. You merely led us
>through the maze that is your thinking process.

Its the total person. A person that can recite Shakespeare, but cannot change a flat tire is less useful than the reverse. Tires do not listen to Shakespeare.

I once took an expensive camping "course". The person taught several types of knots. But, he did not tie anything with those knots! Not even a tent. Also, It was more a lecture format, than actually doing something. One learns more by building something.

Also, they tried to cover many <unrelated> topics. It is better to do a small focus skill well, than just introduce to many areas and not do any of them well.

I did not learn anything. I still don't remember those knots.

Just a month ago, I went on a camping DXpedition with a random group of Hams. It was not expensive and I learned alot more.

There was a real purpose and theme of the whole event. The theme of the event was operating and contesting on several radio modes. It had a definite sequence of activities, from setup of antennas to takedown.

That's the difference between worthless skills and worthwhile experiences.

>> I need to find quality homeschooling.
>
>Might I suggest looking in someone else's home?

It takes a village...

>I guess your kids will come up short when it comes time to enter a
>university. They likely will not be accepted.

No, not at all. I've heard of another (not me) that made the case that they could learn something and that person was allowed to take a year off and make up the grade later. That person got accepted into a <great> college.

Okay, the person still had to make up the class. But, the point is there are still ways to fit the useful courses in. I will have to look at homeschool, charter school, making up grades (like that person did), and other options.

Also, if there is a need, I will hire a lawyer.

2235. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 15:31:21 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608113121.22953.00000999@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68384

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays

>There simply aren't enough hours for a college to teach a person
>everything. They teach a basic approach and from there it is up to you.

The basic approach is sitting at a desk. This method will not cover the
required material, regardless of what subject is taught. If gave an example of
the camping course I took.

> Since pop
>culture, movies, music, and sports have nothing to do with your EE major,
>why do you consider them worthwhile

Because these skills are useful.

yet consider literature, biology,
>physics, etc worthless???

Because I can't use this knowledge anywhere.

>There is competition. There are many universities and colleges to choose
>from. The requirements vary from one to another.

All teach traditional education. Therefore, no competition.

2236. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 15:37:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030608113705.14458.00000106@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68385

In article <bbu5ih$dj8li$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Seems like I remember someone offering a similar wish as to intention to
>ALL no-coders (regardless of the specific individual) in this newsgroup.
>Do I smell hypocrisy??
>
>
>--
>Ryan, KC8PMX

Ryan:

If you can "Google up" the the exact quote where I say that I want "ALL
no-coders" to suffer a horrible fate such as to "die in an alcohol-induced
stupor," I assure you that I will offer an immediate and most contrite
apology. But not one second before. However, unless and until YOU
can produce such a quote, I expect YOUR apology to be just as forthcoming.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2237. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 16:22:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608122241.24635.00000289@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68386

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie@townsqr.com
>Date: 6/8/03 2:37 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bbup3ihmh0@208.206.142.75>

>Steve, Vippy hasn't figured out yet that he's gonna be a numbers runner for
>the
>mob.

THAT'S IT! I knew I was missing something! Thanks, Dick!

73

Steve, K4CAP

2238. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 16:23:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608122301.11451.00000299@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68387

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> Any job pays more than what you were before, which was NOT an EE.

I am not an EE now. Isn't that enough for you? Why do you keep saying that I was not an EE before?

>No LEGITIMATE business in the United States deals in
>"unrecorded" cash.

Its a legitimate business.

It becomes unrecorded when the employee gives items or service and accepts cash, and does not report it to the employer.

>>Many would be tempted to take some, believing it
>>would not get noticed. ANYone would steal in this type of job.
>
> Anyone with any amount of self respect would stay there any longer than
>to
>find out what's going on then get out.

If someone takes something off the shelf, it is likely to get noticed. Not reporting cash and hiding transactions is more effective.

Its also challenging because there are many ways to hide transactions. One way is they could charge the customer more, and record a lower amount, and keep the difference.

Alot of cash is handled daily. And the employees don't make much. I believe anyone would steal under this situation. Suppliers steal also. Therefore, steps should be taken to minimize this.

The current manager warned me that this is a risky job. My pay will be tied to how well I keep track of and control the transactions.

Thats not my only job duties, of course. I have to serve customers also. Its not a glamorous job. However, one does not get this job without the right connections, which I luckily had. I will accept it because what it is paying (if less money lost) is well worth the risk.

2239. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 16:37:55 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608123755.22953.00001003@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68388

Here's what a Morser may experience:

I must admit, CW was a guilty pleasure - until recently. CW filled my empty soul. It seemed so easy. Learn a skill - gain instant admiration. It gave me purpose, a goal, an ideal. It allowed me to reverse, where in the rest of society, I did not accomplish. Societal inversion. Social distortion. And all supported by a widely recognized amateur radio license structure. You see, to advance to the next license class, one must learn this Morse code skill. It allowed me to feel superior to others that did not learn this skill.

It was a source of pride, having this skill.

Then it went bad. I became obsessed about increasing my speed. I started to feel great highs and lows. Every source of animal flesh was devoured. I jogged - believing it would increase my CW skill. The spouse was avoided. I became anti-social. I became confrontational.

And this skill was important to society, I told myself.

I imagined a secret society of people that could instantly translate real-time Morse code transmissions. A select group of individuals from all professions would have the common bond of real time Morse code recognition. Secret meetings would be held to discuss issues relating to this activity. Those that did not have this ability would be eliminated.

I know that, like riding a bicycle, once one learns CW, one cannot forget it.

Then, it happened. Like a wolf, which can hear the faintest sound, I had the ability to instantly translate Morse code. Everything began to look like CW. I saw road signs. I instantly translated it. At first this was fun, then it was annoying. Now a curse - it occupies me constantly. I needed an "exorcism".

I seeked relief from this pain.

Luckily, I am recovering. I saw my spouse, still understanding. Then, I realized what's important. Now, I feel freer than ever. Able to enjoy life. The sun is shining. The air is fresh. It's a brand new day.

2240. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 17:31:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bbvrt7$s4j$0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 68389

Vshah101 wrote:

> Here's what a Morser may experience:
>

> It's a brand new day.

But you're still a stale old troll.

2241. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 19:24:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608152458.27503.00000412@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68391

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hg51b44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 19:32:35 -0500, H. Adam Stevens wrote:
>
>>Hey folks.
>>Armstrong gave up and jumped; Look it up.
>
> The main reason leading to Armstrong's depression and suicide was
> his pal, David Sarnoff, stealing his patents.

Sorry, but there is a great deal missing in that claim.

In 1920 Armstrong sold rights to two of his patents to Westinghouse for $335,000. He traded rights to the superregenerative receiver for a big block of (then new) RCA Corporation stock. Leaving the US Army with rank of Major and the recipient of the French Legion of Honor, Armstrong wasn't exactly a pauper then.

Armstrong was emeshed in a big patent fight with Lee deForest from 1922 to 1934, eventually leading to a Supreme Court case (Armstrong lost). Both Westinghouse and RCA Corporation were on Armstrong's side. Professional associations didn't go along with the federal courts and honored Armstrong for his achievements (he was the first recipient of IRE's medal).

From 1934 on to 1940 Armstrong was involved in several different patent fights with others, even while developing wideband FM broadcasting. The FM quality was not yet recognized due to an unfortunate early supposition of technical quality from some AT&T types thinking that it would not be static free (they hadn't thought about the limiter effect enough).

1940 FCC decision to move FM broadcasting up from the 40 MHz region to its present band was a financial burden to Armstrong's fledgling BC organization. Armstrong had funded most of that development with his own money.

Various patent suits continued on into the post-WW2 period. Ed's wife got tired of all that court battling and left him. That and some physical illnesses left Armstrong very depressed. He suicided on January 31, 1954.

> Had he waited, he would have been vindicated when Sarnoff/RCA was
> found liable for same shortly after and was ordered to pay
> Armstrong's estate a sizeable sum.

In actuality, Armstrong's widow eventually won no less that 21 patent infrigement suits against as many corporations and won about $10 million total restitution.

Continuing to portray RCA Corporation and David Sarnoff in a bad light is incorrect. RCA had backed Armstrong in pre-WW2 suits and Armstrong continued to earn dividends from RCA stock.

If it is any consolation, remember that Sarnoff was a morseman and that RCA Corporation was a creation from part of General Electric...the same corporation that bought RCA in the 1980s. :-)

2242. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 19:25:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608152500.27503.00000413@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68390

In article <RZxEa.598$a7.272516@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030605210725.03776.00000066@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> From (N2EY)
>>
>> [snip]
>> Some worthless courses I had to take: literature (just to meet requirement),
>> biology, physics (not for electronics), linear algebra (very worthless),
Pascal
>> (should have had C class, no one uses Pascal), probability.
>
>Actually you missed the entire point of these classes. I will address the
>requirement of Pascal as an example. The point of that class was to teach
>you structured programming. The best language to do that in is Pascal as it
>is inherent in the language itself and you must structure your program to
>make it work.

Sorry, but that "structuring" is no more inherent to Pascal (or Ada) than
with any other computer programming language, high level to assembler.

"Structuring" and "structured programming" are just buzzwords. What
they originally meant was LOGICAL construction of statements in the
program but some PR-oriented gurus embraced it as a talisman word
in promoting some computer languages over others.

>Once you learn good programming techniques such as structured
>programming, the techniques can be transfered to other programming languages
>even though the other languages don't require quite so much structure.

ALL computer programs require a logical structure. ALL. There are
no exceptions. It was so since the first computer language and
continues today.

>Once
>you have learned PROGRAMMING, switching computer languages is no big deal.

Rubbish. All of the higher-level computer programs have differing
syntax and statement structures. Compare them all and you will
NOT find anything common to them except for the need in all to be
logical in structure.

>If you had learned what was taught, you had a solid foundation upon which to
>build. There simply aren't enough hours for a college to teach a person
>everything. They teach a basic approach and from there it is up to you.

That is often viewed as an academician's cop-out, a rationale to explain their importance in the scheme of things.

The "solid foundation" is another buzzword used by colleges and universities. Those haven't figured out if they are a basic training camp or some kind of institute of higher learning...they can't be both.

The closest approach to "a solid foundation" is mathematics as applied to electronics technology. Electronics (radio is a subset of that) requires mathematics to apply exact component values for a circuit or system...and to explain operation of same. A thorough basic mathematics knowledge is necessary from algebra and simple trigonometry...but higher-level mathematics is less useful in inverse proportion to level.

The thing about higher-level math is that it makes the paper writer look so absolutely Learned and Knowledgeable. Lots of high-level math may look absolutely wizard on paper but it is seldom useful in explaining the purpose of a paper on some subject...except perhaps as a scientific sort of phenomenon explanation that seldom has any practical explanation. The Appearance of a paper is far too often taken as the criteria rather than the subject itself. Image is all.

One of the worst, illogical, badly-structured statements is that "learning a foreign language teaches one the proper skills for English." That's one of the worst rationales in academia and totally impractical in the real world. One learns a foreign language in order to be skilled in that language, not English. One learns English in order to be skilled in English, not some other language.

>Plus you need to keep building on the foundation the rest of your life. The
>school cannot do it for you.

Corporate personnel departments are unable to reference "the rest of anyone's life" but they will readily accept graduation certificates as proof of having learned something. Personnel personnel ("human resources specialists") are almost universally deficient in grading anyone's life experience up to the point of the initial interview, thus the need for all those academic certificates showing "proof."

That's one of the reasons for the FINAL decision interviewing done by corporate departments' department personnel (the ones who do the real work). They know what is required and lots of fancy certification isn't always the criterion for performance in the corporation.

>For example, I was required to take FORTRAN as a programming language in
>school. Building on that, I later learned several programming languages
>long after I was out of college. These included Pascal, C, several variants
>of BASIC, QBASIC, and Visual Basic.

I've never taken any programming languages in formal college classes. I didn't know that such were so necessary so I just bought Dan McCracken's softcover book explaining Fortran IV programming. In

less than three months of off-work self-study I could write working programs. It helped to have some background experience in the logical statement writing of programs for the HP 9100 calculator, that not requiring any formal classroom training either.

All of the Basics are subsets-modifications of Fortran, a language that applies well to iterative formula calculation. If one needs calculation of numbers, Fortran (or FORTRAN for programming purists) is the easiest to use since it "speaks" in formulas.

Pascal was originally the "odd man out" in a different syntactical set and attempt at "universality" of program languages. Its' proponents were probably intimidated by mathematical formulas, therefore they nay-sayed the formula-oriented languages. Cobol is apparently despised since it is oriented towards business purposes (therefore not "pure") and has simpler mathematical formula statements. Pascal morphed into C and the first C evolved into C++. Syntax of C++ is almost incomprehensible to Fortran writers, not at all the alleged "ease" of transference from formulas to universally-structured top-down whatsis buzzwords of C writing.

>Automechanics is a vocational school course not a college class.

Impure! Impure! How dare anyone equate a Vocational course to the college level! :-)

Good grief...talk about academic-intellectual snobbery! :-)

Any good hands-on EE needs some vocational (hack, ptui) skills to be able to work in the lab and in the field. Electrons, fields and waves don't give diddly on someone's certificates or rankings in the academic or personnel world.

Electrons, fields and waves don't care squat about political science courses, history of the country, foreign language learning, or achieving top-ten in grades or classroom work. They work by their own physics laws. Obey those and you can make them work for you.

Of course, morse code skills are on the vocational level, aren't they? :-)

2243. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 19:29:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <18MEa.1445$a7.395632@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68392

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030608113121.22953.00000999@mb-m13.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays
>
> >There simply aren't enough hours for a college to teach a person
> >everything. They teach a basic approach and from there it is up to you.
>
> The basic approach is sitting at a desk. This method will not cover the
> required material, regardless of what subject is taught. If gave an
example of
> the camping course I took.
>

You have to take the personal responsibility to get off your behind and
practice applying it. It's up to you to build upon what you are taught.
Nobody is going to take you by the hand and spoon feed an education.

> > Since pop
> >culture, movies, music, and sports have nothing to do with your EE major,
> >why do you consider them worthwhile
>
> Because these skills are useful.

Nope. They are not "useful". Pop culture changes at such a fast pace, that
it is pointless to study it. What use is there in studying movies? They do
not contribute to the skills you need in any facet of your daily life. Same
with music and sports. Unless you go into one of these fields to make your
living, they are all useless. However they are all enriching and if a
person is interested, they are worth studying for that reason alone.

>
> yet consider literature, biology,
> >physics, etc worthless???
>
> Because I can't use this knowledge anywhere.
>

Studying literature is just as useful or useless as studying music or
movies. Actually it is more useful as it makes studying English much more
pleasant. And in this country it certainly helps to be proficient at
English.

Having an understanding of biology and physics will prevent you from
sounding like an idiot in discussions with other people. Such subjects do
come up among educated people from time to time especially when an
interesting news article comes along to spark the discussion. That alone

makes them worthwhile.

> >There is competition. There are many universities and colleges to choose
> >from. The requirements vary from one to another.
>
> All teach traditional education. Therefore, no competition.

Well obviously there is not a sufficient market for alternative forms of education. In this country, if there's a market, someone will produce the product. Again, if you think the traditional is insufficient, there is NOTHING but yourself stopping you from filling in the gaps on your own.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2244. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 20:23:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608162314.10078.00000101@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68393

In article <20030604000926.08632.00000687@mb-m24.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>Ya go where the money is, Vippy.
>
>Thats right. Believe me, I felt cheapened more in the EE profession that
>anything

Reminds me of a line from the TV comedy "Frasier", in which Dr. Niles Crane, (played by David Hyde Pierce) has done something very uncharacteristic for him:

"It makes me feel so...dirty.

And I LIKE it!"

Joking aside, EE has never made me feel "cheapened".

2245. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 22:50:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE3BDEE.3010007@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68394

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> Nope. They are not "useful". Pop culture changes at such a fast pace, that
> it is pointless to study it.

It's almost quantum like in that the any examination of it alters the
outcome.

<snippage>

> Having an understanding of biology and physics will prevent you from
> sounding like an idiot in discussions with other people.

Too late Dee!

> Such subjects do
> come up among educated people from time to time especially when an
> interesting news article comes along to spark the discussion. That alone
> makes them worthwhile.

All the time, Dee.

What our good Mr. Shah does not realize is that nothing occurs in a
vacuum. A person that assumes they "know" what portions of their
education are worthwhile, and what parts are not, and is willing to
forgo those parts they declare useless, is showing a strange combination
of ignorance and hubris.

I use bits and pieces of my whole education all the time.

But then again, we are talking about a person who will help hams put up
an antenna, but not take it down because he does not "learn as much"
doing that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2246. Re: Solar Storms - CW Still Gets Through

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-08 23:51:19 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <XZPEa.621474$Si4.565547@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 68395

.
>
> I seeked relief from this pain.
>
> Luckily, I am recovering. I saw my spouse, still understanding. Then, I
> realized what's important. Now, I feel freer than ever. Able to enjoy
life. The
> sun is shining. The air is fresh. It's a brand new day.

I suggest going on a fast ....perhaps sitting on a mountain with a jug of water and no food .....I think you will get the answers that plague you soon enough .....

CW always gets through will be your mantra ..... I knew we would get you you sooner or later .....

See you on 40 ..... CW always gets through ...CW always gets through ....CW always gets through .....

73 God Bless Tom KI3R in Port Vue for the last day .....PA

2247. Re: Ham radio = toast?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 00:11:48 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <u6QEa.24054$DI.962@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68396

"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bbqgtn$h3f$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> I suspect there are some people in this here chatrum who don't even
> acknowledge the existence of amateur radio activity above 30MHz, but for
> those who aren't living in the 1920s, here is another reason for concern
> about VHF and above allocations.
>
> This time it's from W himself:
>
> "We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of U.S.
> spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available to
> support critical government functions."
>
>
http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A.shtml
>
> Do ARRL and/or radio amateurs have an answer? Does that answer have
> enough zeros before the decimal point if you know what I mean wink wink
> nudge nudge say no more say no more?
>
> 73 Corry K4DOH

Well, unlocking any of the amateur spectrum that is actually used by hams would be somewhat counterproductive.

It just wouldn't work.

Say the 20m band was given or sold to a private company. With thousands of antennas and transceivers already set up to transmit in the new Corporate frequency, there would be so many pirate transmissions by the former users as to render the band useless to the new owners. Also, the rest of the world would not necessarily follow W, thus I think all of the HF bands are frozen in the amateur domain. VHF may or may not be useable by a buyer, depending upon the amount the amateur hardware in the field. I wouldn't give UPS much of a chance on actually using 144-148MHz, no matter how much they paid for it. 220MHz? Obviously not a problem because it was not used. If amateurs would actually use the allocations and make or purchase hardware for it, the more unattractive it would become to prospective buyers. And selling 27MHz or anything near the CB allocation would be similar to selling the Brooklyn bridge or ocean front property in Nevada. We shouldn't worry so much; we should just use our allocations and forget it about this 'threat that I have heard ever since becoming a ham 10 years ago.

73

de KR4AJ

2248. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 00:15:03 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <ve7kf113fsui9b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68397
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil,

Hummmm. If you can not transmit CW and its not a Amatuer Band,
could the FCC allow Tech to operate on the band?

What was the FCC reasoning for the allocation?

Will five channel enable a significate amount increase
communications to make this worth the effort?

Larry, KC8EPO

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hg2zyqi.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Fri, 06 Jun 2003 10:26:45 GMT, Scrounger wrote:
>
> >Well, if you can't do CW here, then it must not be a real Amateur Band.
>
> It's not - it's five channels in the Fixed and Mobile Services where
> amateur operators can operate om a secondary basis.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

2249. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 00:55:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608205512.21466.00000247@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68398

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo

>What our good Mr. Shah does not realize is that nothing occurs in a
>vacuum.

This proves my point further. Traditional education assumes that everything occurs in a vacuum.

>A person that assumes they "know" what portions of their
>education are worthwhile, and what parts are not, and is willing to
>forgo those parts they declare useless, is showing a strange combination
>of ignorance and hubris.

The useful subjects occur frequently, while the not so useful course subjects rarely occur. Its foolish to do exercises for the infrequently occuring subjects, when the frequently needed knowledge is unlearned.

>I use bits and pieces of my whole education all the time.

Good for you. I tried to pay someone using traveller's checks and the person did not know that I could do that. This person must have went to school. Yet this person did not know how to accept my payment.

I'm sure that flat tire got fixed when you recited Shakepeare to it or calculated Fourier Transforms.

2250. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 01:18:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608211828.21466.00000250@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68399

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

I agree with everything you said here. You seem to understand and agree what I was saying about traditional education and you explained it very well.

>>Actually you missed the entire point of these classes. I will address the
>>requirement of Pascal as an example. The point of that class was to teach
>>you structured programming.

>Rubbish. All of the higher-level computer programs have differing
> syntax and statement structures. Compare them all and you will
> NOT find anything common to them except for the need in all to be
> logical in structure.

Pascal was already out of use at that time and C was in use. The university could have taught C, they just didn't. They were wrong in doing that. It makes no sense to study Pascal when companies ask for C.

>They teach a basic approach and from there it is up to you.
>
> That is often viewed as an academician's cop-out, a rationale to
> explain their importance in the scheme of things.

Yes, its a way for them to explain why they didn't teach you anything useful. They say they are just teaching the basic approach. Unfortunately, most people do not examine the educational system and believe this nonsense. Instead, they should be asking for higher quality.

>Those haven't figured out if they are a basic training
> camp or some kind of institute of higher learning...they can't be both.

They say they teach, they don't train. Its just another excuse not to provide the useful skills in that particular subject.

> Personnel personnel ("human
> resources specialists") are almost universally deficient in grading
> anyone's life experience up to the point of the initial interview, thus
> the need for all those academic certificates showing "proof."

Thats another issue, but I agree with you on that also.

>They know what is required and lots of fancy
> certification isn't always the criterion for performance in the
> corporation.

The person that has built projects in a subject, is much better than the person that simply took a course because it was required for EE.

>>Automechanics is a vocational school course not a college class.
>
> Impure! Impure! How dare anyone equate a Vocational course
> to the college level! :-)

You are right. Its about image, more than learning useful skills.

2251. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 01:26:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE3E27C.4000407@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68400

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo
>
>
>>What our good Mr. Shah does not realize is that nothing occurs in a
>>vacuum.
>
> This proves my point further. Traditional education assumes that everything
> occurs in a vacuum.

Huh? make yourself clear.

>>A person that assumes they "know" what portions of their
>>education are worthwhile, and what parts are not, and is willing to
>>forgo those parts they declare useless, is showing a strange combination
>>of ignorance and hubris.
>
>
> The useful subjects occur frequently, while the not so useful course subjects
> rarely occur. Its foolish to do exercises for the infrequently occuring
> subjects, when the frequently needed knowledge is unlearned.

This reminds me of a Simpsons episode where Homer is telling Marge
that his head is so full of knowledge that every time he learns
something new, something he learned earlier was pushed out of memory,
leading to:

Homer: "Remember when I got that winemaking kit, Marge? I learned how
to do that, and forgot how to drive a car!"

Marge: Oh, Homer, you were just drunk!"

Homer: "Annnd How!"

It is very strange that you seem to subscribe to a model where a person
"unlearns" things. Do you have any citations in the literature of this?

>
>>I use bits and pieces of my whole education all the time.
>
>
> Good for you. I tried to pay someone using traveller's checks and the person
> did not know that I could do that. This person must have went to school. Yet
> this person did not know how to accept my payment.

I meet idiots all the time. I don't translate their idiocy to the
education system.

Remember, half of the people in the world are below average.

> I'm sure that flat tire got fixed when you recited Shakepeare to it or
> calculated Fourier Transforms.

I can fix a flat. I can rebuild an engine. I can also hold a
conversation in quantum physics (at a lay level of course) while I'm
doing it. Its a big interesting world out there. Too bad you want to
limit your knowledge to just what you think is relevant at the moment.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2252. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 02:12:21 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030608221221.21466.00000251@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68451

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo

>> This proves my point further. Traditional education assumes that everything
>> occurs in a vacuum.
>
> Huh? make yourself clear.

It assumes the only consequence of a subject is the quantifyable facts in the subject matter. The total path in practicing that subject matter is ignored. In some cases this part has a bigger impact.

Like the example of studying many kinds of knots, the history of knots, people's opinions of knots, and writing an essay on knots vs the person who used a knot as part of putting a tent up. The person who put up the tent learned alot more.

> Homer: "Remember when I got that winemaking kit, Marge? I learned how
>to do that, and forgot how to drive a car!"
>

My example is different. In my example, the person would never get a chance to use the winemaking kit so he didn't learn that at all.

>It is very strange that you seem to subscribe to a model where a person
>"unlearns" things. Do you have any citations in the literature of this?

I never said one unlearns things. I said the person never gets a chance to learn the useful skills.

>I meet idiots all the time. I don't translate their idiocy to the
>education system.

They were unable to do that because they were not taught that in school.

>Too bad you want to
>limit your knowledge to just what you think is relevant at the moment.

I don't want to learn something that I know is of no use to me.

2253. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 02:13:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hg6r2pc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68452
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 8 Jun 2003 20:15:03 -0400, lk wrote:

>Phil,
>
>Hummmm. If you can not transmit CW and its not a Amatuer Band,
>could the FCC allow Tech to operate on the band?

On an international basis it's not a ham band, but domestically the FCC is allowing ham operation on those channels. Until and unless the international requirements for a code test are lifted, it's a safe bet that non-code-exam hams won't be allowed there. It's a Catch-22 situation.

>What was the FCC reasoning for the allocation?

It was requested as an "intermediate band" between 80/75 meters and 40 meters. It would have been a wider (150 kHz) allocation without channelization except that the NTIA - the "landlord" of that portion of the spectrum - disagreed, hence the detailed restricted operation.

>Will five channel enable a significate amount increase communications
>to make this worth the effort?

Personal opinion - I doubt it. I would be happy if I were proved wrong, though.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2254. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 04:08:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68453

In article <3EE3E27C.4000407@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo

>> I'm sure that flat tire got fixed when you recited Shakepeare to it or
>> calculated Fourier Transforms.
>
> I can fix a flat. I can rebuild an engine. I can also hold a
>conversation in quantum physics (at a lay level of course) while I'm
>doing it. Its a big interesting world out there. Too bad you want to
>limit your knowledge to just what you think is relevant at the moment.

I've fixed flats, including the old inner tube tire type. So what?
I've never had to rebuild any engine but I did keep up most of
the maintenance on my '53 Austin-Healey sports car. So what?

I've hob-nobbed with physicists but none of them conversed in
or about quantum mechanics socially. :-)

I've also been out in the big interesting world and half a century
ago actually operated HF communications...lots of it and none of
it using morse code modes. But...lots of the already-licensed
INSIST on keeping that code test for amateur radio a half century
later. You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
new arguments for keeping it. :-)

2255. Re: What's worse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 04:08:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609000826.02222.00000088@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68454

In article <3EE2A2A3.5000504@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>> Senior Wensles is more how it is pronounced but I am sure my spelling is a
>> little off...
>
> Thanks Ryan. I guess my mind was somewhere else when I thought it was
>Wenches..... ;^)

While it doesn't have anything to do with amateur radio...but might
be about rather amateurish vaudeville performers from off-shore, the
character name was written as "Senior Wences" but was pronounced
with an S instead of a C.

Anyone working for a CBS affiliate would remember that and the still-
used "eye" logo. Always be ready to "take network" at one second
after the hour (or half-hour)...if the station wanted to get paid... :-)

2256. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 05:48:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609014810.05587.00000586@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68455

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/8/03 10:24 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030608112407.22953.00000997@mb-m13.aol.com>

>Traditional education is fine for you. I won't allow it for my children. I
>will
>look into homeschooling and charter schools.

"Charter schools", perhaps. It would be borderline child neglect to let
someone with YOUR views on "education" homeschool a child.

>Even charter schools don't go far enough. Also, homeschoolers still have to
>meet minimum SAT or MCAS scores. This is unfair to those that don't believe
>in
>those things.

Well, boo hoo.

>>Those don't sound like worthless courses to me, Vipul.
>
>I never used them again in EE or anywhere else. If those classes were cut, I
>would still "learn how to think" in the remaining classes. More so, if the
>subject matter <and methods> are useful.

Much of what we "use" in life is not specifically attributable to any one
moment in our educational careers. I never liked English classes myself, but I
dare say they've benefitted me to this day.

>>What makes you
>>so special?
>
>I want quality education.

You wouldn't know "quality education" if it jack-slapped you into a new
dimension.

>Education is expensive, and time consuming.

Not if you do it right.

>Also, courses should be evaluated on their usefulness.

They are. That you don't care for the results is too bad.

>Also, allow private educational companies to offer courses that compete with
>schools and offer credit for them. The same college credit you would get from
>your college. Most people take required non-major courses for credits.

>However,
>if <requirement meeting> course was offered, but with practical applications
>and non-traditional methods (not just sitting at a desk), many would chose to
>learn something.

Look into the SUNY/Excelsior Regents program, Vippy.

>>Sorry, Vipul, you didn't really "show" anything. You merely led us
>>through the maze that is your thinking process.
>
>Its the total person. A person that can recite Shakespeare, but cannot change
>a
>flat tire is less useful than the reverse. Tires do not listen to
>Shakespeare.

Nor will any tires be found in the Forbes 500. But I bet you a lot of
THOSE people who are on the list know a bit of Shakespeare.

>Also, they tried to cover many <unrelated> topics. It is better to do a small
>focus skill well, than just introduce to many areas and not do any of them
>well.

So what do you consider "unrelated" topics in a camping course, Vippy?

>I did not learn anything. I still don't remember those knots.

You must have learned something...Your writings are often in knots.

>Just a month ago, I went on a camping DXpedition with a random group of Hams.
>It was not expensive and I learned alot more.

Whats a NON-random group of hams, Vippy?

>>Might I suggest looking in someone else's home?
>
>It takes a village..

No, it does not. It takes a responsible parent.

Steve, K4CAP

2257. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 05:51:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609015147.05587.00000587@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68456

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/8/03 7:55 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030608205512.21466.00000247@mb-m20.aol.com>

>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo
>
>>What our good Mr. Shah does not realize is that nothing occurs in a
>>vacuum.
>
>This proves my point further. Traditional education assumes that everything
>occurs in a vacuum.

Just when I think Vippy couldn't be any more ludicrous or silly, he pops
yet another of my bubbles with yet another rediculous pronouncement.

>>A person that assumes they "know" what portions of their
>>education are worthwhile, and what parts are not, and is willing to
>>forgo those parts they declare useless, is showing a strange combination
>>of ignorance and hubris.
>
>The useful subjects occur frequently, while the not so useful course subjects
>rarely occur. Its foolish to do exercises for the infrequently occuring
>subjects, when the frequently needed knowledge is unlearned.

There was something to be said in there, but no one I've shown this too
can tell me what it was.

Anyone else got a clue?

>>I use bits and pieces of my whole education all the time.
>
>Good for you. I tried to pay someone using traveller's checks and the person
>did not know that I could do that. This person must have went to school. Yet
>this person did not know how to accept my payment.

And the point is?

Steve, K4CAP

2258. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 06:03:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609020313.05587.00000588@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68457

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/8/03 9:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030608221221.21466.00000251@mb-m20.aol.com>

>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo
>
>>> This proves my point further. Traditional education assumes that
>everything
>>> occurs in a vacuum.
>>
>> Huh? make yourself clear.
>
>It assumes the only consequence of a subject is the quantifyable facts in the
>subject matter. The total path in practicing that subject matter is ignored.
>In
>some cases this part has a bigger impact.

How ludicrous.

>I never said one unlearns things

WHHHHOOOOAAAAAA! YOU said that if someone is proficient at higher speeds
of Morse Code, they became UN-proficient (unlearned) Morse Code at the SLOWER
rate. So which way is it?

>>I meet idiots all the time. I don't translate their idiocy to the
>>education system.
>
>They were unable to do that because they were not taught that in school.

Gene Pool Deficiency transcends class and education.

>>Too bad you want to
>>limit your knowledge to just what you think is relevant at the moment.
>
>I don't want to learn something that I know is of no use to me.

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

This has GOT to be the BEST "VippyIdiom" I have seen yet!

What a COMPLETE freakin' idiot!

Steve, K4CAP

2259. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 06:04:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609020404.05587.00000590@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68458

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/8/03 11:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>

The scumbag's back.

It was nice while it lasted.

Steve, K4CAP

2260. Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 06:08:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609020836.05587.00000592@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68459

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/8/03 11:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>

>But...lots of the already-licensed
> INSIST on keeping that code test for amateur radio a half century
> later.

I know you disdain facts, Oh Scummy One, however it's not those unwashed masses of licensed Amateurs who are "insisting" on keeping Morse Code testing...it's those UNLICENSED folks in Gettysburg, PA.

>You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
> new arguments for keeping it.

YOU are welcomed to explain why you keep stalking licensed Amateur Radio operators online and making such obviously and patently false accusations about them.

Steve, K4CAP

2261. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 06:09:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609020957.05587.00000593@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68460

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/8/03 8:18 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030608211828.21466.00000250@mb-m20.aol.com>
>
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>I agree with everything you said here

Putz and Putzii. Two of a kind.

Sheeeesh.....

Steve, K4CAP

2262. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 06:19:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609021903.05587.00000594@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68461

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/8/03 11:23 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030608122301.11451.00000299@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>> Any job pays more than what you were before, which was NOT an EE.
>
>I am not an EE now. Isn't that enough for you? Why do you keep saying that I
>was not an EE before?

Becauase you've not provided us any evidence, either in documentation or
practice, that leads us to believe that youa re being truthful about it.

>>No LEGITIMATE business in the United States deals in
>>"unrecorded" cash.
>
>Its a legitimate business.

It may FRONT as a "legitimate" business, but if it's processing "unrecorded
acsh", it's NOT "legitimate".

>It becomes unrecorded when the employee gives items or service and accepts
>cash, and does not report it to the employer.

You need to bail out and report this place to the law, Vippy. Not a
single thing you've said about it sounds even remotely legitimate to me.

>> Anyone with any amount of self respect would stay there any longer than
>>to
>>find out what's going on then get out.
>
>If someone takes something off the shelf, it is likely to get noticed. Not
>reporting cash and hiding transactions is more effective.

...and is still just as illegal.

>Its also challenging because there are many ways to hide transactions. One
>way
>is they could charge the customer more, and record a lower amount, and keep
>the
>difference.

...and is still just as illegal.

>Alot of cash is handled daily. And the employees don't make much. I believe
>anyone would steal under this situation. Suppliers steal also. Therefore,
>steps
>should be taken to minimize this.

Illegal AND unethical.

>The current manager warned me that this is a risky job. My pay will be tied
>to
>how well I keep track of and control the transactions.

...and how well you manage to evade "the silver bullet".

>Thats not my only job duties, of course. I have to serve customers also. Its
>not a glamorous job. However, one does not get this job without the right
>connections, which I luckily had. I will accept it because what it is paying
>(if less money lost) is well worth the risk.

Funny...A buddy of mine in the Coast Guard says a lot of the doper pilots
and boaters they bring in say the very same thing.

Steve, K4CAP

2263. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 06:40:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609024022.05587.00000595@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68462

>Subject: Re: spectrum efficiency
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/7/03 11:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030608002432.25052.00000459@mb-m11.aol.com>

>In article <20030607162512.12501.00000072@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:

>>Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:
>
> The article had NO "threats to amateur radio" since amateur
> radio wasn't even mentioned. Only three specific user groups
> were cited: Cellular telephony, military radio, and public
> safety users (police, fire). The World Radio Conference
> beginning shortly in Geneva was briefly mentioned in the LA
> Times AP article printing.

Oh...I SEE....One minute you are insulting Amateurs for not being able to
see beyond thier "limited scope" of radio knowledge, and then when they
demonstrate clearly that THAT accusation was false, you try to mitigate your
lunacy by understating the truth again.

>>1) The new technology folks obviously want more VHF/UHF allocations, and
>ours
>>are an obvious target. Some are protected by international treaty, but
>others
>>are not.
>
> Considerable bandspace has already been vacated by the military
> and the changeover to DTV from NTSC TV in TV BC channel
> reallotment. I would suggest perusing the FCC and ITU website
> before trying to be a Sumner editorialist.

I am sure there was some intent or meaning here, but it never made it to
the top.

>The bandspace free-up has been on-going for about six years now.
> If you have compared the "international allocations" versus those
> of the US on UHF and higher, you will find that very few of the UHF
> and higher bands of the USA are "protected by any ITU treaty."
> See the BIG chart in Part 2, Title 47 CFR.

And we've already suffered the "bandspace free-up" in recent years.

ANY announcement of reconsideration of frequency allocations affects
Amateur Radio...Maybe not today, but certainly tomorrow.

>>The proposed "Power Line Communication"
>>stuff is an example.
>
> Ho's article did not mention those things, didn't even touch on the
> power distribution signalling and telemetry. Neither did Ho touch
> on the (approximately) 5 different high-speed digital LAN systems
> using existing electric power wiring ("PowerPlug" as an example).

Thankfully those of us with more than an inkling of the goings-on of
current radio politics know that this one article does not represent ALL
current spectrum use matters.

>Amateurs have no more "right" than any other radio user to the
> spectrum, despite what many think. Once you understand that,
> the overall regulatory picture is clearer. "Those folks" are not out
> there "simply to do things affecting others' use of the spectrum"...
> any more than amateurs are doing things to affect non-amateur
> users.

"We", however have more "right" to it by reason of licensure than YOU do,
Lennie, and that's enough for me.

Go back to wherever it was you were, Your Scumminess.

Steve, K4CAP

2264. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 08:07:10 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bc2f6u$eimek$21@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68471

Larry,

1. Re-read the line where it says "similar wish as to intention." It does not state that this person wished for IDENTICAL action to the no-coders. Again, similar does not equal exact.

2. If the line stated "Seems like I remember Larry Roll offering....." instead of the word "someone" I would be more than happy to offer an apology. How do you know I was or was not referring to you? Guilty conscience??? How do you know I wasn't referring to another person here????

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030608113705.14458.00000106@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <bbu5ih$dj8li$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Seems like I remember someone offering a similar wish as to intention to
> >ALL no-coders (regardless of the specific individual) in this newsgroup.
> >Do I smell hypocrisy??
> >
> >
> >--
> >Ryan, KC8PMX
>
> Ryan:
>
> If you can "Google up" the the exact quote where I say that I want "ALL
> no-coders" to suffer a horrible fate such as to "die in an alcohol-induced
> stupor," I assure you that I will offer an immediate and most contrite
> apology. But not one second before. However, unless and until YOU
> can produce such a quote, I expect YOUR apology to be just as forthcoming.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2265. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 08:26:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bc2f70$eimek$22@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68472

Quite simply put..... USE THE BAND OR LOSE THEM!!!!!!!!!!

2 meters is typically popularly used, but in some areas is quiet except for certain times like morning and evening drive time. 70 cm is (in my area at least) used a little bit for repeater use, but otherwise quiet. At least gear for these bands are widely available..... just wish they would make all mode 2 meter rigs and allmode 70cm rigs!!!!!

Six could start to be utilized more on a local basis if hams started to use it more. I have found that my case, mobile operation, that using SSB I have had local range use of 30-70 miles radius of my location. FM on six gets anywhere from around 10-30 miles local use (simplex) This is my personal experience. It seems like we still could use that band a little more than just during band openings. I see ham's usage of six meters akin to only caring for your kids when they are good, and totally disowning them when they are bad!

As far as 220, 902 and 1.2Ghz allocations, if there were more gear available, at a reasonable price from our bigger manufacturers (Kenwood, Icom, Yaesu, Alinco etc.) may be we would hear more on these bands. I would also like to see them make more all-mode gear for those bands, (or at least SSB) for some of the different digital modes. PSK would be cool to use on 6m, 2m, and 70cm as an alternative to packet. In fact I can see some merit in using PSK over packet in those bands for public service/emergency comms!

If we as a whole don't start using the bands.... we are gonna lose them. And I probably will be the first to say, "I told ya so!"

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030607162512.12501.00000072@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.
> >
> >
> >http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A
> .shtml
> >
> Cecil,
>
> Thanks for posting this! A true policy issue.
>
> Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:

>
> 1) The new technology folks obviously want more VHF/UHF allocations, and
ours
> are an obvious target. Some are protected by international treaty, but
others
> are not.
>
> 2) Other new technology folks are bothered by Part 15 and Part 95 rules
which
> limit their ability to radiate RF. The proposed "Power Line Communication"
> stuff is an example. These folks don't want allocations - they simply want
to
> do things that will adversely impact others' use of the spectrum.
>
> How do we fight these challenges?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2266. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 12:23:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609082312.14458.00000141@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68463

In article <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
> new arguments for keeping it. :-)
>
Why are new arguments needed when many of the existing ones are still valid?

2267. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 12:47:38 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <ve90huei6t9t58@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68464
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil,

I realize that the FCC will not change the 5mhz allocation at this point.
But could they allow Techs to operate, and not violate the ITU treaty?

And, if they did violate the treaty, what would be ITU's recourse?

If the Morse code require were determined to be unnecessary,
not in conformity with 5 USC 706, and ITU rule S25.5 remained
after WRC 2003, how would you think the court should decide
when presented with the question of no-code operation on
amateur HF bands?

Or, what are the limitation of ITU rule into the domestic
FCC rules? Your comments about some of the legal battles
between US AM broadcast stations was very interesting.
What happens when one station is in Canada, and the other is in
the USA. Probably take 100 years to resolve.

Larry, KC8EPO

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hg6r2pc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 8 Jun 2003 20:15:03 -0400, lk wrote:
>
> >Phil,
> >
> >Hummmm. If you can not transmit CW and its not a Amatuer Band,
> >could the FCC allow Tech to operate on the band?
>
> On an international basis it's not a ham band, but domestically the
> FCC is allowing ham operation on those channels. Until and unless
> the international requirements for a code test are lifted, it's a
> safe bet that non-code-exam hams won't be allowed there. It's a
> Catch-22 situation.
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2268. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 15:27:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc291h$hr7$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68465

Good one Steve...and 'Putz' is being nice.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030609020836.05587.00000592@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 6/8/03 11:08 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
> >But...lots of the already-licensed
> > INSIST on keeping that code test for amateur radio a half century
> > later.
>
> I know you disdain facts, Oh Scummy One, however it's not those
unwashed
> masses of licensed Amateurs who are "insisting" on keeping Morse Code
> testing...it's those UNLICENSED folks in Gettysburg, PA.
>
> >You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
> > insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
> > new arguments for keeping it.
>
> YOU are welcomed to explain why you keep stalking licensed Amateur
Radio
> operators online and making such obviously and patently false accusations
about
> them.
>
> Steve, K4CAP

2269. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 15:38:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE4A9E4.8010509@psu.edu>
Source record: 68466

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>
>>I guess you adhere to the vocational type education.
>
>
> No, not just vocational. A combination of technical (for example EE or other
> major), and PRACTICAL education.
>
> Competition in the education system, more importantly competition in the ideas
> of education, is the only way education will improve. And it needs change and
> improvement now. For some people, it just doesn't meet their needs.
>
>
>>Problem is that you don't really know when
>>parts of your education may be needed. Tell me what you will need 5
>>years from now.
>
>
>>How do you know what you might
>>use in the future.
>
>
> Its common sense really. Nothing that I knew that others didn't
>
> I made a list before I started my first semester of college. I looked at the
> list a few years after I graduated. The list makes alot of sense now. It is the
> useful skills I should have had.
>
>
>>Many of these are also worthwhile. I might take exception to popular
>>culture, which to me celebrates ignorance.
>
>
> Its about being aware, not being ignorant. Traditional education keeps you
> ignorant.
>
>
>>Where do you get your paradigms?
>
>
> I can see by your arguments that you don't understand the concept I am trying
> to advocate.

Which is why I just asked you your paradigms for your concept. You have to be able to explain them if you want anyone to believe them. Or do you just want us to agree based on your say-so?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2270. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 15:44:00 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bc2a00$ip0$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 68467
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"lk" (lklose@net-link.net) writes:
> Phil,
>
> I realize that the FCC will not change the 5mhz allocation at this point.
> But could they allow Techs to operate, and not violate the ITU treaty?
>
> And, if they did violate the treaty, what would be ITU's recourse?
>
Fine, so let's see international broadcasters interloping on the ham
bands.

A treaty is an agreement, likely based on some tradeoffs. We'll do
this, and you won't do that.

I have no idea about how ITU could enforce things, but the minute someone
decides that the rules don't count for them, then it just makes it easier
for someone else to see the same thing. You seem to think this doesn't
matter since it's a minor thing (I'd question why it's so important
for people who haven't passed the code test to use this puny, other
than because someone sees a false loophole), but it is the very adherance
to the treaty agreements that keep things in line. If nobody sees
the point in honoring a treaty, then it all falls apart like a house
of cards. And likely other countries, if they followed suit, would
break the treaty on far bigger issues, that will impact far greater
than this puny issue.

Michael VE2BVW

2271. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 16:47:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE4BA38.9060404@psu.edu>
Source record: 68468

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo
>
>
>>>This proves my point further. Traditional education assumes that everything
>>>occurs in a vacuum.
>>
>> Huh? make yourself clear.
>
>
> It assumes the only consequence of a subject is the quantifyable facts in the
> subject matter. The total path in practicing that subject matter is ignored. In
> some cases this part has a bigger impact.

If the student only plans on taking the test, passing it, and moving on
to the next class, you are kind of right. Thing is, the student is given
the material, and tehn must put in some effort thinking and applying it
to life.

But this is a student failure, not an educational system failure.

> Like the example of studying many kinds of knots, the history of knots,
> people's opinions of knots, and writing an essay on knots vs the person who
> used a knot as part of putting a tent up. The person who put up the tent
> learned alot more.

But the study of knots is just as important. And the history of knots
can illustrate the type of knots you *don't* want to tie.

>> Homer: "Remember when I got that winemaking kit, Marge? I learned how
>>to do that, and forgot how to drive a car!"
>>
>
>
> My example is different. In my example, the person would never get a chance to
> use the winemaking kit so he didn't learn that at all.

>>It is very strange that you seem to subscribe to a model where a person
>>"unlearns" things. Do you have any citations in the literature of this?
>
>
> I never said one unlearns things. I said the person never gets a chance to
> learn the useful skills.

You posted:

<Vipul> The useful subjects occur frequently, while the not so useful
course subjects
<Vipul>rarely occur. Its foolish to do exercises for the infrequently
occuring
<Vipul>subjects, when the frequently needed knowledge is unlearned.

>>I meet idiots all the time. I don't translate their idiocy to the
>>education system.
>
>
> They were unable to do that because they were not taught that in school.

Uh huh, The poor student isn't being taught properly by the evil,
stupid teacher. Well then, why doesn't the poor student go find someone
who can teach them then?

The student-teacher compact is about 25 % teacher, and 75% student.
While a poor teacher can have a negative inpact on the student, that
does not matter. The onus IS on the Student.

Because the fact is that the teacher is just a facilitator, giving out
the knowledge. They can't force the student to learn. All they can do is
present it, and to help explain it to the student.

And the student that does not learn then blames it on the teacher?

Let's take you for instance. Many here have taken issue with your ideas
about education. I see them laying out a rational, logical argument, as
compared to your "just so" posts. Now, consider us the teachers, and
yourself as a student. You are discarding everything we have to say on
the subject, and refusing to learn anything from it. You take an active
part in this refusal, as you talk about useless courses and material.

>>Too bad you want to
>>limit your knowledge to just what you think is relevant at the moment.
>
>
> I don't want to learn something that I know is of no use to me.

Many adolescents share the same feelings, Vipul. That is because they
are adolescents, and do not have enough life experience to realize that
what may not be of any use now, might be a real lifesaver later.

Are you an adolescent? And what is better, to learn something that you
may never use, or to miss learning something that becomes of critical
importance just because at one time, you KNEW it was of no usful purpose?

- Mike KB3EIA

2272. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 16:52:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE4BB3C.3060108@psu.edu>
Source record: 68469

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)

<some snippage>

>>I don't want to learn something that I know is of no use to me.
>
>
> BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
> HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !
>
> This has GOT to be the BEST "VippyIdiom" I have seen yet!
>
> What a COMPLETE freakin' idiot!

Ya'know, I didn't pick up on that one, Steve. How on earth does a
person know something that he doesn't know is of no use to him?

Good Grief.... now I have a headache

- Mike KB3EIA -

2273. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 16:59:37 UTC
From: charlesnewman1@attbi.com
Message-ID: <1507896e.0306090859.6f8c01c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68470
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jay \"Boogieman\" Edwards" <boogie350@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message news:<Xns93946CD30B4D4boogie350NOSPAMyahoo@216.168.3.44>...
> > Unlicensed Low-power FM broadcasting is growing by leaps
> > and bounds. Equipment is being sold at hamfests across the
> > country, and one can hear discussions about the subject on
> > VHF ham radio. Web sites which provide technical advice and
> > technical discussions are also growing in numbers with new web
> > sites coming on line all the time. Equipment can be purchased
> > via the internet at hundreds of web sites. Owners and operators
> > of such stations are being interviewed by newspapers and other
> > media. Public demand and support for this type of operation is
> > growing by quantum leaps. Unlicensed LPFM is not only here
> > to stay but is growing at an unprecedented rate.
>
> It seems more people are willing to take the risk in running an "illegal"
> transmitter nowdays, but for those who are still shy on the idea, there was

Of course, you can increase the range of a part-15 device without breaking the law. All you need to do is to put a better antenna on. The right kind of directional antenna can greatly increase your range, without breaking the law.
In the 1990s, I hooked about 50 feet on antenna wire to my SoundFeeder SF-120 and was about to increase the range from 20 feet to nearly a mile, which was legal, becuase I only modified the antenna and not the innards of the SF-120

2274. WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 17:31:04 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9395897D5CB20elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in
news:bc2a00$ip0$1@freenet9.carleton.ca:

> "lk" (lklose@net-link.net) writes:
>> Phil,
>>
>> I realize that the FCC will not change the 5mhz allocation at this
>> point. But could they allow Techs to operate, and not violate the ITU
>> treaty?
>>
>> And, if they did violate the treaty, what would be ITU's recourse?
>>
> Fine, so let's see international broadcasters interloping on the ham
> bands.
>
> A treaty is an agreement, likely based on some tradeoffs. We'll do
> this, and you won't do that.
>
> I have no idea about how ITU could enforce things, but the minute
> someone decides that the rules don't count for them, then it just makes
> it easier for someone else to see the same thing. You seem to think
> this doesn't matter since it's a minor thing (I'd question why it's so
> important for people who haven't passed the code test to use this puny,
> other than because someone sees a false loophole), but it is the very
> adherance to the treaty agreements that keep things in line. If nobody
> sees the point in honoring a treaty, then it all falls apart like a
> house of cards. And likely other countries, if they followed suit,
> would break the treaty on far bigger issues, that will impact far
> greater than this puny issue.
>
> Michael VE2BVW
>
>

Since WRC 2003 is likly to dump s25.5 in a few days, this is moot. It's a
pity a 60m band is not on the WRC agenda.

2275. ARNewsline 1347 - June 6 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 17:43:41 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609134341.02070.00000875@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68474

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1347 – June 6, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1347 with a release date of Friday, June 6th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

HIPPA affects ham radio and update on a harmonized 40 meter band. These stories and more on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1347 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

FEDERAL LAW VS. HAM RADIO: THE CONFUSION OVER HIPPA

A new federal healthier law with the acronym HIPPA is affecting Amateur Radio. Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, takes a look at the recent implementation of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and its impact on the hobby.

--

If you are a ham with a disability and are a member of a group any other organization that has knowlege of your problem, then listen up. In order to continue receiving most benefits from such a group you are now required under Federal law to fill out and return the new Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act privacy guidelines forms that you may have already recieved or will recieved from each group.

Its the Federal government that requires the paperwork, and signing it will allow groups that must disclose disability information in the course of routine business to continue to serve you. For hams with disabilities it means that groups like the Handi Hams can continue to provided direct assistance with license renewal or license changes, publish news of individual license upgrades, and even send a birthday greeting by the ham radio's National Traffic System.

What about individuals who do not sign the forms? They will still be able to receive some services offered by these groups, but limited to those which do not involve releasing information about their physical condition. However, in the case of the Handi Hams, a disabled ham could no longer be connected with the groups assistance community of other members and volunteers because of the new federal privacy regulations.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

Full information on the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act is on-line at http://aspe.hhs.gov/admnsimp/ (Tnx HandiHams, others)

**

INTERNATIONAL: 40 METER CHANGE LOOKS GOOD

ARRL Executive Vice President Dave Sumner, K1ZZ, says that prospects for a harmonized worldwide 40 meter ham band are starting to look good. Speaking at a recent Dayton Hamvention forum, Sumner says it may all hang on what the United States proposes for the upcoming World Radio Communications conference later this year:

--

Sumner Here

--

Even if a large number of delegations come up with similar proposals, Sumner says that caution is still the by-word until all the voting has been done:

--
Sumner Here
--

You can hear more of what Dave Sumner has to say regarding 40 meters and other issues on this weeks RAIN report. Its in streaming audio at www.rainreport.com. Those without web access can her it by dialing up 847-827-RAIN. Thats 847-827-7246 (RAIN, ARNewsline™)

**

HAM SPECTRUM: 5 MHZ SPOT FREQUENCIES AVAILABLE MIDNIGHT JULY 3

LOOKING FOR SOMETHING NEW IN HAM RADIO? WELL, HERE'S NEWS JUST IN FROM THE FCC AND THE ARRL. I'M ROY NEAL, K6DUE, WITH A LATE BREAKING STORY THAT HAMS HAVE BEEN WAITING A LONG TIME TO HEAR. 60 METERS. 5 MEGAHERTZ …SOON WILL BE AVAILABLE WITH

5 CHANNELS FOR YOUR PLEASURE AND INVESTIGATION. A SECONDARY FIVE CHANNEL DOMESTIC HAM RADIO ALLOCATION WILL BECOME AVAILABLE STARTING AT MIDNIGHT, THURSDAY THE THIRD OF JULY.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT USERS ARE PRIMARY IN THE 5 MHZ BAND. AMATEURS GET FIVE CHANNELS, 2.8 KHZ WIDE, WITH CENTER FREQUENCIES OF 5332, 5348, 5368, 5373, AND 5405 KILOHERTZ.

GENERAL AND HIGHER CLASS LICENSE HOLDERS WILL BE PERMITTED TO OPERATE UPPER SIDEBAND PHONE, WITH A MAXIMUM OF 50 WATTS EFFECTIVE RADIATED POWER.

USERS ARE BEING ADVISED TO SET THEIR CARRIER FREQUENCY ONE AND A HALF KILOHERTZ LOWER THAN THE CHANNEL CENTER FREQUENCY. THE ARRL ALSO SUGGESTS RESTRICTING AUDIO BANDWIDTH TO 200 HERTZ ON THE LOW SIDE AND 2800 HERTZ ON THE HIGH END TO KEEP THE TOTAL BANDWIDTH WITHIN THE 2.8 KHZ IMPOSED BY THE FCC.

THE REPORT AND ORDER GRANTING THE NEW SPOT FREQUENCY ALLOCATION AT 5 MEGS WAS PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER ON JUNE THIRD. LOOK FOR LOTS MORE ON THE SUBJECT IN THE NEAR FUTURE HERE ON THE AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE.

NORM. (ARRL, FCC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - SOLOMON ISLANDS: LICENSING CONFUSION

Meantime, in the Southern Hemisphere, some questions and some possible answers regarding the confused state of ham radio licensing in the Solomon Islands. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the details:

--

Sam Voron, VK2BVS, spoke to QNEWS from an Internet kiosk at Dubai airport. Sam was en route to Somalia, but paused just long enough to answer a few rumors regarding the Solomon Island H44 prefix licenses.

According to Voron, there had been no way for people to get a license in the Solomons because there are no exams there. So in 2002 the H44 national radio regulatory body called Spectrum printed 21 novice licenses with the call signs chosen by students at a radio school. These are people took the Unrestricted level license class of ham radio training.

But Spectrum said that it first wanted to issue Novice licenses because it felt new operators should start with an entry level ticket before moving on to a full license. But Voron admits that at least two of these licenses may have been issued with Unrestricted privileges.

According to Voron, the Secretary of the H44 national ham society has now drawn up an Unrestricted exam. Students not happy being forced into the novice license when they spent 6 months studying for the Unrestricted will be able to take the exam. If they pass, they will go directly to the Unrestricted instead of the Novice class operating privileges.

In further news just in and unsubstianted as yet, the real exam is ready. Spectrum has directed the candidates to sit for it. The school and candidates are said to be dealying because they are frightened that it may be to hard.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News, down-under, in Brisbane, Australia.

--

No matter when that first upgrade test is held, it appears as if a method is at least now in place for native born Solomon Islanders to take an Amateur Radio exam. (Q-News)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W4DUX 147.255 MHz repeater of

the Peace River Repeater Association serving Punta Gorda Florida.

(5 sec pause here)

**

FCC: KILLS RULES FOR LIGHTING DEVICE EMISSION LIMITS AT 2400-2500 MHZ

Remember a few years back when hams became very worried about degradation to the 2 point 4 Gigahertz band? This, after the FCC adopted a First Report and Order that relaxed the emission limits for R F lighting devices.

That was on June 9th of 1999 and at that time the Commission deferred to a future date action on changes to the rules to permit such devices to operate from 2400 to 2500 MHZ.

Now, with no apparent remaining interest by the lighting industry to produce RF lighting devices in that spectrum, the FCC has decided to forego any further rule change. Well, at least for the moment it has.

The whole story is at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-123A1.doc on the World Wide Web. (CGC)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC ACTS TO EASE MEDIA OWNERSHIP RESTRICTIONS

Federal regulators have acted to relax rules that restrict media ownership. The change will permit companies to buy more broadcast properties and own a newspaper as well as a radio or television station in the same city.

On Monday, June 2nd the Federal Communications Commission announced that it voted 3 to 2 to adopt a series of changes favored by media companies. It now says that a single company can now own TV stations that reach 45 percent of United States households instead of the previous 35 percent limit. The agency also eased rules governing local TV ownership so one media conglomerate can own two television stations in more markets and up to three stations in the largest markets like New York or Los Angeles.

More controversial was a decision to end an age-old ban on joint ownership of a newspapers and broadcast stations in the same city. The revised rule lifts all 'cross-ownership' restrictions in markets with nine or more TV stations. Smaller markets still face some limits and cross-ownership is still banned in city’s and towns with three or fewer television outlets.

And even these rule changes are expected to face court challenges. Some media companies already indicate wanting more wide spread deregulation. Meantime consumer advocates will be seeking to reverse the deregulatory trend in favor of more local control over the print and broadcast media.

Not approached in this latest round of broadcast deregulation was the subject of direct foreign ownership of U-S broadcast properties. Currently foreign entaties and governments are banned from such ownership. But over the years there has been intensive lobbying by foreign interest groups to do away with

this ban which requires an act of Congress to lift. Most annylists say its not likely to happen in the near future. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: LOCAL CHARGES FILED AGAINST OHIO CB OPERATOR

Complaints from a group of neighbors experiencing interference on household appliances from phones and TV sets to baby monitors have resulted in a court case against a citizens band radio operator. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, takes a look at a most interesting case:

--

On the CB airwaves, he's said to go by the name Sugar Bear. James A Disbennet, of Lancaster, Ohio, faces first degree misdemeanor charges of operating a CB radio exceeding 4 watts. He also faces two counts of operating a CB radio without certification. The Lancaster Eagle Gazette says Disbennet was released on bond after answering a summons in Fairfield County Municipal Court May 20th.

The Lancaster City Council was the first such group in the U-S to pass an ordinance allowing the City to enforce rules set by the FCC governing the strength of CB radios. On April 10th, an assistant superintendent of the City's Electrical, Communications and Signals Department went on a transmitter hunt. The interfering signals were traced to Disbennet's home. The City then obtained a search warrant, with Lancaster police serving the warrant the following day. Officers seized four pieces of CB radio equipment worth more than a thousand dollars.

A trial date has yet to be set. If convicted, Disbennet could be hit with a 1,000 dollar fine and 180 days in jail.
For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH.

--

According to the law under which Disbennet was charged, the definition of CB radio "includes all private, two-way, short-distance voice communications service for personal or business activities of the general public. Citizens filing complaints must keep an accurate log of the interference for a minimum of four weeks and there has to be more than one complainant in order to file charges. The only exclusions to the law are for emergency communications services like police, fire and FCC licensed radio amateurs.

The complete story is in cyberspace at http://www.lancastereaglegazette.com/news/stories/20030521/localnews/339596.html. (N6RU)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC WITHDRAWS LETTER IN ENHANCED SSB OPERATION

Remember a stir created on April 3rd the FCC sent advisory letters several hams who run enhanced or so-called high fidelity single sideband? The FCC told

those operating the mode that the agency had received complaints from other radio amateurs alleging that the enhanced mode transmissions were using bandwidth wider than necessary. The FCC termed this as being contrary to good engineering practice.

One of those hams receiving such a notice was Anthony G. Latin, W4NSG, of Ocala Florida. Now, a month later the FCC has withdrawn its original letter to Latin, stating that it was issued to him in error. The regulatory agency also apologized to W4NSG for whatever inconvenience that letter may have caused him. No specific reason for the withdrawal of the letter was given. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ISSUES ANOTHER ENHANCED SSB WARNING

But its not over yet. This is because the FCC has issued another ham a similar warning regarding the use of enhanced SSB on the Amateur Service bands.

The May 12th letter went to Tyler Stampfli, KA0KA. Like those issued back in April, it tells the La Grange, North Carolina ham that use of enhanced Single Sideband emission with a bandwidth wider than necessary is contrary to good engineering practice. It also notes that no spectrum in the Amateur Service is designated specifically as “wideband audio” frequencies, either by Commission rule or in any informal band plans.

The FCC did not cite Stampfli. It did however request that he fully review the relevant Amateur Service rules and to make certain his station conforms to them. Also that he operate in the best interests of the Amateur Radio Service as a whole. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: BIG CELLULAR FINE

The FCC has issued Western Wireless Corporation and WWC Holdings two Notices of Apparent Liability to Monetary Forfeiture in the amount of $200,000 each. The companies are the licensee of Cellular Radio Station KNKN343 in North Dakota. The FCC says that the the companies are operating radio transmitting equipment from an unauthorized location resulting in the first fine.

The second $200,000 is the result of what the FCC says was Western Wireless for operating radio transmitting equipment from another unauthorized location. The two NAL’s wewre issued on May 5th and the companies were given the customary time to appeal.

More is on the web at
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-109A1.doc and
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-234290A1.doc (FCC)

**

HAM RADIO AND THE LAW: CA HAM FILES FOR COURT COSTS

Mark Abrams, WA6DPB, the ham who recently triumphed over the city of Rancho Palos Verdes California in an antenna zoning case is headed back to court. In

an e-mail to Amateur Radio Newsline, Abrams says that his attorneys have recently completed our briefing in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals on the issue of damages. Abrams says that he is now waiting for a court date which he expects will be around the end of August or early September. After the hearing, Abrams says that he expects to wait another 60 days for a written decision from the Court. If the Court decides in his favor he wins the right to have another trial on the amount of attorney's fees, court costs and damages. If he looses Abrams says that it will be unlikely that he will take the matter of reimbursement for his legal fees any further. (WA6DPB)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: FRANK SCHWAB, W8OK, - S.K.

Some sad news to report. The changing of the guard in ham radio continues. This with word that Frank Schwab, W8OK, has passed away.

As we reported last week, Schwab, who helped to craft the Dayton Hamvention over a half century ago suffered a heart attack a few hours prior to this years event. At the time, the 77 year old Schwab was also fighting cancer and several other ailments.

While best known for his work in creating the Hamvention, W8OK was also a world-class D-X’er and heavily involved in public service activities. Services were held Monday June 2nd at St. Christopher's Church in Vandalia, Ohio. A page long tribute to Schwab appeared recently in the Dayton Daily News. (W8ILC)

**

TIME TO RETIRE: WISCONSIN SCHOOL CLUB GOING QRT

After over 25 years in operation, Andrew Martin, KB9ZLL, reports over qrz.com website that the Fond du Lac, Wisconsin High School's ham radio club is dissolving. This, due to the retirement of it's trustee Jeffry Hoeft, K9NC.

The club had its beginnings in the old high school building in 1972. Back then it consisted of a wire antenna and CW transciver. Today the group has operations on the high frequency bands as well as two meters and 440 Mhz. More important, the Fond du Lac club has been responcible for the licensing of nearly two dozen new hams over the years it has operated. (KB9ZKK, QRZ.COM)

**

NET NEWS: NEW ECHOLINK VHF CONFERENCE

Ron Pastterson, W6FM, reports the creation of a new conference on Echolink devoted to the discussion of all aspects of VHF and UHF weak signal operating. The name of the on-line gathering is *VHF_TALK* and it was created to assist in coordinating skeds, discussing band openings and anything else related to operations in the world above 50 Mhz.

For those who aren't familiar, Echolink is a voice over I P system available to licensed amateurs. For more information on it and the new conference take your web browser over to www.echolink.org. Ron adds that the conference will hopefully soon be avail over the world wide Internet Repeater linking Project as well. Information on IRLP is in cyberspace at www.irlp.net . (VHF Reflector)

**

ON THE WEB: AMATEUR REPEATER BUILDERS HOME PAGE GOES QRT

The Amateur Repeater Builders Home Page appears to have gone QRT and its owner is blaming the attitudes of some hams for its demise. In a posting to the website, its administrator says in part that due to an unfortunate series of events resulting from this groups actions the Amateur Repeater Builders Page page will no longer be maintained.

Whats involved appears to be a dispute over universal recognition and acceptance of the the Northern California Amateur Radio band plan and what the board administrator terms as intentional interference to coordinated 420 links with an ATV transmitter. He says that the FCC's lack of time and/or interest in addressing the issue has caused him to become thoroughly disgusted and that he is -- quote -- ‘Gone fishing!’

But all might not be lost. Kevin Custer, W3KKC, says that he plans to contact the Amateur Repeater Builders Home Page owner to try to obtain the rights to the website and host it himself. He says he will let everyone know what happens over the Yahoogroups based Repeater Owners remailer. (W3KKC, VHF Reflector)

**

RADIO PICTURES FROM SPACE: THE EARTH FROM NEAR MARS

NASA's Mars Global Surveyor spacecraft turned away from the red planet for a while on May 8th and took a unique picture of Earth from Mars-orbit. This first-ever image of its kind not only shows our home planet as a tiny alien world in the vast darkness of space, but also includes Earth's moon and a view of the giant planet Jupiter. Go see http://science.nasa.gov/headlines/y2003/22may_alienearth.htm?list913324 for more. (NASA)

**

INTERNATIONAL - CUBA: FIRHAV 2004

Oscar Moroles, CO2OJ, says that the Federation of Radioamateurs of Cuba is organizing an international gathering of hams to be held next March. Called FIRHAV 2004, it will include sessions on all aspect of operation used on the bands above 50 Mhz including the new digital techniques. More information about FIRHAV 2004 and how to participate is on the web at http://frc.co.cu (CO2OJ)

**

ON THE AIR: COOKEN IN JUNE

Turning to on-the-air operations, the Central Ohio Operators Klub Extra - Novice is sponsoring special event station WW8OH June 21st 1200 to 2000 UTC. This, to coincide with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Cranberry Bog open house.

Look for WW8OH in the General portion of the 40m band and QSL as directed on the airr. More inforrmation is at www.cooken.org and the word Klub is spelled with a “K.” (E-mail)

**

DX

In D-X, word that a group of five Greek operators will sign SX9G from Gavdos Island through the 15th of June. QSL via SV2DGH. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE OWLS ARE BACK

And finally this week, its time to get ready to T-Hunt down those ever elusive Burrowing Owls. And this year there’s another creature to look for -- bats. Heres Joe Moell, K0OV, with all the details:

--

For five years, ham operators and scanner listeners in western states have monitored VHF frequencies to help researchers in Saskatchewan and Washington state study the migratory behavior of Western Burrowing Owls, a species of concern. Now three more monitoring projects are beginning, and this time we need volunteers in south-central and southeastern states.

A biologist at the University of South Florida at Tampa (USF) is studying Florida Burrowing Owls. That's a slightly different subspecies from the Western Burrowing Owl. It is thought that their range is limited to Florida and the Keys, but there is one 40-year-old report of a sighting in North Carolina. Researchers have banded the legs of these birds in the past, but none of the banded owls have been recovered after leaving their Florida homes.

For the new study, some Florida Burrowing Owl chicks are being radio-tagged right now. Local researchers are tracking them as they leave their nests, learning to forage. In the summer, the young owls are expected to take off for parts unknown. USF wants volunteers throughout the southeast to listen for the VHF radio tags in an attempt to determine their routes and final destinations.

That's project #1. Number two involves Mexican Long-nosed Bats. For about a month beginning in mid-June, Bat Conservation International wants volunteers to join a team that will track their movements in and around Big Bend National Park in Texas as they pollinate century cactus plants. Physically fit hikers are especially wanted, but a few vehicle-based monitors will also be helpful. And there may be opportunities for some home monitors. Hams with VHF radio direction finding equipment are particularly needed.

Project #3 is a study of orphaned Great Horned Owls. It's being done by the Heard Natural Science Museum and Wildlife Sanctuary in McKinney, Texas, along with the University of North Texas. After being raised at the sanctuary, up to two dozen of these owls will be released into the wild this summer, with radio tags attached to help determine their dispersal patterns and survival rates. Volunteers are needed to monitor for the radio tags, especially in the Denton and Collin County areas. Great Horned Owls are territorial and do not migrate long distances.

My Web site on radio direction finding carries the latest details, frequencies, and contact information for all three projects. Point your browser to www.homingin.com HomingIn is one word --- homingin.com

Thanks in advance for your help! From southern California, where Burrowing Owls are diminishing but still can be seen in the farmlands, this is Joe Moell, Kay-zero-oscar-victor, for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Again, that website is www.homingin.com. (K0OV, ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, we want to tell you that a talk by our producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, dealing with the problems facing ham radio and some possible solutions is this months Newsline Extra audio feature. The presentation was recorded at the 2002 Joplin Hamfest banquet and is available as an MP3 file on the same webpage where you find the weekly newscast. Go to www.arnewsline.org/quincy and click on ARNewsline Extra at the bottom of the page.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

2276. Re: Ham radio = toast?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 17:56:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306090956.10c1d34f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68475

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<u6QEa.24054$DI.962@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>...

> . . . . If amateurs
> would actually use the allocations and make or purchase hardware for it, the
> more unattractive it would become to prospective buyers.

Of the total number of licensees there are only so many who actually
get on the air. Spreading them out over currently underutilized ham
allocations would have a dilution effect which would make all our high
bands sitting ducks, exactly the opposite result you expect.

> And selling 27MHz
> or anything near the CB allocation would be similar to selling the Brooklyn
> bridge or ocean front property in Nevada. We shouldn't worry so much; we
> should just use our allocations and forget it about this 'threat that I have
> heard ever since becoming a ham 10 years ago.

The threat is very real and based on the changes I've seen in my years
on the bands I suggest that you get comfortable with the prospect of
losing spectrum space above 30 mHz.

> 73
>
> de KR4AJ

w3rv

2277. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 19:20:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE4DDDF.29F6B9AF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68476

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >You, young Mr. Vipul Shah, the square peg of
> >RRAP, will decide which educational material is worthless
>
> Traditional education is fine for you. I won't allow it for my children.

What children?

> I will
> look into homeschooling and charter schools.

Charter schools may be your only hope. Home schooling would only result
in additional non-linear thinking Vipuls.

> Even charter schools don't go far enough. Also, homeschoolers still have to
> meet minimum SAT or MCAS scores. This is unfair to those that don't believe in
> those things.

Yeah, Vipul. To a guy like you, life is full of inequities.

> >much
> >as you've decided which of the amateur radio licensing requirements are
> >worthless.
>
> Yes, code is worthless.

You have no way of knowing if it is worthless or not.

> >Those don't sound like worthless courses to me, Vipul.
>
> I never used them again in EE or anywhere else. If those classes were cut, I
> would still "learn how to think" in the remaining classes. More so, if the
> subject matter <and methods> are useful.

How do you know you'll never use them again? You haven't lived your
life yet.

> >What makes you
> >so special?
>
> I want quality education.

You can start by demanding a refund for those EE classes. That story
about fluorescent lighting in automobiles indicates that you didn't get
your money's worth.

> >...and Vipu Shah is a special kind of guy, the kind of guy who'd like to
> >not take required courses which he finds "worthless".
>
> Education is expensive, and time consuming.

You can always take up space and waste oxygen. Those are both free.
The time you'll waste is only your own.

> >> This affects any course, whether you take an economics course or an EE
> >course.
> >> (Less true of EE courses, but still true).
> >
> >I can envision you as an Econ student, demanding to tinker with Federal
> >Reserve Bank policy issues.
>
> There should be enough course offerings to take quality courses and not be
> stuck with lower quality courses.

How will you know which courses are "quality courses"? How will you
know which are "lower quality courses"?

> Also, courses should be evaluated on their
> usefulness.

...as determined by you?

> Also, allow private educational companies to offer courses that compete with
> schools and offer credit for them. The same college credit you would get from
> your college. Most people take required non-major courses for credits. However,
> if <requirement meeting> course was offered, but with practical applications
> and non-traditional methods (not just sitting at a desk), many would chose to
> learn something.

I'm certain that many "would chose" to learn something. Many
universities are, in reality, private educational companies. They
charge much more money that state-owned colleges. They pick and choose
who their students will be. They all offer credit for their courses.

> >Sorry, Vipul, you didn't really "show" anything. You merely led us
> >through the maze that is your thinking process.
>
> Its the total person. A person that can recite Shakespeare, but cannot change a
> flat tire is less useful than the reverse.

...not in a theatre full of people expecting to see "Othello" and who
instead are treated to the sight of a guy changing a tire.

> Tires do not listen to Shakespeare.

Apparently neither do you. You and tires have something in common.

> I once took an expensive camping "course". The person taught several types of
> knots. But, he did not tie anything with those knots! Not even a tent. Also, It
> was more a lecture format, than actually doing something. One learns more by
> building something.

Who the hell takes a camping course?

>
> Also, they tried to cover many <unrelated> topics. It is better to do a small
> focus skill well, than just introduce to many areas and not do any of them
> well.

Yeah, a few hours of practical, hand-on training on zipping and
unzipping the sleeping bag would have proved infinitely more practical.

> I did not learn anything. I still don't remember those knots.

Blame yourself. Maybe you're just not a good student.

> Just a month ago, I went on a camping DXpedition with a random group of Hams.
> It was not expensive and I learned alot more.

The fat, old guys taught you something, huh?

> There was a real purpose and theme of the whole event. The theme of the event
> was operating and contesting on several radio modes. It had a definite sequence
> of activities, from setup of antennas to takedown.

My day is filled with not just one but quite a number of sequenced
activities. Is this sequenced activities thing new to you?

> That's the difference between worthless skills and worthwhile experiences.

That's valueable information coming from a guy like you.

> >> I need to find quality homeschooling.
> >
> >Might I suggest looking in someone else's home?
>
> It takes a village...

...and in the village, you'll find a school. Let your children go there
and interact with other children. They'll be much better for it.

> >I guess your kids will come up short when it comes time to enter a
> >university. They likely will not be accepted.
>
> No, not at all. I've heard of another (not me) that made the case that they
> could learn something and that person was allowed to take a year off and make
> up the grade later.

I'm not talking about making up grades, I'm talking about not being
admitted because they'll have not met the standards for entrance. Go
back and read what you wrote.

> That person got accepted into a <great> college.

Not without meeting the standards of admission.

> Okay, the person still had to make up the class. But, the point is there are
> still ways to fit the useful courses in. I will have to look at homeschool,
> charter school, making up grades (like that person did), and other options.

The options are: 1) meet the standards and be accepted to a university or 2) skip college and find work.

> Also, if there is a need, I will hire a lawyer.

Save your money. Hire a tutor.

Dave K8MN

2278. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 19:24:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE4DEBD.BAB956B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68477

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays
>
> >There simply aren't enough hours for a college to teach a person
> >everything. They teach a basic approach and from there it is up to you.
>
> The basic approach is sitting at a desk. This method will not cover the
> required material, regardless of what subject is taught. If gave an example of
> the camping course I took.

Who the hell takes a camping course?

> > Since pop
> >culture, movies, music, and sports have nothing to do with your EE major,
> >why do you consider them worthwhile
>
> Because these skills are useful.

Pop culture is important but great literature isn't important?

> yet consider literature, biology,
> >physics, etc worthless???
>
> Because I can't use this knowledge anywhere.

Most folks are content to be quiet in their ignorance. Why do you feel
compelled to shout it from the roof tops?

Dave K8MN

2279. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 19:30:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE4E04D.C22105DF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68478

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo
>
> >What our good Mr. Shah does not realize is that nothing occurs in a
> >vacuum.
>
> This proves my point further. Traditional education assumes that everything
> occurs in a vacuum.

You'd have to have proven your point to see it proven further. Please explain how traditional education assumes that everything occurs in a vacuum. Show your work.

> >A person that assumes they "know" what portions of their
> >education are worthwhile, and what parts are not, and is willing to
> >forgo those parts they declare useless, is showing a strange combination
> >of ignorance and hubris.
>
> The useful subjects occur frequently, while the not so useful course subjects
> rarely occur. Its foolish to do exercises for the infrequently occuring
> subjects, when the frequently needed knowledge is unlearned.
>
> >I use bits and pieces of my whole education all the time.
>
> Good for you. I tried to pay someone using traveller's checks and the person
> did not know that I could do that. This person must have went to school.

The person writing the lines above "must have went" to school as well.

> Yet
> this person did not know how to accept my payment.

I've never heard of a high school or university course in the handling of travelers checks.

> I'm sure that flat tire got fixed when you recited Shakepeare to it
> or calculated Fourier Transforms.

You're a guy who can't remember how to tie knots. How can I expect you to remember how to change a tire?

Dave K8MN

2280. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 19:32:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE4E0CF.5FED929E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68479

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> > Impure! Impure! How dare anyone equate a Vocational course
> > to the college level! :-)
>
> You are right. Its about image, more than learning useful skills.

Vipul, meet Leonard. Leonard, meet Vipul.

This is a classic example of water seeking its own level.

Dave K8MN

2281. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 19:38:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE4E218.D6653F3A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68480

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE3E27C.4000407@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >Vshah101 wrote:
> >> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo
>
> >> I'm sure that flat tire got fixed when you recited Shakepeare to it or
> >> calculated Fourier Transforms.
> >
> > I can fix a flat. I can rebuild an engine. I can also hold a
> >conversation in quantum physics (at a lay level of course) while I'm
> >doing it. Its a big interesting world out there. Too bad you want to
> >limit your knowledge to just what you think is relevant at the moment.
>
> I've fixed flats, including the old inner tube tire type. So what?
> I've never had to rebuild any engine but I did keep up most of
> the maintenance on my '53 Austin-Healey sports car. So what?

I can recite Shakespeare. So what? I know morse code. So what?
Mike wasn't asking whether you could fix a flat. Vipul seems to be the
one in need of an automechanics course which teaches the changing of a
flat tire.

> I've also been out in the big interesting world and half a century
> ago actually operated HF communications...lots of it and none of
> it using morse code modes.

Done anything in the last half century?

> But...lots of the already-licensed
> INSIST on keeping that code test for amateur radio a half century
> later. You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up > any new arguments for
keeping it. :-)

Quite a number of things are tested for which were tested for a half
century ago.

Why is any of this a concern for you? You aren't involved.

Dave K8MN

2282. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 20:32:58 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bc2qtr$g4f$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68539

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030609020836.05587.00000592@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 6/8/03 11:08 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
> >But...lots of the already-licensed
> > INSIST on keeping that code test for amateur radio a half century
> > later.
>
> I know you disdain facts, Oh Scummy One, however it's not those
unwashed
> masses of licensed Amateurs who are "insisting" on keeping Morse Code
> testing...

You're joking, right?

Quotes randomly culled from GoogleGroups:

"I say this because many of the pro-code-test proponents have indicated
that they support Morse Code testing because it helps to overcome many
of the limiations of the current VE/question-pool testing arrangement."

" Most pro-coders would like to see the code examinations beefed up as well"

"And the ARRL should continue to do so." (in reply to a comment that the
ARRL supports morse code testing.)

"All I have seen is a bunch of no-code Hams who use 2 meters like the CB
band."

CW in emergencies....

" I don't think it's right that someone might not live through an ordeal
just because the 'ham' didn't understand what was being sent."

On keeping the riff-raff out of the ARS as being only one reason to keep
code:

"The most important of which is preserving code as an alternate and
potentially vital communicatons capability."

"it keeps the HF bands relatively uncrowded, for the simple reason
that code requirements filter out a LOT of people who otherwise would buy
a radio and start yakking."

"I worked my buns off to pass the test so I could
enjoy the privileges, and I am dead set against giving the spectrum away
to people whose only qualification is the price of a radio and the
ability to win at guess-the-answers."

"Such as" the existence of this debate. The "no-code" VHF licensing
has created the expectation that "no-code" HF licensing will soon
follow as some sort of logical inevitability. It's the fervent wish of all
who want to pick up a microphone and engage in the powerful, ego-
intensive rush of instant gratification they can get from projecting their
voice louder and farther than anyone else. In so doing, they create
an enormous amount of chaos on the bands, since those attracted
mainly by voice operation usually become frustrated by their inability
to truly dominate in that sphere. We've already seen this on VHF,
where a continuing influx of No-code Techs get on a local repeater,
find that they don't have anything interesting to discuss, and therefore,
nobody wants to talk to them. Therefore, they become convinced that
if only they could get on HF, ham radio would suddenly be more
fulfilling to their needs. The no-coders don't give a whit about
furthering the "technical state of the art" or making any other
valuable "contributions," although they've become quite adept at
using this as a justification for their position. This newsgroup, and the
no-code supporters on it, are living proof of my statment quoted above.

"But it is still used as a filter, while it is not perfect, it does work
better than anything else that has been thought up."

"> A big factor in the no-code side is "class envy." These underachievers
simply
> resent the fact that so many people are able to meet the requirements for
an
> Extra-class license and they, for whatever reasons, either can't or wont."

Hhhmmm...dropping the code leads to anarchy?

"So for just a minute, let's just go ahead and unilaterally drop the code
because we don't like it. Then some other group doesn't like the laws by
which
THEY are governed and they force the government to ignore the laws THEY are
constrained by...THAT, Mark, is ANARCHY."

Well, enough of that.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.488 / Virus Database: 287 - Release Date: 6/5/2003

2283. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 21:05:45 UTC
From: Huffy <uhflink@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <uhflink-24A98F.14054509062003@corp.newsfeeds.com>
Source record: 68481
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <1507896e.0306090859.6f8c01c5@posting.google.com>,
charlesnewman1@attbi.com (Charles Newman) wrote:

> "Jay \"Boogieman\" Edwards" <boogie350@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93946CD30B4D4boogie350NOSPAMyahoo@216.168.3.44>...
> > > Unlicensed Low-power FM broadcasting is growing by leaps
> > > and bounds. Equipment is being sold at hamfests across the
> > > country, and one can hear discussions about the subject on
> > > VHF ham radio. Web sites which provide technical advice and
> > > technical discussions are also growing in numbers with new web
> > > sites coming on line all the time. Equipment can be purchased
> > > via the internet at hundreds of web sites. Owners and operators
> > > of such stations are being interviewed by newspapers and other
> > > media. Public demand and support for this type of operation is
> > > growing by quantum leaps. Unlicensed LPFM is not only here
> > > to stay but is growing at an unprecedented rate.
> >
> > It seems more people are willing to take the risk in running an "illegal"
> > transmitter nowdays, but for those who are still shy on the idea, there was
>
>
> Of course, you can increase the range of a part-15 device without breaking
> the law. All you need to do is to put a better antenna on. The right kind of
> directional antenna can greatly increase your range, without breaking the
> law.
> In the 1990s, I hooked about 50 feet on antenna wire to my SoundFeeder
> SF-120
> and was about to increase the range from 20 feet to nearly a mile, which was
> legal, becuase I only modified the antenna and not the innards of the SF-120

Uh, not true. The Part 15.239 rule specifies a maximum field strength
measured 3 meters from the device, and the testing regimen requires
testing at all possible angles of emission.

Furthermore, it is not permissible to remove the antenna from a Part 15
device and install a different antenna. This is controlled by requiring
the antenna to either be permanently attached, or to use a special type
of antenna connector that is not availble at RadioShack (or so the FCC
tesing lab engineer will tell you). This is why you can buy reverse SMA
connectors from Digikey, for example.

Now, there is not much that they can do about you mounting a Part 15
device (including its 6 inch rod antenna) at the focus of a 12 foot
diameter satellite dish...

--Huffy

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2284. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 21:09:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc2tf6$n6s$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:ve7kf113fsui9b@corp.supernews.com...
> Phil,
>
> Hummmm. If you can not transmit CW and its not a Amatuer Band,
> could the FCC allow Tech to operate on the band?

It is an amateur HF set of frequencies or channels and would, it seems,
possibly allow techs to be given permission to operate. The FCC
would have to make a rule change to do that. Does anyone know if a tech
is allowed to operate on the speial 7mhz channel in Alaska?

> What was the FCC reasoning for the allocation?

To allow amateurs to operate there. The ARRL had petitioned for
a band. The FCC gave 5 discrete frequencies instead and specified
USB mode only.

> Will five channel enable a significate amount increase
> communications to make this worth the effort?

Depends on how you define worthwhile.
Will this aleviate any "crowding" on other HF bands? Not
at all. Does this provide a unique and beneficial set
of designated emergency channels? Yes, and that should
prove worthwhile if for no other reason.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2285. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 21:48:13 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68483
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9395897D5CB20elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
>
> > "lk" (lklose@net-link.net) writes:
> >> Phil,
> >>
> >> I realize that the FCC will not change the 5mhz allocation at this
> >> point. But could they allow Techs to operate, and not violate the ITU
> >> treaty?
> >>
> >> And, if they did violate the treaty, what would be ITU's recourse?
>
> Since WRC 2003 is likly to dump s25.5 in a few days, this is moot. It's a
> pity a 60m band is not on the WRC agenda.

It should be be moot, but I would not bet on it until its sign and sealed.
The requirement been on international life-support for a least ten years.

But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur alllocation,
could the FCC allow Techs to operate. The band is already being used
as an uppper SSB band by person without CW proficiency.

The FCC already is allowing citizens without licenses to operate below 30
mhz on
40 channels using upper and lower side band, and AM modes.

In other word, is the code requirement a band requirement or licensee
requirement?
Why would a person need CW proficiency to use a band the bars the use of CW?

Larry

2286. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 22:22:34 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EE508AA.70225879@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 68484
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Now, there is not much that they can do about you mounting a Part 15
> device (including its 6 inch rod antenna) at the focus of a 12 foot
> diameter satellite dish...

I've considered the making of a beam for FRS that slips over the
antenna. Three elements, the fixed "stub" being the driver.

Tall building...point and shoot!!!

2287. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-09 23:03:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609190325.20710.00000171@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68485

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/9/03 2:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE4DEBD.BAB956B@earthlink.net>

>> > Since pop
>> >culture, movies, music, and sports have nothing to do with your EE major,
>> >why do you consider them worthwhile
>>
>> Because these skills are useful.
>
>Pop culture is important but great literature isn't important?

Of course, Dave. How else do you think a guy who wears horn rimmed
glasses and pocket protectors learns to impress "preety fems"???

Steve, K4CAP

2288. Re: Why Is It?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 00:07:51 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vea8dbb3mrr1ab@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68486

"Tom Jefferson" <tj@amercontsfreedom.org> wrote in message
news:bbij59$i6l$0@pita.alt.net...
> Why is it that Big Government Liberals believe the NRA is bad
> because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
> the ACLU is good because it supports certain parts of the
> Constitution?
>
> Tom Jefferson

Why is it that Small Government Conservaties believe the NRA is good
because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
the ACLU is bad because it supports certain parts of the
Constitution?

John Adams

2289. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 00:23:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609202326.03929.00000116@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68487

In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>> Since WRC 2003 is likly to dump s25.5 in a few days, this is moot. It's a
>> pity a 60m band is not on the WRC agenda.
>
>It should be be moot, but I would not bet on it until its sign and sealed.

And ratified by The Congress.

>The requirement been on international life-support for a least ten years.

How do you figure?
>
>But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur alllocation,
>could the FCC allow Techs to operate.

Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.

>The band is already being used
>as an uppper SSB band by person without CW proficiency.

But they are not radio amateurs.
>
>The FCC already is allowing citizens without licenses to operate below 30
>mhz on 40 channels using upper and lower side band, and AM modes.

But they are not radio amateurs.
>
>In other word, is the code requirement a band requirement or licensee
>requirement?

It's a service requirement.

The treaty says that anyone who is licensed to operate an amateur radio station
must pass the code test if the license grants any privileges below 30 MHz.
Nothing about power level, mode, etc.

>Why would a person need CW proficiency to use a band the bars the use of >CW?
>
It's only needed if the station is an amateur radio station.

Consider this: Why do hams have to take written tests on radio theory in order
to use manufactured, certified equipment? Many other users of the spectrum
don't have to. No test or license required to run low-power AM or SSB on 11
meters, but to use the power SSB on 10 meters requires at least a Tech written,
and to use AM anywhere on amateur HF/MF requires at least a General written.

If/when the code test goes away, those writtens will still be in place.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2290. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 00:54:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <g%9Fa.302$qv1.13@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 68488
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Actually, you can make a nice corner reflector for it from a cardboard box and some aluminum file. Much more portable than a 12 foot dish. Given time, they'll likely put something into the rules (I believe they outlawed a passive reflector type device - essentially an antenna which would re-radiate police radar frequencies much more effectively than an untuned body - which had a diode which had an audio signal fed to it. This modulated signal would be recovered by the radar set and see the modulation much more strongly than the Doppler effect so you could set the speed the cop would see). The radar fooling apparatus is *not* a transmitter, but they did cover that. As of now, the antenna is not removable; therefore the device (unmodified) is legal. What can they say about a cardboard box with aluminum foil in it? They probably never will, since the slight increase in forward coverage is more than made up for by the total lack of coverage behind the corner reflector (your total area coverage would most likely be much less - but it would be further in the forward direction, but not by much. Line of sight pretty well limits that).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Huffy" <uhflink@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:uhflink-24A98F.14054509062003@corp.newsfeeds.com...
> In article <1507896e.0306090859.6f8c01c5@posting.google.com>,
> charlesnewman1@attbi.com (Charles Newman) wrote:
>
> > "Jay \"Boogieman\" Edwards" <boogie350@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93946CD30B4D4boogie350NOSPAMyahoo@216.168.3.44>...
> > > > Unlicensed Low-power FM broadcasting is growing by leaps
> > > > and bounds. Equipment is being sold at hamfests across the
> > > > country, and one can hear discussions about the subject on
> > > > VHF ham radio. Web sites which provide technical advice and
> > > > technical discussions are also growing in numbers with new web
> > > > sites coming on line all the time. Equipment can be purchased
> > > > via the internet at hundreds of web sites. Owners and operators
> > > > of such stations are being interviewed by newspapers and other
> > > > media. Public demand and support for this type of operation is
> > > > growing by quantum leaps. Unlicensed LPFM is not only here
> > > > to stay but is growing at an unprecedented rate.
> > >
> > > It seems more people are willing to take the risk in running an
"illegal"
> > > transmitter nowdays, but for those who are still shy on the idea,
there was
> >

> >
> > Of course, you can increase the range of a part-15 device without
breaking
> > the law. All you need to do is to put a better antenna on. The right
kind of
> > directional antenna can greatly increase your range, without breaking
the
> > law.
> > In the 1990s, I hooked about 50 feet on antenna wire to my
SoundFeeder
> > SF-120
> > and was about to increase the range from 20 feet to nearly a mile, which
was
> > legal, becuase I only modified the antenna and not the innards of the
SF-120
>
> Uh, not true. The Part 15.239 rule specifies a maximum field strength
> measured 3 meters from the device, and the testing regimen requires
> testing at all possible angles of emission.
>
> Furthermore, it is not permissible to remove the antenna from a Part 15
> device and install a different antenna. This is controlled by requiring
> the antenna to either be permanently attached, or to use a special type
> of antenna connector that is not availble at RadioShack (or so the FCC
> tesing lab engineer will tell you). This is why you can buy reverse SMA
> connectors from Digikey, for example.
>
> Now, there is not much that they can do about you mounting a Part 15
> device (including its 6 inch rod antenna) at the focus of a 12 foot
> diameter satellite dish...
>
> --Huffy
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.488 / Virus Database: 287 - Release Date: 6/5/03

2291. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 01:30:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hg8jur5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 9 Jun 2003 17:48:13 -0400, lk wrote:

>The FCC already is allowing citizens without licenses to operate
>below 30 mhz on 40 channels using upper and lower side band, and AM
>modes.

CB is not amateur radio. CB as we know it was a big mistake that
the FCC didn't want to admit making and couldn't undo because it was
too late. IIRC the Dutch undid CB my making examples out of those
who refused to stop operating after it was banned in the early 1970s.

>In other word, is the code requirement a band requirement or licensee
>requirement? Why would a person need CW proficiency to use a band the
>bars the use of CW?

It's a licensee requirement. Perhaps the FCC feels that non-code
folks are not qualified to operate there. Perhaps the moon is made
of green cheese.

In regulatory law, one does not ask "why", one asks "how". This is
reality.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2292. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 01:41:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc3d16gpn0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 68490

Dave Heil wrote:

>

>
> > It takes a village...
>
> ...and in the (every) village, you'll find a

I just can't resist.....a VIPUL!

Hey Vipul; your village is calling.....

2293. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 01:48:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc3ddnhff0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 68491
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Huffy wrote:

> there is not much that they can do about you mounting a Part 15
> device (including its 6 inch rod antenna) at the focus of a 12 foot
> diameter satellite dish...
>
>

Sure there is. When you did that you just drastically modified the antenna and made it a high gain array. VERY illegal.

2294. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 02:09:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609220903.10018.00000220@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68492

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>It may FRONT as a "legitimate" business, but if it's processing "unrecorded
>acsh", it's NOT "legitimate".

Let me try to explain it to you. Its a legitamate business that sells a
product. The customer pays cash or credit card, usually cash. The worker
doesn't record the transaction and keeps the cash. This makes it unrecorded
cash. Thats stealing from the company.

>One
>>way
>>is they could charge the customer more, and record a lower amount, and keep
>>the
>>difference.
>
> ...and is still just as illegal.

This particular example is NOT illegal. This happens, for example, in a
restaurant. If you pay the waiter a tip, it is extra money for that person, not
to the restaurant.

However, this type of business is not the type of business where one receives
tips. Also, the difference is that the customer did not give a tip - the person
charged the customer more.

>>The current manager warned me that this is a risky job. My pay will be tied
>>to
>>how well I keep track of and control the transactions.
>
> ...and how well you manage to evade "the silver bullet".

What's "the silver bullet"?

>I will accept it because what it is paying
>>(if less money lost) is well worth the risk.
>
> Funny...A buddy of mine in the Coast Guard says a lot of the doper
>pilots
>and boaters they bring in say the very same thing.

Its not illegal. I'm tempted to make a bet about its salary 6 months from now.
I wont bet if its illegal or tell you what it is. (I wouldn't want your
characteristic laugh). Dont bet money, bet something else.

2295. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 02:14:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE53F3A.80202@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68493

Dave Heil wrote:
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays
>>
>>
>>>There simply aren't enough hours for a college to teach a person
>>>everything. They teach a basic approach and from there it is up to you.
>>
>>The basic approach is sitting at a desk. This method will not cover the
>>required material, regardless of what subject is taught. If gave an example of
>>the camping course I took.
>
>
> Who the hell takes a camping course?
>
Sports scholarship students?

>>>Since pop
>>>culture, movies, music, and sports have nothing to do with your EE major,
>>>why do you consider them worthwhile
>>
>>Because these skills are useful.
>
>
> Pop culture is important but great literature isn't important?
>
>
>>yet consider literature, biology,
>>
>>>physics, etc worthless???
>>
>>Because I can't use this knowledge anywhere.
>
>
> Most folks are content to be quiet in their ignorance. Why do you feel
> compelled to shout it from the roof tops?

It seems to be a new thing. Well actually it's just an extension of the
old thing " If you can't be as good as they are, demean everything they
can do".

I thing it is a pop culture thing, and the celebration of failure.
Funny, because that is exactly what it produces... failure.

2296. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 02:43:48 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609224348.10018.00000223@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68494

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>> I can see by your arguments that you don't understand the concept I am
>trying
>> to advocate.
>
> Which is why I just asked you your paradigms for your concept. You have

>to be able to explain them if you want anyone to believe them.

You missed it. Lenover21 understands my points, and agrees with them. He also explained it very well.

2297. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 02:50:04 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609225004.10018.00000224@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68495

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Look into the SUNY/Excelsior Regents program, Vippy.

Sure. What do they have there?

>Whats a NON-random group of hams, Vippy?

I said random. That means I had no part in the selection process, nor did I have knowledge of what they looked like, nor any reason to believe they were overweight.

I chose that event because they were going on a DXpedition and operating a few different radio modes - things I were interested in.

2298. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 02:58:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609225801.10018.00000225@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68497

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Traditional education is fine for you. I won't allow it for my children.
>
>What children?

I don't have any children now. I meant in the future.

>This is unfair to those that don't believe in
>> those things.
>
>Yeah, Vipul. To a guy like you, life is full of inequities.

I obtained good grades in difficult rf specific courses. Unfortunately, the courses were not of good quality. I saw some good rf courses, with a lab, at Ohio State.

>> Yes, code is worthless.
>
>You have no way of knowing if it is worthless or not.

It may be useful for some people. It doesn't deserve to be in between a license class.

>How do you know you'll never use them again? You haven't lived your
>life yet.

Several years later, I've never used them. It's common sense that some topics are not useful. I know I'll never run across the situation where I do need to use that subject.

Also, the topics that I wrote down before I started college, I seem to run across those often.

>You can start by demanding a refund for those EE classes. That story
>about fluorescent lighting in automobiles indicates that you didn't get
>your money's worth.

Its part of building a Ham station. That could be useful to some people.

>> Also, courses should be evaluated on their
>> usefulness.
>
>...as determined by you?

Well, politicians should not determine it. One example is some courses to improve MCAS scores, as recommended by a politician. Also, just school administrators should not evaluate them. I believe teachers that know their

subject material, and are allowed to use non-traditional method (as long as it helps understand the subject), would help.

Also, don't exclude certain experts, for example people that worked in that subject for many years, and may know more than Profs that never worked in their field, just because they couldn't get a teaching certificate.

>Many
>universities are, in reality, private educational companies.

Once you are enrolled in that college, you cannot take a private education course that competes with the school's course, and get college credit for it. I've seen private companies offer C classes for lower cost than what universities charge, probably at the same or higher quality. But because the school was not accredited, you received no college credit for that course.

Schools get accredited, not courses. A school with all bad courses CAN get accredited. It has happened. You won't receive credit for a good quality course if the school is not accredited.

>.not in a theatre full of people expecting to see "Othello" and who
>instead are treated to the sight of a guy changing a tire.

If you have seen some recent plays, you would be surprise that some have "common" people stuff. You may see a person changing a tire. But, that's another subject.

>> Tires do not listen to Shakespeare.
>
>Apparently neither do you. You and tires have something in common.

That's a good one!

>Who the hell takes a camping course?

I wanted to learn some of the stuff traditional education does not teach. It was a private company. Unfortunately, they were very school-like and taught by lectures, more than experiences. The experience way is better.

The DXpedition I went on last month with some Hams turned out to be much better learning experience for the camping skills I was trying to learn. They should have DXpeditions, operating radios on several modes, for the camping course.

>> It takes a village...
>
>...and in the village, you'll find a school. Let your children go there
>and interact with other children. They'll be much better for it.

You may find a set of traditions, culture, and real purpose. Something that you can't learn in school. Something that school takes away from you.

2299. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:01:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE54A35.9020300@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68498

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Quite simply put..... USE THE BAND OR LOSE THEM!!!!!!!!!!

Sure enough.

> 2 meters is typically popularly used, but in some areas is quiet except for
> certain times like morning and evening drive time. 70 cm is (in my area at
> least) used a little bit for repeater use, but otherwise quiet. At least
> gear for these bands are widely available..... just wish they would make all
> mode 2 meter rigs and allmode 70cm rigs!!!!!

> Six could start to be utilized more on a local basis if hams started to use
> it more. I have found that my case, mobile operation, that using SSB I have
> had local range use of 30-70 miles radius of my location. FM on six gets
> anywhere from around 10-30 miles local use (simplex) This is my personal
> experience. It seems like we still could use that band a little more than
> just during band openings. I see ham's usage of six meters akin to only
> caring for your kids when they are good, and totally disowning them when
> they are bad!

But why am I going to buy a 6 meter rig to talk local. I think one of
the reasons we have 6 meters in the first place is that it is such an
unrelaible band. That may be the fun of it for some hams, but for
business use, they would have to use it for local use, then put up with
occasional major intereference from everyone else on that frequency.

>
>
> As far as 220, 902 and 1.2Ghz allocations, if there were more gear
> available, at a reasonable price from our bigger manufacturers (Kenwood,
> Icom, Yaesu, Alinco etc.) may be we would hear more on these bands. I would
> also like to see them make more all-mode gear for those bands, (or at least
> SSB) for some of the different digital modes. PSK would be cool to use on
> 6m, 2m, and 70cm as an alternative to packet. In fact I can see some merit
> in using PSK over packet in those bands for public service/emergency comms!
>
>
> If we as a whole don't start using the bands.... we are gonna lose them.
> And I probably will be the first to say, "I told ya so!"

Sure enough. Problem is, the really high band's utility for most
amateur type work are pretty limited. I enjoy the articles about how so
and so conjured up some rig to talk to his buddy across town, and the
gargantuan efforts to set distance record between a few hams, but that's
about the extent of the people there. It is a fertile ground for short
distance comms, how many do we need? If we were on the air in droves

there, I would take up a "my cold dead fingers" approach. But we're not, and I'm not going to become an experimenter at those freq's just to camp out there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2300. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:02:46 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609230246.10018.00000227@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68499

From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie

>> > It takes a village...
>>
>> ...and in the (every) village, you'll find a

I know that one. You'll find a village idiot.

>I just can't resist.....a VIPUL!

Thats not funny. By the way, Vipul means someone with vast knowledge. (I may not live up to that, but thats what my name means).

2301. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:04:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EE54AAC.3050007@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68500

>
>
> 1940 FCC decision to move FM broadcasting up from the 40 MHz
> region to its present band was a financial burden to Armstrong's
> fledgling BC organization. Armstrong had funded most of that
> development with his own money.
>
>
My father had an FM tuner for that band. Listened to Armstrong's
station, and
called in a request. Ed was thrilled that he had a listener :) Told
my brother,
who was 3 years old at the time that it was bedtime.

> In actuality, Armstrong's widow eventually won no less that 21
> patent infrigement suits against as many corporations and won
> about $10 million total restitution.
>
> Continuing to portray RCA Corporation and David Sarnoff in a bad
> light is incorrect. RCA had backed Armstrong in pre-WW2 suits
> and Armstrong continued to earn dividends from RCA stock.
>
Ed and Dave used to be friends, but had a "falling out". Sarnoff didn't
want FM to
distract the consumer from his baby television. Monday morning
quarterbacking
would suggest that if Armstrong mentioned that FM would make an awesome
soundtrack
for television to Sarnoff, maybe the confrontations and such might not
have happened ....
Sure.....

>
> If it is any consolation, remember that Sarnoff was a morseman
> and that RCA Corporation was a creation from part of General
> Electric...the same corporation that bought RCA in the 1980s.
> :-)
>
>
You mean raped and pillaged. I was there. Wasn't a pretty sight :(

2302. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:10:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609231031.10018.00000228@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68401

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>I never said one unlearns things
>
> WHHHHOOOOAAAAAA! YOU said that if someone is proficient at higher speeds
>of Morse Code, they became UN-proficient (unlearned) Morse Code at the SLOWER
>rate. So which way is it?

You are right. In general one does not unlearn things.

This is a special case where one unlearns something as a result of learning something else (actually the same thing at a faster speed). This occurs when one tries to memorize a real-time sequence. A teacher (not a Morse code teacher), told me that this can occur. It has happened to me, on occasion.

>>They were unable to do that because they were not taught that in school.
>
> Gene Pool Deficiency transcends class and education.

Someone cannot know something they were not taught. Some believe in psychics, but I don't believe in them.

2303. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:12:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609231232.10018.00000229@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68402

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>How on earth does a
>person know something that he doesn't know is of no use to him?

By that same logic, how do educators know whats useful to a person?

2304. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:23:24 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609232324.10018.00000231@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68403

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>Uh huh, The poor student isn't being taught properly by the evil,
>stupid teacher. Well then, why doesn't the poor student go find someone
>who can teach them then?

Often, its not the teacher's fault. They have to work within the system. If
they tried non-traditional methods, they would not be allowed that.

The student can't go somewhere else because the student needs those courses to
graduate. The student can't go to another school because that school is
following the same methods.

>And the student that does not learn then blames it on the teacher?

Its worse than that. Whole <useful> subjects are not being taught. And
worthless subjects are being taught.

>That is because they
>are adolescents, and do not have enough life experience to realize that
>what may not be of any use now, might be a real lifesaver later.

I can ask a very old person whether certain subjects are useful and that person
probably will agree with me.

>And what is better, to learn something that you
>may never use, or to miss learning something that becomes of critical
>importance just because at one time, you KNEW it was of no usful purpose?

How about something I knew that <would> be useful, but I could not learn
because it did not fit into the required courses according to traditional
educational criteria?

2305. Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:25:39 UTC
From: xganon <remailer@xganon.com>
Message-ID: <7fdc15a21dd3ef5c5dea7eb0c59549ed@xganon.com>
Source record: 68496
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think. We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions. We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know technical issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This should not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do. For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to talk with him before you condemn him.

This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html

I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)

Unit 2711, Florida
twistedhed@webtv.net

This post was anonymized at http://www.xganon.com

XGANON is sponsord by
http://www.pca.net
For all your computer needs!

2306. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:27:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE5506C.2050404@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68404

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>
>
>>>I can see by your arguments that you don't understand the concept I am
>>
>>trying
>>
>>>to advocate.
>>
>> Which is why I just asked you your paradigms for your concept. You have
>
>
>>to be able to explain them if you want anyone to believe them.
>
>
> You missed it. Lenover21 understands my points, and agrees with them. He also
> explained it very well.

Oh sheesh!..... Heh heh.... Just about the time you think you've seen
it all.... This is the most amusing thing I've seen in a while...

- Mike KB3EIA -

2307. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:31:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609233133.10018.00000232@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68405

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Please
>explain how traditional education assumes that everything occurs in a
>vacuum.

One example is an econ course where the stock market is discussed, but they never show you how to read the stock market tables.

>I've never heard of a high school or university course in the handling
>of travelers checks.

That's right. They don't. They should.

2308. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:32:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE5517A.6030701@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68406

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>How on earth does a
>>person know something that he doesn't know is of no use to him?
>
>
> By that same logic, how do educators know whats useful to a person?

By the experiences they have had. In the aggregate, experienced people can have a good idea of wwhat is needed.

And your response to me indicates that logic wasn't used at all.

But then again, maybe your new best friend understands what you are talking about! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2309. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:42:37 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030609234237.10018.00000234@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68407

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo

>I thing it is a pop culture thing, and the celebration of failure.
>Funny, because that is exactly what it produces... failure.
>

Some of that is not even a "celebration of failure". Some of the music has no message at all! One sentense has no relationship to another. They just use a bunch of rhyming words with music.

Similarly, many movies are becoming that way. Seems like some of the dumbest movies often have high box office sales, while meaningful movies sometimes don't. They will keep getting that way if the public keeps buying that way.

2310. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:45:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE5542A.E0E883D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68408

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 6/9/03 2:24 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EE4DEBD.BAB956B@earthlink.net>
>
> >> > Since pop
> >> >culture, movies, music, and sports have nothing to do with your EE major,
> >> >why do you consider them worthwhile
> >>
> >> Because these skills are useful.
> >
> >Pop culture is important but great literature isn't important?
>
> Of course, Dave. How else do you think a guy who wears horn rimmed
> glasses and pocket protectors learns to impress "preety fems"???

I think he's desperate to attract one, "preety" or not so he can get
started on producing those children he intends to home school in only
worthwhile (to him) subjects. I envision a pack of mini-Vipuls, able to
change tires and tie knots but who won't have an inkling of Huxley or
Steinbeck.

Dave K8MN
sitting on a gold mine of worthless information. Questions answered -
$1 each. Questions answered correctly - $5 each.

2311. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:48:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EE55529.5040103@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68409

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>
>>Please
>>explain how traditional education assumes that everything occurs in a
>>vacuum.
>
>
> One example is an econ course where the stock market is discussed, but they
> never show you how to read the stock market tables.

I learned that in High school. We had a course in which we were taught
that. Took about one class and a quiz. You can learn the same by talking
to your stockbroker.

>>I've never heard of a high school or university course in the handling
>>of travelers checks.
>
>
> That's right. They don't. They should.

We had a course in that when I went to high school too. Took me about
ten minutes to learn. Having a specific course in it would put me to sleep.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2312. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 03:51:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE55598.706EA89A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68410

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> >Look into the SUNY/Excelsior Regents program, Vippy.
>
> Sure. What do they have there?
>
> >Whats a NON-random group of hams, Vippy?
>
> I said random. That means I had no part in the selection process, nor did I
> have knowledge of what they looked like, nor any reason to believe they were
> overweight.
>
> I chose that event because they were going on a DXpedition and operating a few
> different radio modes - things I were interested in.

No, Vipul, they weren't going on a DXpedition.

Dave K8MN

2313. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:10:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE55A98.ABDAD00@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68412

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Traditional education is fine for you. I won't allow it for my children.
> > >
> > >What children?
> >
> > I don't have any children now. I meant in the future.

As I recall, you haven't met the right "preety fem" yet either. You'll
have plenty of time after finding someone who agrees to marry you and to
bear your children for both the kids and you to grow.

> > >This is unfair to those that don't believe in
> > >> those things.
> > >
> > >Yeah, Vipul. To a guy like you, life is full of inequities.
> >
> > I obtained good grades in difficult rf specific courses. > Unfortunately, the courses
were not of good quality. I saw some good > rf courses, with a lab, at
> Ohio State.

Blame yourself. You screwed up and went to the wrong school.

> > >> Yes, code is worthless.
> > >
> > >You have no way of knowing if it is worthless or not.
> >
> > It may be useful for some people.

You just told us that it is worthless.

> It doesn't deserve to be in between a license class.

You have no way of determining that.

> > >How do you know you'll never use them again? You haven't lived your
> > >life yet.
> >
> > Several years later, I've never used them.

Life is a long road. I never used geometry for years then--BANG! I
needed to calculate the length of some guy wires. I never thought I'd
need Joseph Conrad again until some "preety fem" sitting next to me at a
dinner asked what I thought of "Heart of Darkness".

> It's common sense that some topics are not useful.

Not YOUR common sense, it isn't.

> I know I'll never run across the situation where I do need to
> use that subject.

I just KNOW that you're incorrect.

> Also, the topics that I wrote down before I started college, I seem to run
> across those often.

That seems right. If you write down "pop music" and then proceed to
listen to nothing but pop music, you've got yourself a self-fulfilling
prophecy.

> >You can start by demanding a refund for those EE classes. That story
> >about fluorescent lighting in automobiles indicates that you didn't get
> >your money's worth.
>
> Its part of building a Ham station. That could be useful to some people.

Flourescent lighting is part of building a ham station?

> >> Also, courses should be evaluated on their
> >> usefulness.
> >
> >...as determined by you?
>
> Well, politicians should not determine it. One example is some courses to
> improve MCAS scores, as recommended by a politician. Also, just school
> administrators should not evaluate them. I believe teachers that know their
> subject material, and are allowed to use non-traditional method (as long as it
> helps understand the subject), would help.

What I asked was: "as determined by you?"

> Also, don't exclude certain experts, for example people that worked in that
> subject for many years, and may know more than Profs that never worked in their
> field, just because they couldn't get a teaching certificate.

Why couldn't they get a teaching certificate?

> >Many
> >universities are, in reality, private educational companies.
>
> Once you are enrolled in that college, you cannot take a private education
> course that competes with the school's course, and get college credit for it.

Got some news for you. If you enroll at Joe's Computer School, Joe
isn't going to give you credit for anybody else's courses either.
You can, however, transfer credits between accredited schools.

> I've seen private companies offer C classes for lower cost than what
> universities charge, probably at the same or higher quality. But because the
> school was not accredited, you received no college credit for that course.

Lower cost and maybe better quality (but you don't know)...Why not just
take the courses and skip the credit if superior (maybe) quality and
saving a few bucks is what is important to you?

> Schools get accredited, not courses. A school with all bad courses CAN get
> accredited. It has happened.

Please provide an example. Show your work.

> You won't receive credit for a good quality
> course if the school is not accredited.

No kidding? That still seems okay if the school teaches broadcasting
and all I'm interested in doing is learning the necessary skills to work
in broadcasting. I'd likely seek an accredited school if I wanted to
teach broadcasting.

> >.not in a theatre full of people expecting to see "Othello" and who
> >instead are treated to the sight of a guy changing a tire.
>
> If you have seen some recent plays, you would be surprise that some have
> "common" people stuff. You may see a person changing a tire. But, that's
> another subject.

Shakespeare's stuff was full of common people. Alas, the tire had not
been invented in his time.

> >> Tires do not listen to Shakespeare.
> >
> >Apparently neither do you. You and tires have something in common.
>
> That's a good one!
>
> >Who the hell takes a camping course?
>
> I wanted to learn some of the stuff traditional education does not teach. It
> was a private company. Unfortunately, they were very school-like and taught by
> lectures, more than experiences. The experience way is better.

The Boy Scouts is not only better, it is cheaper.

> The DXpedition I went on last month with some Hams turned out to be much better
> learning experience for the camping skills I was trying to learn.

It seems that you didn't learn that you did not go on a DXpedition.
If you believe you did so, please tell us about the country or countries
visited on your DXpedition. Please show your work. If you went to
China, please show your wok.

> They should
> have DXpeditions, operating radios on several modes, for the camping course.

Sure they should, Vipul and Osbourne family reruns playing non-stop.

> >> It takes a village...
> >
> >...and in the village, you'll find a school. Let your children go there
> >and interact with other children. They'll be much better for it.
>
> You may find a set of traditions, culture, and real purpose. Something > that you can't learn in school. Something that school takes away from > you.

Vipul, quit insulting my intelligence.

Dave K8MN

2314. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:10:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306092010.1088fffc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68411
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bc2tf6$n6s$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
> news:ve7kf113fsui9b@corp.supernews.com...
> > Phil,
> >
> > Hummmm. If you can not transmit CW and its not a Amatuer Band,
> > could the FCC allow Tech to operate on the band?
>
> It is an amateur HF set of frequencies or channels and would, it seems,
> possibly allow techs to be given permission to operate. The FCC
> would have to make a rule change to do that. Does anyone know if a tech
> is allowed to operate on the speial 7mhz channel in Alaska?

I've never heard of a 40M Alaska emergency freq, would be new info for
me. Do you perchance mean the 5167.5 mHz Alaska Emergency freq?

>
> > What was the FCC reasoning for the allocation?
>
> To allow amateurs to operate there. The ARRL had petitioned for
> a band. The FCC gave 5 discrete frequencies instead and specified
> USB mode only.
>
> > Will five channel enable a significate amount increase
> > communications to make this worth the effort?
>
> Depends on how you define worthwhile.
> Will this aleviate any "crowding" on other HF bands? Not
> at all. Does this provide a unique and beneficial set
> of designated emergency channels? Yes, and that should
> prove worthwhile if for no other reason.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

w3rv

2315. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:17:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE55C6D.5BC38B91@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68413

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

> Its worse than that. Whole <useful> subjects are not being taught. And
> worthless subjects are being taught.

Again, Vipul, these judgements have been made by you?

> >That is because they
> >are adolescents, and do not have enough life experience to realize that
> >what may not be of any use now, might be a real lifesaver later.
>
> I can ask a very old person whether certain subjects are useful and
> that person probably will agree with me.

Ask an old, coherent person who has been successful in life and I
believe you'll find a person who does not agree with you. That person,
after speaking at length with you, may even grow fearful. Try not to
alarm the old people you encounter, Vipul.

> How about something I knew that <would> be useful, but I could not > learn because it did not fit into the required courses according to > traditional educational criteria?

I've learned a number of things which I've found useful but which were
not taught in school. I learned about them on my own. Can't you do the
same? Your education doesn't stop after class or after you've completed
school.

Dave K8MN

2316. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:30:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE55EBA.F4F247A6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68414

xganon wrote:
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.

No, you don't.

> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions.

Maybe some of you are good operators. But all of you are scofflaws.

> We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know technical
> issues as well or better.

Using a radio made for radio amateurs does not prove that you know
anything about technical issues at all. By the way, it is "Yaesu" and
"Icom".

> However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This > should not be.

You are second class citizens. You are lawbreakers. You have not taken
and passed any license exam.

> We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.

Sure you do. If licensed hams broke the law as you do, they'd face
similar penalties.

> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding > is a viable
alternative to getting a ham radio license.

I don't know of any U.S. hams who feel that they are "under Uncle Sam's
thumb". I don't know why anyone would rather operate illegal equipment
on illegal frequencies when it would be a simple matter to pass a
licensing exam for those of you familiar with "technical issues".

> What I am saying is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to > talk with him before
you condemn him.

If it is all the same to you, I'd rather not talk to him at all.

Dave K8MN

2317. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:32:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE55F4F.785FA7B9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68415

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >Please
> >explain how traditional education assumes that everything occurs in a
> >vacuum.
>
> One example is an econ course where the stock market is discussed, but they
> never show you how to read the stock market tables.

Vipul, have you ever taken an Econ course?

> >I've never heard of a high school or university course in the handling
> >of travelers checks.
>
> That's right. They don't. They should.

I think they might in some of the remedial classes.

Dave K8MN

2318. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:41:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610004148.25815.00000588@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68417

In article <bc291h$hr7$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Good one Steve...and 'Putz' is being nice.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

No. Definitely NOT "nice."

>> >But...lots of the already-licensed
>> > INSIST on keeping that code test for amateur radio a half century
>> > later.
>>
>> I know you disdain facts, Oh Scummy One, however it's not those
unwashed
>> masses of licensed Amateurs who are "insisting" on keeping Morse Code
>> testing...it's those UNLICENSED folks in Gettysburg, PA.

Hmmm...I thought the FCC is headquartered in DC.
A few at the FCC do have amateur radio licenses;
Riley Hollingsworth is one of those.

>> YOU are welcomed to explain why you keep stalking licensed Amateur
Radio
>> operators online and making such obviously and patently false accusations
about
>> them.

I don't have to answer any baseless charges made by some
PCTAs who refuse to accept the fact that there are differing
opinions on the code test issue...and insist that all such
differing opinions are "insults."

As to "stalking," I'm not the one stalking any posting I
make. That's a licensed amateur.

I've made no "false accusations" as to the stubbornness of
some PCTAs' refusal to accept any viewpoint other than
their own. It's on public view.

2319. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:41:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610004149.25815.00000589@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68416

In article <20030609082312.14458.00000141@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
>> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
>> new arguments for keeping it. :-)
>>
>Why are new arguments needed when many of the existing ones are still valid?

The existing arguments in favor of code test retention are
NOT valid.

The only "validity" is that the already-licensed extras had to
take such a test and they seem to insist that everyone else
must do so, too.

That's just emotional self-righteousness of a very personal
kind, not at all applicable to the US agency that grants such
amateur licenses.

2320. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 04:54:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE564E7.3AFA355D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68418

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030609082312.14458.00000141@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
> >> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
> >> new arguments for keeping it. :-)
> >>
> >Why are new arguments needed when many of the existing ones are still valid?
>
> The existing arguments in favor of code test retention are
> NOT valid.

You'll excuse me while I laugh out loud at the idea of your making such
a judgement call. After all, you aren't involved in amateur radio.

> The only "validity" is that the already-licensed extras had to
> take such a test and they seem to insist that everyone else
> must do so, too.

I haven't seen that as a reason for retention of morse testing. I note
that YOU trot it out periodically.

> That's just emotional self-righteousness of a very personal
> kind, not at all applicable to the US agency that grants such
> amateur licenses.

How do you deal with the your appearance of emotional self-righteousness
in promoting your views as a non-participant in amateur radio?

Dave K8MN

2321. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 05:00:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE56657.BED5248C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68419

Len Over 21 wrote:

> I don't have to answer any baseless charges made by some
> PCTAs who refuse to accept the fact that there are differing
> opinions on the code test issue...and insist that all such
> differing opinions are "insults."

Your opinions have not been held to be insults. You've frequently inserted the insults along with your opinions on morse testing. On occasion, you hurl insults at amateur radio in general, at the ARRL or at individual radio amateurs who disagree with you.

> I've made no "false accusations" as to the stubbornness of
> some PCTAs' refusal to accept any viewpoint other than
> their own.

Sure you have, Leonard, old boy. Fess up. Can you tell us why you stubbornly refuse to consider any viewpoint other than your own?

> It's on public view.

Yes, "they are" not "it's" on public view.

Dave K8MN

2322. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 05:57:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610015724.10078.00000145@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68422

In article <3EE5517A.6030701@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>
>>>How on earth does a
>>>person know something that he doesn't know is of no use to him?
>>
>> By that same logic, how do educators know whats useful to a person?
>
> By the experiences they have had. In the aggregate, experienced people
>can have a good idea of wwhat is needed.

The problem is that few in the academic world ARE experienced
in the field that they teach. The vast majority of the electronics
instructors in college is that they are way behind on electronics
technology used in industry or found in the marketplace.

Few instructors of political science have actually run for any
government-level elective office. Few instructors of economics
have used their "knowledge" to advance their own finances.
Few instructors of history have ever set any history. :-)

Students have to sit politely in classrooms and do their
assignments obediently in order to secure the grades that will
allow them to eventually graduate. They also are required to
respect their instructors no matter what...without that they
get tossed out of class with loss of credits.

I once took an extension course in digital logic at a large
junior college here in Los Angeles. The instructor had about
a tenth of the work experience I had at the time and his "industry
examples" were at least 20 years old. Some of his class rules
were quite strict such as never, ever thinking of an Exclusive-OR
gate as a gate. Ex-ORs had to always be drawn made up out of
ANDs and ORs and Inverters. He refused to unbend from that
militant ruling despite being shown a Texas Instrument TTL
package long on the market containing 4 Exclusive-ORs. All of
us students had to work according to His rules on that. This
instructor had a control-freak personality but one had to be nice
to him or risk loss of credits. No real learning in such classes,
none that couldn't be had from 20 year old textbooks carrying
the same information.

Extension courses don't normally count for degree credits but
they should be taught to the same standards as in all classes
and with reasonably up-to-date curricula.

> And your response to me indicates that logic wasn't used at all.

Your response indicates that you are just another hopping on
the Hate bandwagon of Bwahahah and the Colonel, stalking
all who don't conform to their idea of an amateur. <shrug>

> But then again, maybe your new best friend understands what you are
>talking about! ;^)

Who would that be? I have several good friends and one was
Best Man at my wedding...W6MJN.

2323. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 05:57:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610015725.10078.00000146@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68420

In article <3EE5506C.2050404@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> You missed it. Lenover21 understands my points, and agrees with them. He
>also
>> explained it very well.
>
> Oh sheesh!..... Heh heh.... Just about the time you think you've seen
>it all.... This is the most amusing thing I've seen in a while...

You are wanting maybe a Don Rickles imitation, hockey puck?

:-)

2324. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 05:57:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610015725.10078.00000147@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68421

In article <20030609230246.10018.00000227@mb-m26.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie
>
>>> > It takes a village...
>>>
>>> ...and in the (every) village, you'll find a
>
>I know that one. You'll find a village idiot.
>
>>I just can't resist.....a VIPUL!
>
>Thats not funny. By the way, Vipul means someone with vast knowledge. (I may
>not live up to that, but thats what my name means).

One problem with US amateur radio is its demographics indicating an overwhelming majority being white males of Judeo-Christian religious beliefs. Such hams will have great fun putting down anyone not of Anglo-Saxon ancestry or "western" ethnics.

No "western" given name? Oh, wow, great opportunity for calling such all sorts of depreciatory names, making fun of them for not fitting in with "being American." That's getting more typical every day in US amateur radio.

2325. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 05:57:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610015727.10078.00000148@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68423

In article <3EE54AAC.3050007@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> 1940 FCC decision to move FM broadcasting up from the 40 MHz
>> region to its present band was a financial burden to Armstrong's
>> fledgling BC organization. Armstrong had funded most of that
>> development with his own money.
>>
>My father had an FM tuner for that band. Listened to Armstrong's
>station, and called in a request. Ed was thrilled that he had a listener :)
Told
>my brother, who was 3 years old at the time that it was bedtime.
>
>> In actuality, Armstrong's widow eventually won no less that 21
>> patent infrigement suits against as many corporations and won
>> about $10 million total restitution.
>>
>> Continuing to portray RCA Corporation and David Sarnoff in a bad
>> light is incorrect. RCA had backed Armstrong in pre-WW2 suits
>> and Armstrong continued to earn dividends from RCA stock.
>>
>Ed and Dave used to be friends, but had a "falling out". Sarnoff didn't want
FM to
>distract the consumer from his baby television. Monday morning quarterbacking
>would suggest that if Armstrong mentioned that FM would make an awesome
soundtrack
>for television to Sarnoff, maybe the confrontations and such might not have
happened ....
>Sure.....

The black-and-white TV standards in the US were developed before
WW2 by an industry group. It specified FM for the sound carrier.
The FCC accepted that. Neither Armstrong nor Sarnoff had much to
say about it. US radio-electronics industry said it and specified it.

After WW2 and after the CBS-RCA technical fight over color TV
standards (both were bad for the market), industry again did their
thing on standards. The NTSC came up with the compatible color
system that allowed old B&W receivers to get color TV images in
black and white. Sound carrier remained FM just as the prewar
US TV standard.

RCA Corporation's huge color TV campaign for the NTSC system
meant RCA corporate income in everything from TV receivers to
broadcast equipment (they "owned" the market on TV studio

cameras in the 50s and 60s). Sound-only broadcasting was a
much smaller economic environment in the post-WW2 period.
The USA already had thousands of AM BC stations and the
quality music through FM BC was limited to those involved in
"high fidelity sound." The market wasn't as large for only sound
but picture-and-sound had mass appeal.

>> If it is any consolation, remember that Sarnoff was a morseman
>> and that RCA Corporation was a creation from part of General
>> Electric...the same corporation that bought RCA in the 1980s.
>> :-)
>>
>You mean raped and pillaged. I was there. Wasn't a pretty sight :(

I was employed by RCA Corporation 8 years and RCA's only
West Coast division split up and sold before the GE acquisition.
It was just another hiccup in local aerospace, not the "rape or
pillage." Stuff happens.

The assumption is always that Ed Armstrong was a wonderful guy
sort of genius. He wasn't. He was a mover and shaker himself
and had a sizeable ego and temperament. He wasn't all that easy
to get along with if you didn't go along with him, according to many
who did go along with him. Genius, I would say, but not the sort
to be any sort of saint. Armstrong could never have gotten his FM
network started without those qualities of his.

David Sarnoff was a businessman first and foremost. He had the
knack of recognizing good potentials for investment and profit
in the future. [that didn't get passed to his son Robert...]
In the post-WW2 period, Armstrong had traded his superregen
patent rights for a big block of RCA stock (Westinghouse had
already bought rights to Armstrong's other patents before WW2).
By 1960 there wasn't much chance of a superregenerative
receiver having great profit potential for RCA...conventional
superheterodyne receivers were already working well at VHF for
FM BC reception. Armstrong's superheterodyne patents were
already losing ground on licensing due to expiration (superhet
patent was granted 1920 and renewable once, would expire in
1954). All Armstrong had going for him was his fledgling FM
network and he was up against other networks besides NBC.

Sometimes the "heroes" wind up with all sorts of clay things.

2326. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 08:39:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB0B1185.1C8CE%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 68424

"Dave Heil" wrote:

> xganon wrote:
>>
>> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things
>> I have read in this group and in QRZ discussions
>> regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies
>> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams
>> than you might think.
>
> No, you don't.

This is a troll message, Dave. The exact same message was posted several months ago, right down to the subject line (search Google). Not surprisingly, I responded to that one almost the same as you did to this one.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2327. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 08:44:44 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3ee598c0.2347457325@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 68425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

On Mon, 9 Jun 2003 22:25:39 -0500, xganon <remailer@xganon.com> wrote:

>What I am saying is
>that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to talk with
>him before you condemn him.

Maybe some of the condemnation is directed at the activity (which
happens to not be legal) instead of the person doing it.

You may be a nice guy, understand radio theory, be a good operator,
etc., but you are still breaking the law.

And if you'd disregard one law, chances are you might just disregard
many. So how do you expect to gain any respect from people when
you openly admit to being a criminal ?

73, Jim KH2D

2328. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 12:28:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306100428.f228e54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68426

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030609202326.03929.00000116@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
> writes:

> >But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur alllocation,
> >could the FCC allow Techs to operate.
>
> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.

The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.

For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply. See: Japan.

Brian

2329. Re: Ham radio = toast?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 12:40:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306100440.37befbe2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68427

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<u6QEa.24054$DI.962@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>...
> "Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bbqgtn$h3f$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > I suspect there are some people in this here chatrum who don't even
> > acknowledge the existence of amateur radio activity above 30MHz, but for
> > those who aren't living in the 1920s, here is another reason for concern
> > about VHF and above allocations.
> >
> > This time it's from W himself:
> >
> > "We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of U.S.
> > spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available to
> > support critical government functions."
> >
> >
> http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A.shtml
> >
> > Do ARRL and/or radio amateurs have an answer? Does that answer have
> > enough zeros before the decimal point if you know what I mean wink wink
> > nudge nudge say no more say no more?
> >
> > 73 Corry K4DOH
>
> Well, unlocking any of the amateur spectrum that is actually used by hams
> would be somewhat counterproductive.
>
> It just wouldn't work.
>
> Say the 20m band was given or sold to a private company. With thousands of
> antennas and transceivers already set up to transmit in the new Corporate
> frequency, there would be so many pirate transmissions by the former users
> as to render the band useless to the new owners.

You are saying that the former users (US Amateurs) are lawless. I disagree.

2330. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 12:49:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610084953.11485.00000302@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68428

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/9/03 11:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030610004148.25815.00000588@mb-m07.aol.com>

> No. Definitely NOT "nice."

For YOU, Lennie...?!?! It was exceedingly conservative.

> Hmmm...I thought the FCC is headquartered in DC.
> A few at the FCC do have amateur radio licenses;
> Riley Hollingsworth is one of those.

My bust...However the FACT remains tht it is NOT the LICENSED Amateurs who have "insisted" on keeping the code...but the UNLICENSED folks in the FCC...As YOU have pointed out.

Again...YOU are HARASSING the WRONG people.

>>> YOU are welcomed to explain why you keep stalking licensed Amateur
>Radio
>>> operators online and making such obviously and patently false accusations
>about
>>> them.
>
> I don't have to answer any baseless charges made by some
> PCTAs who refuse to accept the fact that there are differing
> opinions on the code test issue...and insist that all such
> differing opinions are "insults."

Sure you do.

You lie. You "misdirect". You mislead and deceive. You have a LOT to answer for, Your Putziness.

>As to "stalking," I'm not the one stalking any posting I
> make. That's a licensed amateur.

Nope. You came here. This is a forum for discussing Amateur Radio Policy. You are clearly NOT a licensed Amateur Radio operator.

>I've made no "false accusations" as to the stubbornness of
> some PCTAs' refusal to accept any viewpoint other than
> their own. It's on public view.

Yes...And it's pretty shameful stuff to read, too.

You should be ashamed of how you act. If "putziness" and "creepiness"
were quantifyable, you'd be at the head of your peergroup in all respects.

Putz.

Steve, K4CAP

2331. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:03:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610090319.11485.00000303@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68429

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/10/03 12:57 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030610015725.10078.00000147@mb-m26.aol.com>

>One problem with US amateur radio is its demographics indicating
> an overwhelming majority being white males of Judeo-Christian
> religious beliefs.

I am just beside myself waiting to see how Lennie the Lame explains how this bit of racist tripe fits into his "I Am Only Here To Civilly Debate The Morse Code Issue" rhetoric.

> Such hams will have great fun putting down
> anyone not of Anglo-Saxon ancestry or "western" ethnics.

No one here has put Vipul "down" because of any perception of non-Anglo origin. For all I know he's a white kid adopted into a Central Asian family.

YOU are the one making a racist issue of it.

>No "western" given name?

Only you are making an issue of it. Yeah, I call hip "Vippy", but then I call you Lennie...So what...?!?!

Steve, K4CAP

2332. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:06:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610090644.11485.00000304@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68430

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/9/03 9:43 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030609224348.10018.00000223@mb-m26.aol.com>

>You missed it. Lenover21 understands my points, and agrees with them. He also
>explained it very well.

He's also a documented pathological liar and antagonist.

I wouldn't be too anxious to affiliate myself with a creep like that,
Vipul.

Steve, K4CAP

2333. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:08:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610090845.11485.00000305@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68431

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/10/03 12:57 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030610015725.10078.00000146@mb-m26.aol.com>
>
>In article <3EE5506C.2050404@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>writes:
>
>>> You missed it. Lenover21 understands my points, and agrees with them. He
>>also
>>> explained it very well.
>>
>> Oh sheesh!..... Heh heh.... Just about the time you think you've seen
>>it all.... This is the most amusing thing I've seen in a while...
>
> You are wanting maybe a Don Rickles imitation, hockey puck?

Speaking of hockey pucks...

Steve, K4CAP

2334. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:20:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610092026.11485.00000306@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68432

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/9/03 9:50 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030609225004.10018.00000224@mb-m26.aol.com>

>>Look into the SUNY/Excelsior Regents program, Vippy.
>
>Sure. What do they have there?

The Excelsior Regent's program allows you to do home study and does
testing through the Sylvan Centers. I'll find the links and e mail them to
you.

>>Whats a NON-random group of hams, Vippy?
>
>I said random.

I know you did. I asked you what a NON-random group was.

>That means I had no part in the selection process, nor did I
>have knowledge of what they looked like, nor any reason to believe they were
>overweight.

Unless you know a particular group of Hams really well, it usually is very
random. And the "group" is always subject to last minute cancellations and
last minute additions, therefore is almost always "random".

Steve, K4CAP

2335. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:22:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610092240.11485.00000307@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68433

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/9/03 10:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030609231031.10018.00000228@mb-m26.aol.com>

>Someone cannot know something they were not taught. Some believe in psychics,
>but I don't believe in them.

"Psychics"...?!?!

Preety fems who can read your thoughts...?!?!

Steve, K4CAP

2336. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:28:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610092835.11485.00000308@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68434

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/9/03 9:09 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030609220903.10018.00000220@mb-m26.aol.com>

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>>It may FRONT as a "legitimate" business, but if it's processing "unrecorded
>>acsh", it's NOT "legitimate".
>
>Let me try to explain it to you. Its a legitamate business that sells a
>product. The customer pays cash or credit card, usually cash. The worker
>doesn't record the transaction and keeps the cash. This makes it unrecorded
>cash. Thats stealing from the company.

Well why didn't you say so a week ago?

I stand corrected.

>>>The current manager warned me that this is a risky job. My pay will be tied
>>>to
>>>how well I keep track of and control the transactions.
>>
>> ...and how well you manage to evade "the silver bullet".
>
>What's "the silver bullet"?

Let folks at your new job find out you're spying on them, and you'll find
out.

Steve, K4CAP

2337. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:36:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610093610.11485.00000309@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68435

>Subject: Respect For Freebanders
>From: xganon remailer@xganon.com
>Date: 6/9/03 10:25 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <7fdc15a21dd3ef5c5dea7eb0c59549ed@xganon.com>

>I am posting here because...(SNIP)

...I have nothing original to say and have reposted this tripe.

>We who use the frequencies
>from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.

Other than producing RF energy, freebanders have nothing in common with
licensed Amateurs.

>We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions.

And NO knowledge of the law.

>We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
>technical
>issues as well or better.

I'd think you'd be smart enough to have edited the names of the
manufacturers by now. Pretty well sums up the freebander stereotype.

>However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
>rude and condescending.

As they should. Freebanders are thieves and lawbreakers.

>We are treated like 2nd class citizens.

As thieves and lawbreakers should be treated.

>This should not be.

Sure it should.

>We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.

Show me where in the Constitution of the United States it says
"lawbreakers shall be treated equally". Other than your right to due process
and a fair trial, you don't deserve squat. You're a thief.

>What I am saying is
>that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to talk with
>him before you condemn him.

Freebander = Thief. Thief = Lawbreaker.

Steve, K4CAP

2338. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 13:37:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610093734.11485.00000310@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68436

>Subject: Re: Respect For Freebanders
>From: kh2d@my-deja.com
>Date: 6/10/03 3:44 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ee598c0.2347457325@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>

>And if you'd disregard one law, chances are you might just disregard
>many. So how do you expect to gain any respect from people when
>you openly admit to being a criminal ?

Smooth logic, Jim. Well said.

Steve, K4CAP

2339. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 15:11:07 UTC
From: Slim <DX@dxslimtonone.net>
Message-ID: <bc4se2hhc0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68437

Freebanders operate traffic nets and emergency service nets.
They also use data modes. They are good at what they do,
maybe better than hams. Now, hams may not like this, and
this activity may not be legal, but that doesn't change the fact
that it is happening and has been happening for decades.
Freeband activity, in fact, is on the rise. They are moving into
ten meters in ever increasing numbers. Now if you think the
FCC or anyone is going to stop that trend, I've got a bridge you
can buy and some waterfront property in Nevada.

(This space reserved for hams to foam at the mouth and jump
up & down while having a fit and throwing a tantrum.)

Slim,
standing by on 27880 khz
Mountain States Traffic Net

2340. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 15:31:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc4tkdjij0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 68438

Slim wrote:

> Freebanders operate traffic nets and emergency service nets.
> They also use data modes.

And may we suppose they coordinate those activities with local
authoritie? Right.

> They are good at what they do,
> maybe better than hams.

Being good at lawbreaking, and flitting among the shadows is an
attractive
attribute? Not where I come from.

> Now, hams may not like this, and
> this activity may not be legal, but that doesn't change the fact
> that it is happening and has been happening for decades.

So has robbing banks and rape, riot, and revolution.

>
> Freeband activity, in fact, is on the rise.

You wish. Most of them have gone to the Internet.

> They are moving into
> ten meters in ever increasing numbers.

And that may well be their Waterloo....look it up.

> Now if you think the
> FCC or anyone is going to stop that trend, I've got a bridge you
> can buy and some waterfront property in Nevada.

So you have to hide out in the desert to evade detection and
apprehension.

>
>
> (This space reserved for hams to foam at the mouth and jump
> up & down while having a fit and throwing a tantrum.)
>

Yeah, Right.

> Slim,
> standing by on 27880 khz
> Mountain States Traffic Net

So key up and let Uncle Charlie have a good fix. One transmission and
GOTCHA!!!

2341. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 16:57:35 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306100857.5a75d427@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68439

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21), returning from his Fortress Of Solitude, wrote in message news:<20030608002432.25052.00000459@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <20030607162512.12501.00000072@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
> >>Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.
> >>
> >>http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A.shtml
> >>
> >Cecil,
> >
> >Thanks for posting this! A true policy issue.
>
> That Associated Press wire story by David Ho ran in most news-papers on 5 Jun 03.

And the date of Cecil's post was?

> It had little substance to it, hardly more than a "filler" piece to anyone watching the US civil radio regulations.

Sounds like you don't want anyone to read it, Len.
>
> >Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:
>
> The article had NO "threats to amateur radio" since amateur radio wasn't even mentioned.

Faulty logic on your part, Len. The mere fact that a radio service isn't mentioned doesn't mean there's no threat.

> Only three specific user groups were cited: Cellular telephony, military radio, and public safety users (police, fire). The World Radio Conference beginning shortly in Geneva was briefly mentioned in the LA Times AP article printing.

From W hisself:

"We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of U.S.
spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available to
support critical government functions."

"unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential" can mean anything from some minor rules changes to wholesale reallocation.
"U.S. spectrum assets"
doesn't exclude the ham bands.

The threats are there, for anyone unbiased and realistic enough to see it.

But then again, you're not involved, Len.

2342. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 17:09:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc53hn$rq7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306092010.1088fffc@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bc2tf6$n6s$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
> > news:ve7kf113fsui9b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Phil,
> > >
> > > Hummmm. If you can not transmit CW and its not a Amatuer Band,
> > > could the FCC allow Tech to operate on the band?
> >
> > It is an amateur HF set of frequencies or channels and would, it seems,
> > possibly allow techs to be given permission to operate. The FCC
> > would have to make a rule change to do that. Does anyone know if a tech
> > is allowed to operate on the speial 7mhz channel in Alaska?
>
> I've never heard of a 40M Alaska emergency freq, would be new info for
> me. Do you perchance mean the 5167.5 mHz Alaska Emergency freq?

Yes, my mistake. So does anyone know if a tech
is allowed to operate on the special 5 mhz channel in Alaska?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2343. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 20:14:33 UTC
From: Slim <DX@dxslimtonone.net>
Message-ID: <bc5e6s$g90$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68441

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bc4tkdjij0@208.206.142.92...
>
>
> Slim wrote:
>
> > Freebanders operate traffic nets and emergency service nets.
> > They also use data modes.
>
> And may we suppose they coordinate those activities with local
> authoritie? Right.
>
>

Absolutely! Mountain States Net is just one of several regional
public service nets where many local government entities check
in on a daily basis.

>
> > They are good at what they do,
> > maybe better than hams.
>
> Being good at lawbreaking, and flitting among the shadows is an
> attractive
> attribute? Not where I come from.

This county has many bad laws on the books which remain
on the books and are simply not enforced. Nothing is done in
the shadows. Stations check in using valid names and locations,
and other valid identification.

>
>
> > Now, hams may not like this, and
> > this activity may not be legal, but that doesn't change the fact
> > that it is happening and has been happening for decades.
>
> So has robbing banks and rape, riot, and revolution.

You are talking apples & oranges. No comparison!

>
>
> >
> > Freeband activity, in fact, is on the rise.
>

> You wish. Most of them have gone to the Internet.

No, I don't wish. Do you? And internet will not
work to provide the service and emergency applications
being accomplished by nets. Hams argue that point
every day. Don't they?

>
>
> > They are moving into
> > ten meters in ever increasing numbers.
>
> And that may well be their Waterloo....look it up.

Where? In a phone book? Anyway, most of the
nets operate in Freeband, which is why other stations
are taking over the ten meter band. Guess if the hams
don't use it, they'll lose it.

>
>
> > Now if you think the
> > FCC or anyone is going to stop that trend, I've got a bridge you
> > can buy and some waterfront property in Nevada.
>
> So you have to hide out in the desert to evade detection and
> apprehension.

See above, no one is hiding or evading some kind of "detection."
That would defeat the public service purpose. Wouldn't it?

>
>
> >
> >
> > (This space reserved for hams to foam at the mouth and jump
> > up & down while having a fit and throwing a tantrum.)
> >
>
> Yeah, Right.

Well, you proved my point, didn't you?

>
>
> > Slim,
> > standing by on 27880 khz
> > Mountain States Traffic Net
>
> So key up and let Uncle Charlie have a good fix. One transmission and
> GOTCHA!!!
>

You don't know how absurd you sound, and you prove you don't
have the slightest clue how signals are analyzed and located, if in fact
that were even happening, and it is not happening.

I challenge you or anyone to check into a Freeband Public Service
Net and stop your whining and complaining. Hams are the ones who
are always saying we need to perform "public service." Right?

Slim

(Check out 27540 khz. Packet net runs 24/7)

2344. Re: Ham radio = toast?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 20:26:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc5ershlc1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68442

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0306100440.37befbe2@posting.google.com...
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<u6QEa.24054$DI.962@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>...
> > "Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:bbqgtn$h3f$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > I suspect there are some people in this here chatrum who don't even
> > > acknowledge the existence of amateur radio activity above 30MHz, but
for
> > > those who aren't living in the 1920s, here is another reason for
concern
> > > about VHF and above allocations.
> > >
> > > This time it's from W himself:
> > >
> > > "We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of
U.S.
> > > spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available
to
> > > support critical government functions."
> > >
> > >
> >
http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A.sh
tml
> > >
> > > Do ARRL and/or radio amateurs have an answer? Does that answer have
> > > enough zeros before the decimal point if you know what I mean wink
wink
> > > nudge nudge say no more say no more?
> > >
> > > 73 Corry K4DOH
> >
> > Well, unlocking any of the amateur spectrum that is actually used by
hams
> > would be somewhat counterproductive.
> >
> > It just wouldn't work.
> >
> > Say the 20m band was given or sold to a private company. With thousands
of
> > antennas and transceivers already set up to transmit in the new
Corporate
> > frequency, there would be so many pirate transmissions by the former

users
> > as to render the band useless to the new owners.
>
> You are saying that the former users (US Amateurs) are lawless. I
disagree.

The man has a good point Brian. I dont think all...but I think a large
percentage of 'previous occupants' would continue to use the band. And the
FCC catching them would be nill. Just like the zoo of 11 meters.

Only way to shut em down would be to hunt em down and do it that way.

Dan/W4NTI

2345. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 21:16:12 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <863cihprab.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 68443

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "DX" == DX <DX@dxslimtonone.net> writes:

DX> I challenge you or anyone to check into a Freeband Public Service
DX> Net and stop your whining and complaining. Hams are the ones who
DX> are always saying we need to perform "public service." Right?

If it's illegal to transmit on those frequencies in those modes with
that equipment without an amateur radio license, then it's illegal.
It may be condoned by some of the authorities, but it's still illegal.

I confess ignorance to the proper definition of the term "freeband",
but I'm going to go out on a limb and say it's "citizen's band" based
on the frequencies I saw mentioned. I haven't studied the approved
modes for those frequencies, but I'm almost positive that voice (or
phone, this nickel Extra always gets those confused) is the only
permitted mode, and that packet is not permitted. Also, I'm pretty
sure that only equipment that is type-certified for CB is allowed to
be used for CB. Is that the case, or am I mistaken?

If you've got the hardware and the skills, why not just make your
operations perfectly legitimate and get your amateur radio license?
It's obvious that you've made a commitment to operate and you have an
interest in operating well with others and in public service. The
added effort is minimal, and it opens up many other avenues for you to
explore. If your main reason is that you will no longer be able to
operate with your peers, the obvious response is to have all of you
take your tests together.

I suspect the FCC would prefer to have a dozen new hams working
together pursuing goodwill and public service than complaints about
people using the wrong equipment on the wrong frequencies in the wrong
modes. Heck, you might even have a net positive impact on the people
in this newsgroup, and that alone would be pretty impressive to me.

DX> Slim

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

```
iD8DBQE+5kqjGPFSfAB/ezgRAk3qAKCdES2Sxsi/DA8Y/p6QpCwKIeU2xQCfVAH7
kDcSWG/SGdA9RUq8cql/n6A=
=rh1w
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2346. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 21:51:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610175107.23307.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68444

In article <f45722ac.0306100428.f228e54@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030609202326.03929.00000116@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
>> writes:
>
>> >But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur alllocation,
>> >could the FCC allow Techs to operate.
>>
>> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.
>
>The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.
>
>For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply. See: Japan.

Actually, the code TEST requirement applies to administrative
license granting, does not apply to any specific bands other
than "operating privileges below 30 MHz.".

The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
it is written now. There are no ITU-R recommendations specifically
forbidding amateur "classes" anything. There are NO ITU-R
statements concerning "classes" of amateur licenses.

License regulations and allocation of use are disparate subjects.

2347. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 21:51:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610175108.23307.00000652@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68445

In article <3EE56657.BED5248C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> I don't have to answer any baseless charges made by some
>> PCTAs who refuse to accept the fact that there are differing
>> opinions on the code test issue...and insist that all such
>> differing opinions are "insults."
>
>Your opinions have not been held to be insults. You've frequently
>inserted the insults along with your opinions on morse testing.

No. Your own self-righteous opinions forbid any opposing
viewpoints from being anything other than "insults."

You continue to stand in Judgement over others of differing
viewpoints. That is the mark of the self-righteous.

>On
>occasion, you hurl insults at amateur radio in general, at the ARRL or
>at individual radio amateurs who disagree with you.

I've not "hurled insults at amateur radio in general." Some
individuals in here self-righteously identify all of US amateur
radio as having the same opinions as theirs. That is obviously
not true but those poor, thin-skinned righteous defenders of
their faith cannot be convinced otherwise.

>> I've made no "false accusations" as to the stubbornness of
>> some PCTAs' refusal to accept any viewpoint other than
>> their own.
>
>Sure you have, Leonard, old boy. Fess up. Can you tell us why you
>stubbornly refuse to consider any viewpoint other than your own?

I consider each and every viewpoint. Nearly all are personally
rejected and explained in public.

>> It's on public view.
>
>Yes, "they are" not "it's" on public view.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, really looking for "corrections" are you?

"It's" is an accept contraction form of "it is." Are you so self-
righteous in your opinions that you are now dictating rules of

English word and grammar use?

2348. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 21:51:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610175110.23307.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68446

In article <3EE564E7.3AFA355D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030609082312.14458.00000141@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> >>You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
>> >> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
>> >> new arguments for keeping it. :-)
>> >>
>> >Why are new arguments needed when many of the existing ones are still
>valid?
>>
>> The existing arguments in favor of code test retention are
>> NOT valid.
>
>You'll excuse me while I laugh out loud at the idea of your making such
>a judgement call. After all, you aren't involved in amateur radio.

That doesn't answer the question, despite trying to masquerade
as "Jim, N2EY."

The FCC is NOT INVOLVED in operating amateur radios. They
just regulate it along with every other US civil radio service.

The demand to BE INVOLVED or shut up is a bogus one, just
another excuse to attempt winning message points. The BE
INVOLVED argument, if a requirement for determining new
amateur radio regulations, would itself be unconstitutional as it
applied to free speech guarantees under the constitution.

The BE INVOLVED criterion is bogus self-righteousness that
pretends that only those already licensed be allowed to discuss
anything concerning getting into US amateur radio.

Your amateur radio license does not convey any special
conditions that only you or any other already-licensed citizen
are the only ones permitted to discuss getting into amateur
radio.

You do NOT run the FCC, do not have any censorship powers
on who may discuss what in regards to federal regulations.

>> The only "validity" is that the already-licensed extras had to
>> take such a test and they seem to insist that everyone else
>> must do so, too.
>
>I haven't seen that as a reason for retention of morse testing. I note
>that YOU trot it out periodically.

It is inherent in nearly all of the comments made on NPRM 98-
143 in favor of the code test retention. It is "turf," the Territorial
Imperative, "squatter's rights" sort of idea that having been
licensed a long time gives you some special rights over and
above others.

Few long-time radio amateurs will admit such an opinion openly,
yet so many insist that all newcomers meet THEIR criteria in
what a "ham" should be. THAT is your continuing self-
righteous opinion.

>> That's just emotional self-righteousness of a very personal
>> kind, not at all applicable to the US agency that grants such
>> amateur licenses.
>
>How do you deal with the your appearance of emotional self-righteousness
>in promoting your views as a non-participant in amateur radio?

I'm simply stating an opinion on the morse code test necessity,
that it should be abolished. It would seem that such an opinion
grates mightily on your own self-righteous opinion that all should
do the same as you did because you had to do it. That's not a
valid reason for retention of antiquated regulations.

The bogusness of the BE INVOLVED criterion shines above. You
took a morse code test long ago and passed. You are unlikely
to ever have to surrender your amateur radio license grant and the
grandfathering clauses will insure that you never have to take any
test again, provided you keep renewing your amateur license. Yet,
you keep insisting that all newcomers do the same as you did and
attempt forbidding others from talking differently about such test
regulations.

You are NOT with the FCC, you have NO power to override the
Constitution of the USA despite your license. It's fairly obvious
to everyone else that all you are doing is simple dictatorial
controlling - by whatever method, unethical, immoral or
otherwise - in short, to be some kind of self-proclaimed Boss.

2349. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 22:06:09 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610180609.07705.00000513@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68447

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> I chose that event because they were going on a DXpedition and operating a
>few
>> different radio modes - things I were interested in.
>
>No, Vipul, they weren't going on a DXpedition.

Thats what they called it. However, can you call an event in your state a
"DXpedition"?

2350. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 22:11:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610181101.07705.00000514@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68448

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Unless you know a particular group of Hams really well, it usually is very
>random. And the "group" is always subject to last minute cancellations and
>last minute additions, therefore is almost always "random".

Yes it is a random group of Hams. Some people, don't believe that it was a
random group. After the event, I got an email that proves I never met them
before - more proof that it was a random group.

Also, in the email, I got re-invited to the next one of that event.

2351. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 22:27:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610182739.07705.00000515@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68449

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> I don't have any children now. I meant in the future.
>
>As I recall, you haven't met the right "preety fem" yet either.

I never said that.

>> >> Yes, code is worthless.
>> >
>> >You have no way of knowing if it is worthless or not.
>>
>> It may be useful for some people.
>
>You just told us that it is worthless.
>

Useful for some people. Worthless to others.

>> Its part of building a Ham station. That could be useful to some people.
>
>Flourescent lighting is part of building a ham station?

No, emergency power generation is part of building a Ham station. Please pay attention.

>> Schools get accredited, not courses. A school with all bad courses CAN get
>> accredited. It has happened.
>
>Please provide an example.

Several schools have an insufficient number of graduate courses for each major, and they do have full time programs.

I don't like to name names, but Brooklyn Polytechnic, is one example. Their program of graduate full-time EE courses is particularly bad. You must take several UNRELATED courses together to graduate. Remember, in graduate school, the purpose is to specialize, not take BSEE courses again.

And the courses are located on three different campuses that you have to travel to get to. Someone didn't figure out that it makes more sense to group the same specialization at the same campus.

And the quality of the individual courses there is bad too. And yes, surprisingly, they are accedited.

>The experience way is better.
>

>The Boy Scouts is not only better, it is cheaper.

This could be a good component of one's education.

>Please show your work. If you went to
>China, please show your wok.

I did not go to China, so I cannot show my "wok".

>> You may find a set of traditions, culture, and real purpose. Something >
>that you can't learn in school. Something that school takes away from > you.
>
>Vipul, quit insulting my intelligence.

It may be hard to insult something that is hard to find.

2352. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 22:28:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610182816.14458.00000168@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68450

In article <f45722ac.0306100428.f228e54@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 10 Jun 2003 05:28:31 -0700
>
>> In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
>> writes:
>
>> >But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur alllocation,
>> >could the FCC allow Techs to operate.
>>
>> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.
>
>The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.

Sure - but is there any domestic-use limitation in the R&O?
>
>For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply.

Incorrect!

The requirement has to do with the license, not domestic use. It also
specifically requires a General or higher license for hams to use 60 meters.

> See: Japan.

Incorrect! Japanese amateurs are not limited to domestic use only.

Here's how the Japanese sytem works (reposted many times). This is Japan's
argument, not mine:

Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test. These are
"4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify not
having a code test for them:

1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and to
promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.

2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful interference need
to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all countries,
and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.

3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that are
worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is
prevented.

4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on HF (10 watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful interference to amateurs of other countries is avoided.

Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its measures re 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not agree with Japan's reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan on it in at least the past 35 years.

Note that the other three classes of Japanese amateur radio license DO require a code test.

Note also that Japanese 4th classers only have privs on freqs that are worldwide exclusive amateur. (See 3), above). That leaves out 60 meters.

If/when the code test is eliminated, a General class or higher license will still be required to access 60 meters unless the rules change.

It is interesting to note that the idea of a 60 meter band was actually supported by the NTIA. When ARRL formally proposed it, FCC unanimously agreed to give US amateurs a band at least 150 kHz wide, and use of lots of modes. Only after the comment period was over did NTIA register opposition to the idea.

2353. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 22:46:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <QctFa.2124$a7.765548@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68501

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030609233133.10018.00000232@mb-m26.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >Please
> >explain how traditional education assumes that everything occurs in a
> >vacuum.
>
> One example is an econ course where the stock market is discussed, but
they
> never show you how to read the stock market tables.
>
> >I've never heard of a high school or university course in the handling
> >of travelers checks.
>
> That's right. They don't. They should.
>
>

Why should a high school or university offer a course in handling traveler's checks? Anyone that is dumb enough to need such a course is too dumb to learn the material anyway.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2354. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 22:46:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610184659.07705.00000516@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68502

K8MN wrote:
>>Vipul, quit insulting my intelligence.

Then, I wrote:
>It may be hard to insult something that is hard to find.

You do realize that was a joke, don't you. I don't really mean that.

2355. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 22:48:46 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <vpSdnflEOL3__XujRTvU3Q@crocker.com>
Source record: 68503

"Slim" <DX@dxslimtonone.net> wrote in message
news:bc5e6s$g90$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bc4tkdjij0@208.206.142.92...
> >
> >
> > Slim wrote:
> >
> > > Freebanders operate traffic nets and emergency service nets.
> > > They also use data modes.
> >
> > And may we suppose they coordinate those activities with local
> > authoritie? Right.
> >
> >
>
> Absolutely! Mountain States Net is just one of several regional
> public service nets where many local government entities check
> in on a daily basis.

then if you have the backing of your local government you shouldn't mind identifying with a real name and email address??? how about giving us a few specific references of 'local government entities' that check into your net??

not going to do it?? why not? you don't seem to think that the fcc cares about you. how about the hams operating on illegal frequencies that have been contacted recently... since you can't seem to figure out where to look it up, start here:
http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/
and the new fcc/arrl push... see:
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/0103WASHBOX.pdf

now, how about more details on your "net"??? real names of net controls?? 'local government entities' that check in?? if you are so sure of yourself lets name some names!

2356. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 23:02:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hga6md2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68504

On 10 Jun 2003 05:28:31 -0700, Brian wrote:

>> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.
>
>The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.
>
>For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply. See: Japan.

Oh? Does S25.5 say "except for domestic use only" ?

Because Japan is in violation of S25.5 and no one has made a stink
about it doesn't make it OK for the US to do it.

You are starting to see where problems about amateur radio rank in
today's REAL international communications regulation scheme, where
money talks and big money talks loudest.

We are lucky to get to keep what we have.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2357. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 23:17:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610191728.18529.00000510@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68505

>Subject: Re: spectrum efficiency
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/10/03 11:57 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0306100857.5a75d427@posting.google.com>

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21), returning from his Fortress Of Solitude,
>wrote in message...(SNIP)

=)

>> It had little substance to it, hardly more than
>> a "filler" piece to anyone watching the US civil radio regulations.
>
>Sounds like you don't want anyone to read it, Len.

Of course not, Jim. It's direct evidence that Amateurs DO participate in
and are cognizant of other policy issues other than those that DIRECTLY affect
us. It's an embarrasment to him.

>> The article had NO "threats to amateur radio" since amateur
>> radio wasn't even mentioned.
>
>Faulty logic on your part, Len.

I think you were copiously gracious in calling it "logic".

>The mere fact that a radio service
>isn't mentioned doesn't mean there's no threat.

Yeppers.

>We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of
>U.S.
>spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available
>to
>support critical government functions."
>
>"unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential" can mean
>anything from some minor rules changes to wholesale reallocation.
>"U.S. spectrum assets"
>doesn't exclude the ham bands.
>
>The threats are there, for anyone unbiased and realistic enough to see
>it.
>
>But then again, you're not involved, Len.

Well said.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2358. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 23:18:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610191839.18529.00000511@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68506

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/10/03 4:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030610175107.23307.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>

>License regulations and allocation of use are disparate subjects

No, they are not.

Steve, K4CAP

2359. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 23:24:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610192402.18529.00000514@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68507

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/10/03 4:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030610175108.23307.00000652@mb-m29.aol.com>

>>On
>>occasion, you hurl insults at amateur radio in general, at the ARRL or
>>at individual radio amateurs who disagree with you.
>
> I've not "hurled insults at amateur radio in general."

There goes the nose, Pinnochhio. Liar, Liar, Pants On Fire.

>>Sure you have, Leonard, old boy. Fess up. Can you tell us why you
>>stubbornly refuse to consider any viewpoint other than your own?
>
> I consider each and every viewpoint. Nearly all are personally
> rejected and explained in public.

Uh huh...

It comes down to you being a documented liar and antagonist in this
newsgroup. You can "reject" that all you care to, but the facts are there for
all to see, wether you, Leonard H. Anderson, like it or not.

Explain THAT in public, Lennie........

Steve, K4CAP

2360. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-10 23:33:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610193343.23745.00000504@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 68508

In article <c2356669.0306100857.5a75d427@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21), returning from his Fortress Of Solitude,
>wrote in message news:<20030608002432.25052.00000459@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030607162512.12501.00000072@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >>Here's a news story of interest to the ham community.
>> >>
>> >>http://boston.com/dailynews/156/economy/Bush_orders_broad_review_of_ra%3A
>> .shtml
>> >>
>> >Cecil,
>> >
>> >Thanks for posting this! A true policy issue.
>>
>> That Associated Press wire story by David Ho ran in most news-
>> papers on 5 Jun 03.
>
>And the date of Cecil's post was?
>
>> It had little substance to it, hardly more than
>> a "filler" piece to anyone watching the US civil radio regulations.
>
>Sounds like you don't want anyone to read it, Len.

Oh! You reached so far for that snappy comeback that you
must have hurt yourself!

Have you been in some far galaxy the last half decade or so?
Have you overlooked the many documents at the FCC site
on WRC, spectrum realignment, release of government radio
bands to civil radio use (also at NTIA website), and freeing of
the former top TV channel spaces? Strange that you didn't
notice any of that. Many, many others did.

David Ho's article was little more than "filler" material, going
over what has already happened, had no real substance or
anything new other than mentioning the present administration.

>> >Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:
>>
>> The article had NO "threats to amateur radio" since amateur
>> radio wasn't even mentioned.

>
>Faulty logic on your part, Len. The mere fact that a radio service
>isn't mentioned doesn't mean there's no threat.

"Faulty logic?!?" :-)

You've been hearing those black helicopters again! Tsk, tsk.

>> Only three specific user groups
>> were cited: Cellular telephony, military radio, and public
>> safety users (police, fire). The World Radio Conference
>> beginning shortly in Geneva was briefly mentioned in the LA
>> Times AP article printing.
>
>From W hisself:
>
>"We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of U.S.
>spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available to
>support critical government functions."

The NTIA has said words of the same general meaning for years.
So has the Pentagon. Both for years.

>"unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential" can mean
>anything from some minor rules changes to wholesale reallocation.
>"U.S. spectrum assets" doesn't exclude the ham bands.

Neither does it exclude CB, mass media radio, Part 95 R/C,
PLMRS, public safety radio services, etc., etc., etc.

One of the Big topics under rules formation right now is UWB.
There's over 250 MHz of UHF bandspace been released and
now under discussion for domestic US radio use, none of it
involving precious ham bands.

>The threats are there, for anyone unbiased and realistic enough to see
>it.

Just as listening to RF noise too long will make you think there's
CW in there somewhere...the imagining of black helicopters of
paranoid imagination will bring them forth en masse to terrify you!

Spectrum planning and utilization has been the subject of joint
FCC and NTIA surveys for over a dozen years. That has included
the precious HF ham bands (your only "involvement"). You've
refused to acknowledge those mentioned before, now you are
running scared, terrified of the unknown. Why?

Says Jimmie: "Well, just because nothing is mentioned, there's
a great danger out there from loss of ham bands!" Okay, what
is in all that danger? Since 1979 US amateurs have GAINED
bandspace, not lost it, will gain a bit more on 3 July.

>But then again, you're not involved, Len.

Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above. Pity that you
aren't involved. Enjoy old-fashioned working DX on HF with CW.
:-)

2361. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 00:47:28 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306101647.4652fc09@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bc53hn$rq7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306092010.1088fffc@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<bc2tf6$n6s$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > > "lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
> > > news:ve7kf113fsui9b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > Phil,
> > > >
> > > > Hummmm. If you can not transmit CW and its not a Amatuer Band,
> > > > could the FCC allow Tech to operate on the band?
> > > >
> > > It is an amateur HF set of frequencies or channels and would, it seems,
> > > possibly allow techs to be given permission to operate. The FCC
> > > would have to make a rule change to do that. Does anyone know if a tech
> > > is allowed to operate on the speial 7mhz channel in Alaska?
> > >
> > I've never heard of a 40M Alaska emergency freq, would be new info for
> > me. Do you perchance mean the 5167.5 mHz Alaska Emergency freq?
> >
> Yes, my mistake. So does anyone know if a tech
> is allowed to operate on the special 5 mhz channel in Alaska?

I doubt it and I'd be very surprised if the FCC allowed Techs to use
any of the 60M freqs, Alaska, here and otherwise. I expect that all
the usual Part 97 rules apply to all freqs below 30 mHz or we would
have heard about any exceptions by now.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

w3rv

2362. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 00:57:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306101657.1682d3fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68510

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306100428.f228e54@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030609202326.03929.00000116@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
> > writes:
>
> > >But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur alllocation,
> > >could the FCC allow Techs to operate.
> >
> > Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.
>
> The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.
>
> For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply. See: Japan.
>
> Brian

Part 97 clearly states that domestic nocodes cannot operate below the
bottom edge of 6M. Period. Have you seen any exceptions to this rule
published?

Kindly notes that what Japanese hams can do in Japan means squat to
the FCC.

w3rv

2363. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 01:26:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030610212656.09580.00000706@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68511

In article <bc2f6u$eimek$21@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>1. Re-read the line where it says "similar wish as to intention." It does
>not state that this person wished for IDENTICAL action to the no-coders.
>Again, similar does not equal exact.
>
>2. If the line stated "Seems like I remember Larry Roll
>offering....." instead of the word "someone" I would be more than
>happy to offer an apology. How do you know I was or was not referring to
>you? Guilty conscience??? How do you know I wasn't referring to another
>person here????
>

Ryan:

OK, fine. Provide the quote which identifies this "someone."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2364. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 01:39:36 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <ved25d8annkvf7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68512

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hga6md2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...

> Because Japan is in violation of S25.5 and no one has made a stink
> about it doesn't make it OK for the US to do it.

But according to others, Japan argues that they are not in violation.
Apparent the FCC must have agreed or they simple did not care enough
to complain.

But that is not the point of my question. Since 5mhz is not amateur band,
the FCC could have create a new 5mhz emergency service license. New
written exam, no use of amateur frequencies, and no S25.5 violation.

All the FCC did was to expand a non-conforming use (5 USC 706)
by extending the Morse code requirement to a non-amateur band,
SSB mode only, no CW mode, and domestic use. (unnecessary)

> You are starting to see where problems about amateur radio rank in
> today's REAL international communications regulation scheme, where
> money talks and big money talks loudest.

I think the AR problems are of our own making.

> We are lucky to get to keep what we have.

If we can not use our frequencies for the public interest, we will lose
them.

Larry, KC8EPO

2365. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 01:40:52 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bc61b4$80i$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 68513
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian Kelly (kelly@dvol.com) writes:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bc53hn$rq7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
>>
>> Yes, my mistake. So does anyone know if a tech
>> is allowed to operate on the special 5 mhz channel in Alaska?
>
> I doubt it and I'd be very surprised if the FCC allowed Techs to use
> any of the 60M freqs, Alaska, here and otherwise. I expect that all
> the usual Part 97 rules apply to all freqs below 30 mHz or we would
> have heard about any exceptions by now.
>
But likely it would depend on the status of the frequency. These
new 5MHz channels are now allocated to amateur radio in the US,
where any type of hobby use is permitted.

From the vague details I've seen, I gather the Alaska channel is
for emergency use only. Is it an "amateur channel", or a channel
for emergency that also allows someone licensed in another service
to use their existing radios to help in emergencies?

CAP and MARS could be considered a similar situation. They aren't
amateur frequencies (well, not the out of ham band ones), and while
a requirement is a ham license, it isn't really hobby operation and
there are restrictions place on the use of those frequencies.

The treaty about a CW test for hams is specific to amateur radio.
Any other service, there is no such requirement (and beyond international
treaties, there is ample room for each country to decide how to use
radio). So for these non-amateur and non-hobby frequencies, I don't see why
the treaty applies.

Of course, those auxiliary services may want a certain level of
skill, that incorrectly or correctly they judge based on the license
level, and that may keep some hams from participating.

Michael VE2BVW

2366. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:16:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgagmi9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68514
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 11 Jun 2003 01:40:52 GMT, Michael Black wrote:

>From the vague details I've seen, I gather the Alaska channel is
>for emergency use only. Is it an "amateur channel", or a channel
>for emergency that also allows someone licensed in another service
>to use their existing radios to help in emergencies?

The latter. The Part 97 Rule covering that state "Any station...."
and stations in Parts 80 (Maritime), 87 (Aviation), and 90 (Land
Mobile) have similar paragraphs authorizing such use.

CBers are not so authorized.......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2367. Callsign changes on WRC agenda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:23:02 UTC
From: elektros@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <ae406dc2.0306101823.c377fb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68515

I took a look at the official WRC 2003 website. I was looking for info on s.25, but all I found on that was that it's definitely on the agenda. What I also found on the agenda was a proposal to change ham callsigns to avoid running out of them. I couldn't find any more details.

Alun, N3KIP

2368. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:23:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc640s$t3s$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68520

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030610182816.14458.00000168@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0306100428.f228e54@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 10 Jun 2003 05:28:31 -0700
> >
> >> In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
<lklose@net-link.net>
> >> writes:
> >
> >> >But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur
alllocation,
> >> >could the FCC allow Techs to operate.
> >>
> >> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are
not.
> >
> >The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.
>
> Sure - but is there any domestic-use limitation in the R&O?
> >
> >For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply.
>
> Incorrect!
>
> The requirement has to do with the license, not domestic use. It also
> specifically requires a General or higher license for hams to use 60
meters.

However, I think the FCC could have allowed all hams, including
novice and techs, to use the 5 channels without disturbing or
violating the int'l treay.

> > See: Japan.
>
> Incorrect! Japanese amateurs are not limited to domestic use only.
>
> Here's how the Japanese sytem works (reposted many times). This is Japan's
> argument, not mine:
>
> Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test. These
are

> "4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify not
> having a code test for them:
>
> 1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and to
> promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.

Which would apply in the "low power" 5 MHz channels if the FCC wanted to.

> 2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful interference
need
> to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all
countries,
> and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.

Would be the same for the 5 MHz channels also.

> 3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that are
> worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is
> prevented.

In the 5 MHz case, the FCC has already taken into account the
possible interference to non-amateurs.

> 4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on HF
(10
> watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful
interference
> to amateurs of other countries is avoided.

So how does the US and Canada mitigate interference between non-hams
on various non-ham bands/frequencies?

> Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its
measures re
> 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not agree with
Japan's
> reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan on it
in
> at least the past 35 years.

With but minor modification, the same arguments could fit the
5 MHz channels...IF the FCC were to be so inclined.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2369. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:24:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610222436.04207.00000668@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68516

In article <20030610175110.23307.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>The demand to BE INVOLVED or shut up is a bogus one, just
> another excuse to attempt winning message points.

Nobody is telling you to shut up, Len. Even though you have told others to do so.

We're simply pointing out that except for your newsgroup postings, and perhaps your lengthy and anti-child reply comments to the FCC three years ago, you're not involved in amateur radio at all.

Even though there's been an amateur radio license with no code test available in the USA for more than 13 years, you haven't bothered to get one.

Even though the code test requirement was reduced to 5 wpm more than 3 years ago, you haven't bothered to obtain any class of amateur radio license.

Even though you told us almost 3-1/2 years ago you were going for Extra right out of the box, you haven't even attempted any amateur radio license exams. (btw, in the context of the 2000 restructuring, 'right out of the box' obviously meant as soon as the rules changed back on April 15, 2000.)

You're just not involved in any meaningful way, Len. You can rant and rave here all you want, but why should anyone take you seriously?

I sure don't.

And what are these "message points", anyway? Can they be traded for valuable prizes?

2370. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:24:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610222437.04207.00000670@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68517

In article <20030610193343.23745.00000504@mb-m22.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0306100857.5a75d427@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM >(N2EY) writes:
>

>>> >Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:
>>>
>>> The article had NO "threats to amateur radio" since amateur
>>> radio wasn't even mentioned.
>>
>>Faulty logic on your part, Len. The mere fact that a radio service
>>isn't mentioned doesn't mean there's no threat.
>
> "Faulty logic?!?" :-)

Yes, Len. Your logic that there are no threats to amateur radio because amateur radio isn't specifically mentioned is faulty. Mistaken. In error. Falt out wrong.

>>From W hisself:
>>
>>"We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of U.S.
>>spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available to
>>support critical government functions."
>
> The NTIA has said words of the same general meaning for years.
> So has the Pentagon. Both for years.

So? This time it's the president himself. Who faces reelection in a little over 16 months, while the economy is stalled.

A president whose father's success in Gulf War 1 was overshadowed by a stalled economy, resulting in eight years of Mr. Clinton in the White House
>
>>"unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential" can mean
>>anything from some minor rules changes to wholesale reallocation.
>>"U.S. spectrum assets" doesn't exclude the ham bands.
>
> Neither does it exclude CB, mass media radio, Part 95 R/C,
> PLMRS, public safety radio services, etc., etc., etc.

So? This is not a cb newsgroup, not a mass media radio newsgroup, nor a Part 95 newsgroup, nor a public radio services newsgroup. It's an amateur radio newsgroup, dealing with amateur radio.

But you're not involved in amateur radio, Len, other than your numerous lengthy and generally pointless posts to amateur radio newsgroups..
>
> One of the Big topics under rules formation right now is UWB.
> There's over 250 MHz of UHF bandspace been released and
> now under discussion for domestic US radio use, none of it
> involving precious ham bands.

So?
>
>>The threats are there, for anyone unbiased and realistic enough to see
>>it.

> is in all that danger? Since 1979 US amateurs have GAINED
> bandspace, not lost it, will gain a bit more on 3 July.
>
>>But then again, you're not involved, Len.
>
> Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above.

No, you're not, Len. You're not involved in amateur radio except for some newsgroup posts.

2371. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:24:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030610222437.04207.00000669@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68518

In article <20030610175107.23307.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
> Actually, the code TEST requirement applies to administrative
> license granting, does not apply to any specific bands other
> than "operating privileges below 30 MHz.".

That's true.
>
> The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
> to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
> it is written now.

No, that's not true.

The treaty, as FCC interporets it, requires a code test for any license that allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on any allocated frequency below 30 MHz. Since 5 MHz is below 30 MHz, the tests for a license that allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on those 5 channels must include a code test.

That is, until the treaty changes, or the FCC decides to violate the treaty.

> There are no ITU-R recommendations specifically
> forbidding amateur "classes" anything. There are NO ITU-R
> statements concerning "classes" of amateur licenses.

You're just repeating your mistake, Len. 5 MHz < 30 MHz.
>
> License regulations and allocation of use are disparate subjects.

Not in this case.

But why does it matter to you, Len? You're not involved.

2372. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:26:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc640n$sm1$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 68519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Michael Black wrote:

>The treaty about a CW test for hams is specific to amateur radio.

And the new 5mhz allocations are for amateur radio licensees to use. In short, in the US they are amateur
radio allocations on a secondary basis. Hams must yield to the primary users of the allocations. Trying to
make the code requirement disappear on this basis won't fly.

> Any other service, there is no such requirement (and beyond international
> treaties, there is ample room for each country to decide how to use
> radio). So for these non-amateur and non-hobby frequencies, I don't see why
> the treaty applies.

In simple terms, because it applies to amateur radio operators and this allocation is, again, an amateur
radio allocaton. Nothing says that it has to be a worldwide allocation for international treaties to apply,
except those who are creatively trying to avoid reality.

2373. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 02:56:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE69A20.6F2C7EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68521

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> K8MN wrote:
> >>Vipul, quit insulting my intelligence.
>
> Then, I wrote:
> >It may be hard to insult something that is hard to find.
>
> ---
> You do realize that was a joke, don't you. I don't really mean that.

That's quite alright, Vipul. I'm sure you understand that I'm jesting when I tell you that you'd likely have a rough time finding the bathroom on a foggy night.

Dave K8MN

2374. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 03:00:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc666mktn1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68522

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hga6md2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 10 Jun 2003 05:28:31 -0700, Brian wrote:
>
> >> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are
not.
> >
> >The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.
> >
> >For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply. See: Japan.
>
> Oh? Does S25.5 say "except for domestic use only" ?
>
> Because Japan is in violation of S25.5 and no one has made a stink
> about it doesn't make it OK for the US to do it.

That would be the practical aspect of it...IMHO.

> You are starting to see where problems about amateur radio rank in
> today's REAL international communications regulation scheme, where
> money talks and big money talks loudest.

It can also be the squeking wheel that gets the grease...
it isn't always just big money...usually is, but not always.

> We are lucky to get to keep what we have.

Agreed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2375. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 03:15:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE69F3C.F4377513@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68523

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> I don't have any children now. I meant in the future.
> >
> >As I recall, you haven't met the right "preety fem" yet either.
>
> I never said that.

You've told us about your need for finding "preety fems", Vipul. If
you've found one, you'd better hope she doesn't find out that you're
still looking.

> >> >> Yes, code is worthless.
> >> >
> >> >You have no way of knowing if it is worthless or not.
> >>
> >> It may be useful for some people.
> >
> >You just told us that it is worthless.

> Useful for some people. Worthless to others.

Can't make up your mind?

> >> Its part of building a Ham station. That could be useful to some people.
> >
> >Flourescent lighting is part of building a ham station?
>
> No, emergency power generation is part of building a Ham station. > Please pay attention.

Paying attention allowed me to realize that your response did not make
any sense when it followed what I wrote: "You can start by demanding a
refund for those EE classes. That story about fluorescent lighting in
automobiles indicates that you didn't get your money's worth."

You responded with: "Its part of building a Ham station. That could be
useful to some people." Suddenly you're talking about emergency power
generation.

> >> Schools get accredited, not courses. A school with all bad courses CAN get
> >> accredited. It has happened.
> >
> >Please provide an example.
>
> Several schools have an insufficient number of graduate courses for each major,

> and they do have full time programs.

I'll bet I already know what's coming next.

> I don't like to name names, but Brooklyn Polytechnic, is one example. Their
> program of graduate full-time EE courses is particularly bad. You must take
> several UNRELATED courses together to graduate. Remember, in graduate school,
> the purpose is to specialize, not take BSEE courses again.
>
> And the courses are located on three different campuses that you have to travel
> to get to. Someone didn't figure out that it makes more sense to group the same
> specialization at the same campus.
>
> And the quality of the individual courses there is bad too. And yes,
> surprisingly, they are accedited.

What a surprise! I DID know what was coming next. Nothing more than
your opinion. Don't let those messy facts get in the way.

> >The experience way is better.
> >
> >The Boy Scouts is not only better, it is cheaper.
>
> This could be a good component of one's education.

Beats the hell out of admitting to taking a camping course and then
complaining about it.

> >Please show your work. If you went to
> >China, please show your wok.
>
> I did not go to China, so I cannot show my "wok".

Apparently you didn't go out of the country on your DXpedition so you
can't show your work either.

Dave K8MN

2376. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 03:32:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE6A32A.86F16ECF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68524

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE56657.BED5248C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> I don't have to answer any baseless charges made by some
> >> PCTAs who refuse to accept the fact that there are differing
> >> opinions on the code test issue...and insist that all such
> >> differing opinions are "insults."
> >
> >Your opinions have not been held to be insults. You've frequently
> >inserted the insults along with your opinions on morse testing.
>
> No. Your own self-righteous opinions forbid any opposing
> viewpoints from being anything other than "insults."

Responding with "No" doesn't cut it. The fact is, you've done precisely
what I've stated that you've done. It seems that your own
self-righteous opinions forbid any opposing viewpoints from being
anything other than "insults", Len.

> You continue to stand in Judgement over others of differing
> viewpoints. That is the mark of the self-righteous.

What about your standing in judgement over others of differing
viewpoints, Len? See--I told you that you had self-righteous opinions.
After all, you've told us about what marks something as self-righteous.
It is strange that it is something you see only in others.

> >On
> >occasion, you hurl insults at amateur radio in general, at the ARRL or
> >at individual radio amateurs who disagree with you.
>
> I've not "hurled insults at amateur radio in general."

Sure you have, Len. Wanna be Googled and be served up another generous
portion of crow?

> Some
> individuals in here self-righteously identify all of US amateur
> radio as having the same opinions as theirs.

Who has identified all of U.S. amateur radio has having the same opinion
as theirs? Be specific so I can limit the Googling* you'll suffer.

> That is obviously
> not true but those poor, thin-skinned righteous defenders of
> their faith cannot be convinced otherwise.

You're right on part of this one. It is obviously not true but that's
only because you made up what preceeds it.

> >> I've made no "false accusations" as to the stubbornness of
> >> some PCTAs' refusal to accept any viewpoint other than
> >> their own.
> >
> >Sure you have, Leonard, old boy. Fess up. Can you tell us why you
> >stubbornly refuse to consider any viewpoint other than your own?
>
> I consider each and every viewpoint. Nearly all are personally
> rejected and explained in public.

Be honest, Len. You've rejected all of 'em but your own viewpoint.
That's why I'm sure you'll understand that I've considered you views on
both morse testing and a minimum licensing age and have rejected them.

> >> It's on public view.
> >
> >Yes, "they are" not "it's" on public view.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, really looking for "corrections" are you?

No, I didn't look for corrections. I only noticed an error.

> "It's" is an accept contraction form of "it is." Are you so self-
> righteous in your opinions that you are now dictating rules of
> English word and grammar use?

Your error wasn't in the use of the contraction.

*As in, "Boy, that Len really took some Googling, didn't he?".

Dave K8MN

2377. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:04:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE6AA09.5BADA217@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68525

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE564E7.3AFA355D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030609082312.14458.00000141@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >In article <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>,
> >lenover21@aol.com
> >> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >> >
> >> >>You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
> >> >> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
> >> >> new arguments for keeping it. :-)
> >> >>
> >> >Why are new arguments needed when many of the existing ones are still
> >valid?
> >>
> >> The existing arguments in favor of code test retention are
> >> NOT valid.
> >>
> >You'll excuse me while I laugh out loud at the idea of your making such
> >a judgement call. After all, you aren't involved in amateur radio.
>
> That doesn't answer the question, despite trying to masquerade
> as "Jim, N2EY."

I'll excuse your gaffe. I didn't attempt masquerading as anyone. My
post was signed with my name and call. Perhaps you're disoriented.

> The FCC is NOT INVOLVED in operating amateur radios. They
> just regulate it along with every other US civil radio service.

Yes, you are disoriented. You aren't working for the FCC and you have
nothing whatever to do with amateur radio.

> The demand to BE INVOLVED or shut up is a bogus one, just
> another excuse to attempt winning message points. The BE
> INVOLVED argument, if a requirement for determining new
> amateur radio regulations, would itself be unconstitutional as it
> applied to free speech guarantees under the constitution.

I've not told you to shut up, Len. I make light of you. Like Carl Stevenson, you are your own worst enemy. You've commented to the FCC. The FCC is obligated to accept your comments. I'm not so obligated. The FCC recognizes that you are not involved in amateur radio and so do I. The only message points I recognize are for amateur radio traffic handling. You can't mean those since you aren't a radio amateur.

> The BE INVOLVED criterion is bogus self-righteousness that
> pretends that only those already licensed be allowed to discuss
> anything concerning getting into US amateur radio.

You aren't getting into amateur radio. You've made not one feeble attempt in all the years you've posted here. You've only gotten to the discussing part.

> Your amateur radio license does not convey any special
> conditions that only you or any other already-licensed citizen
> are the only ones permitted to discuss getting into amateur
> radio.

You aren't getting into amateur radio, Len. You've declared a decades-long interest in amateur radio but that interest never extended to actually making an attempt at obtaining a license. You've posted here for seven or so years without so much as getting even a code-free ticket. Your talk of "Extra right out of the box" was more vapor.

> You do NOT run the FCC, do not have any censorship powers
> on who may discuss what in regards to federal regulations.

You're right on all counts. Then again, I was quite aware of those realities. Here's some reality for you: You haven't anything to do with amateur radio.

> >> The only "validity" is that the already-licensed extras had to
> >> take such a test and they seem to insist that everyone else
> >> must do so, too.
> >
> >I haven't seen that as a reason for retention of morse testing. I note
> >that YOU trot it out periodically.
>
> It is inherent in nearly all of the comments made on NPRM 98-
> 143 in favor of the code test retention. It is "turf," the Territorial
> Imperative, "squatter's rights" sort of idea that having been
> licensed a long time gives you some special rights over and
> above others.

That's not correct though radio amateurs do possess special rights over and above others. They are authorized to operate radio stations under Part 97 of the FCC regs as they choose. The only people who may do so are those who pass an amateur radio license exam. You've not done so.

> Few long-time radio amateurs will admit such an opinion openly,
> yet so many insist that all newcomers meet THEIR criteria in
> what a "ham" should be. THAT is your continuing self-

> righteous opinion.

Under current regs, it is simply impossible for newcomers to do what I
did to obtain a license. The criteria are not mine, they are those of
the FCC. One must meet the qualifications a specific class of amateur
radio license. There is no other way in. If you want it, you'll do it.
Otherwise, you're simply irrelevant to amateur radio.

> >> That's just emotional self-righteousness of a very personal
> >> kind, not at all applicable to the US agency that grants such
> >> amateur licenses.
> >
> >How do you deal with the your appearance of emotional self-righteousness
> >in promoting your views as a non-participant in amateur radio?
>
> I'm simply stating an opinion on the morse code test necessity,
> that it should be abolished. It would seem that such an opinion
> grates mightily on your own self-righteous opinion that all should
> do the same as you did because you had to do it. That's not a
> valid reason for retention of antiquated regulations.

Others are simply stating an opinion on the morse code test necessity
which differs with yours. You label their views "self-righteous
opinions". Yet others differ with your view on a minimum age for
licensing. You label their views as "self-righteous opinions".
You continue to bring up this straw man of someone doing something
because I had to do it. No one must do as I did under current licensing
regs because the tests are not the same. There is no more 13 wpm morse
test. There is no more 20 wpm more test. Your statements are simply
wrong.

> The bogusness of the BE INVOLVED criterion shines above. You
> took a morse code test long ago and passed. You are unlikely
> to ever have to surrender your amateur radio license grant and the
> grandfathering clauses will insure that you never have to take any
> test again, provided you keep renewing your amateur license. Yet,
> you keep insisting that all newcomers do the same as you did and
> attempt forbidding others from talking differently about such test
> regulations.

There's that old false claim again. None who take a test today can do
as I did. Why are you worried about it? You aren't part of amateur
radio. You haven't even tried to be part of amateur radio. You're
simply a guy with an amateur radio newsgroup fetish.

> You are NOT with the FCC, you have NO power to override the
> Constitution of the USA despite your license. It's fairly obvious
> to everyone else that all you are doing is simple dictatorial
> controlling - by whatever method, unethical, immoral or
> otherwise - in short, to be some kind of self-proclaimed Boss.

Darn, Len. You are NOT with the FCC and you have NO power to override the Constitution. You have nothing to do with amateur radio in any way yet you post to an amateur radio newsgroup in an effort to convince us that you have the answers for amateur radio. You know best what the licensing criteria for radio amateurs should be. On what would this knowledge of yours be based? After all, you aren't involved in any way with amateur radio. What are you--some kind of geezer with a control obsession?

Dave K8MN

2378. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:05:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE6AA40.D08D7D2F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68526

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> I chose that event because they were going on a DXpedition and operating a
> >few
> >> different radio modes - things I were interested in.
> >>
> >No, Vipul, they weren't going on a DXpedition.
>
> Thats what they called it. However, can you call an event in your state a
> "DXpedition"?

...not and know what you're talking about.

Dave K8MN

2379. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:07:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE6AACC.808DD329@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68527

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above. Pity that you
> aren't involved. Enjoy old-fashioned working DX on HF with CW.
> :-)

Lennie means he has satellite TV! Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.

Dave K8MN

2380. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:09:48 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bc6a2craa1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 68528
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" (dixie@townsqr.com) writes:
> Michael Black wrote:
>
>>The treaty about a CW test for hams is specific to amateur radio.
>
> And the new 5mhz allocations are for amateur radio licensees to use. In short, in the US they are amateur
> radio allocations on a secondary basis. Hams must yield to the primary users of the allocations. Trying to
> make the code requirement disappear on this basis won't fly.
>

Go back and reread what I said, and especially the bit I was responding to.
Someone wondered if the no-code technicians were allowed to use the
Alaska emergency frequency. Someone else said likely not.

I was trying to point out that the Alaska frequency, like CAP and MARS,
is actually another service, so code requirements would not apply.

Michael VE2BVW

2381. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:15:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EE6ACCF.70804@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68529
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

xganon wrote:

>I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
>group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies
>from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
>
Those frequencies aren't just empty bandwidth. They are allocated to
various services.
Forest ranger comms and such. You might not hear them (they use low
power) but
they certainly hear freebanders screwing up their channels. Also
there's some military
channels in there as well. Can you say "homeland security"? Oh, they
don't do any
classified comms there, but they still do lots of routine unclassified
stuff.

What can you do in the "freeband" that you can't do legally on ten
meters as a properly
licensed ham? And if you get the ham license you can use other bands
like 20 or
40 or 80m when the sunspots are down. Oh, you need to pass a morse code
test,
but that's at 5 words per minute nowadays. It ain't that hard, I did it
and I'm not that
good at brain reflex tasks.

As for being under the government's thumb, the FCC doesn't really bug
most hams
at all. Only if you make a habit of doing annoying illegal things do
they do anything.
Rules about "no business traffic" are really to protect our frequencies
from getting
hijacked by companies looking for comm channels.

>We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions.
>
You'd then know that the "freeband" goes dead between sunspot cycles.
Other HF ham bands
have decent propagation between cycles.

>We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know technical
>issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
>rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This should
>not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.

>
>
You have the same rights to take the ham radio tests as hams have had.
So study up and
take the damn tests and if you pass you can be legal on the ham bands.

2382. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:36:37 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc6bkl$b66$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 68530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Michael Black wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" (dixie@townsqr.com) writes:
> > Michael Black wrote:
> >
> >>The treaty about a CW test for hams is specific to amateur radio.
> >
> > And the new 5mhz allocations are for amateur radio licensees to use. In short, in the US they are amateur
> > radio allocations on a secondary basis. Hams must yield to the primary users of the allocations. Trying to
> > make the code requirement disappear on this basis won't fly.
> >
>
> Go back and reread what I said, and especially the bit I was responding to.
> Someone wondered if the no-code technicians were allowed to use the
> Alaska emergency frequency. Someone else said likely not.
>
> I was trying to point out that the Alaska frequency, like CAP and MARS,
> is actually another service, so code requirements would not apply.

You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General class or higher is required for *hams* to
access that frequency, a code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.

Dick

2383. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:38:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EE6B252.5020308@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

lk wrote:

>But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur allocation,
>could the FCC allow Techs to operate. The band is already being used
>as an upper SSB band by person without CW proficiency.
>
One of those new "channels" is the same as one in the UK, and so far as
I know, the FCC
didn't say that we were not allowed to have QSOs with the UK hams there.
Thus I'd think
it would fall under the treaty rules for coded hams only.

>
>The FCC already is allowing citizens without licenses to operate below 30
>mhz on
>40 channels using upper and lower side band, and AM modes.
>
The CBers are not supposed to talk to anyone in other countries. Thus
it is an "internal"
service. And it's not ham radio. The treaty talks about code for
hams below 30MHz.

>
>In other word, is the code requirement a band requirement or licensee
>requirement?
>Why would a person need CW proficiency to use a band the bars the use of CW?
>
>
There's a rule that mentions "generally accepted ham practices" and that
it is bad ham procedure
to operate modes outside the generally accepted band plans. Which means
don't use CW in the
middle of SSB country. Also don't use LSB on 20m. Or go simplex in 2m
on a frequency that
happens to be the input frequency of the local repeater. This would
effectively "bar" the use of
CW on certain portions of HF ham bands. But you need to be coded to get
on the HF bands.

2384. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:53:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611005336.02197.00000577@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68533

In article <20030610222436.04207.00000668@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030610175110.23307.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>The demand to BE INVOLVED or shut up is a bogus one, just
>> another excuse to attempt winning message points.
>
>Nobody is telling you to shut up, Len. Even though you have told others to do
>so.

Sorry, Jimmie, the Colonel and the Bwahahaha have both told me
to "shut up." The Colonel called me a "horse's ass" in public and
Bwahahaha has called me several kinds of nasty names. You can
find all that in Google. :-)

>We're simply pointing out that except for your newsgroup postings, and perhaps
>your lengthy and anti-child reply comments to the FCC three years ago, you're
>not involved in amateur radio at all.

You have NO real idea of my "involvement." :-)

Further, you cannot control my involvement, cannot control what
I am involved in. All you do is erect fragile strawbeings and
demand obediance to your wishes.

>Even though there's been an amateur radio license with no code test available
>in the USA for more than 13 years, you haven't bothered to get one.

Why is that necessary? It would make no difference to you
in any event...you would still claim "superiority" from having
taken and passed a morse code test. :-)

I was legally communicating on HF a half century ago and
passed a commercial test (first class) 47 years ago.

I don't need any "licenses" to discuss any federal regulations.
The First Amendment of the US Constitution grants me that
right. I defended that Constitution as a US military member
for 8 years, remember? You've never served in the US military,
remember?

>Even though the code test requirement was reduced to 5 wpm more than 3 years
>ago, you haven't bothered to obtain any class of amateur radio license.

Why is that necessary? It would make no difference to you
in any event...you would still claim "superiority" from having

taken and passed a high-rate morse code test. :-)

I was legally communicating on HF a half century ago and
passed a commercial test (first class) 47 years ago.

I don't need any "licenses" to discuss any federal regulations.
The First Amendment of the US Constitution grants me that
right. I defended that Constitution as a US military member
for 8 years, remember? You've never served in the US military,
remember?

>Even though you told us almost 3-1/2 years ago you were going for Extra right
>out of the box, you haven't even attempted any amateur radio license exams.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, I never said WHEN I would. :-)

You have NO real idea of anything "I attempted." Nada. Zip.

>(btw, in the context of the 2000 restructuring, 'right out of the box'
>obviously meant as soon as the rules changed back on April 15, 2000.)

No, Jimmie, you can't redefine older colloquialisms. "Out of the
box" refers to taking all test elements at once, just one test
session instead of coming up through all the classes like good
little boys and girls of US amateur radio do.

>You're just not involved in any meaningful way, Len. You can rant and rave
here
>all you want, but why should anyone take you seriously?

Why are you so concerned, then? Are you in pre-med, studying
for a psychiatric specialty or trying for a psychology PhD? :-)

>I sure don't.

Sure you do. You can't help but make all kinds of nastygrams
against those who don't believe in your self-righteous opinions.

>And what are these "message points", anyway? Can they be traded for valuable
>prizes?

For your own EGO, Jimmie. :-)

2385. Re: Callsign changes on WRC agenda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:53:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611005337.02197.00000578@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68532

In article <ae406dc2.0306101823.c377fb0@posting.google.com>, elektros@yahoo.com (elektros) writes:

>I took a look at the official WRC 2003 website. I was looking for info
>on s.25, but all I found on that was that it's definitely on the
>agenda. What I also found on the agenda was a proposal to change ham
>callsigns to avoid running out of them. I couldn't find any more
>details.
>
>Alun, N3KIP

The agendas for amateur radio at WRC-03 are numbered 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3. You can find the US administration positions on those at the FCC website, www.fcc.gov. Click on International Bureau, then click on World Radio Conference on the IB page. From there you can select from a large number of administration documents. There are even links to CITEL and the IARU web pages.

2386. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:53:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611005341.02197.00000579@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68534

In article <20030610222437.04207.00000669@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030610175107.23307.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> Actually, the code TEST requirement applies to administrative
>> license granting, does not apply to any specific bands other
>> than "operating privileges below 30 MHz.".
>
>That's true.
>>
>> The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
>> to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
>> it is written now.
>
>No, that's not true.
>
>The treaty, as FCC interporets it, requires a code test for any license that
>allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on any allocated
>frequency below 30 MHz.

Oh? The FCC sat down with you to "interporets" it? :-)

Did the FCC interpret the ITU-R amateur regulations...or didn't
it just make regulations which US citizens must obey directly?

Is the FCC supposed to make all its interpretations known to
the public? Last I knew, the FCC simply made civil radio
regulations. The FCC is not a supreme court of radio, just a
regulator.

You are attempting to split hairs or perhaps have hair of the dog.
ITU-R regulation S25.5 calls for a code test given by any
administration for an amateur radio license having below-30-MHz
privileges. Further, S25.5 clearly states that code test as having
BOTH sending and receiving tests. The US administration quit
requiring the code sending test years ago...thereby putting itself
in violation of that precious treaty.

>Since 5 MHz is below 30 MHz, the tests for a license
>that allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on those 5
>channels must include a code test.

You haven't made the connection between ITU-R regulations
yet. There are NO ITU-R amateur regulations that absolutely

require any test proficiency on any amateur band anywhere in
the spectrum. That's up to the individual national administration.
In the case of the USA, the FCC is the regulating body for the US
administration. The FCC specified which class of licensee can
operate in the amateur-as-secondary 5 frequencies.

ITU-R regulations AND recommendations are very silent on
classes of amateur radio licenses. In fact, they don't make any
distinction at all in class, grade, proficiency...that is determined
by individual national administrations.

FCC 03-105 specified the ONLY mode on the 5 frequencies as
voice. No on-off keying morse code modes at all.

>That is, until the treaty changes, or the FCC decides to violate the treaty.

The FCC long since "violated the treaty" on the optional
elimination of the morse code sending test for a license exam.
:-)

So, expert on geopolitics, economics, and choo-choo trains,
what will happen if the FCC "violates a treaty" on amateur radio?
Will there be WAR? Will the International Radio Police invade
Washington and occupy the FCC building? Will there be "angry
letters of protest" filed with the United Nations? Will the UN
Security Council hold a special session to debate that thorny
problem? :-)

>> There are no ITU-R recommendations specifically
>> forbidding amateur "classes" anything. There are NO ITU-R
>> statements concerning "classes" of amateur licenses.
>
>You're just repeating your mistake, Len. 5 MHz < 30 MHz.

No mistake, Jimmie. There are NO ITU-R regulations or
recommendations on any administration's license classes,
grades, or other distinctions. You can't find them because
they aren't there.

All you can do is make a vague inference between S25.5's
requirement for a code test for any administration's amateur
license having privileges of operation below 30 MHz.

>> License regulations and allocation of use are disparate subjects.
>
>Not in this case.

Sorry, but they are separate. You've had it explained to you but
you still don't understand what any part of S25 says now.

>But why does it matter to you, Len? You're not involved.

Jimmie, you are NOT involved in US amateur radio above the
2m band, are you? That's where the overwhelming EM

spectrum bandspace exists for US radio amateurs.

You are NOT involved in US national politics, so why do you
mention US political parties and at least three US Presidents?
That has nothing to do with amateur radio.

Unless there has been some secret laws passed recently,
there is nothing at all preventing any US citizen from discussing
anything about US federal law. You seem to be one of those
dictatorial types who want to bar US citizens from talking about
US amateur radio law unless they have an amateur radio license.
Why do you insist on violating the First Amendment of our
Constitution?

2387. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 04:53:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611005343.02197.00000580@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68535

In article <20030610222437.04207.00000670@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030610193343.23745.00000504@mb-m22.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <c2356669.0306100857.5a75d427@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>>> >Seems to me there are two threats to amateur radio here:
>>>>
>>>> The article had NO "threats to amateur radio" since amateur
>>>> radio wasn't even mentioned.
>>>
>>>Faulty logic on your part, Len. The mere fact that a radio service
>>>isn't mentioned doesn't mean there's no threat.
>>
>> "Faulty logic?!?" :-)
>
>Yes, Len. Your logic that there are no threats to amateur radio because
amateur
>radio isn't specifically mentioned is faulty. Mistaken. In error. Falt out
wrong.

Neither flat out wrong nor "falt out wrong," Jimmie. :-)

The Ho article didn't mention US amateur radio or any amateur
radio. Why do you insist there is some sinister intent in the
words not written? :-)

>>>From W hisself:
>>>
>>>"We must unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential of U.S.
>>>spectrum assets while ensuring that sufficient spectrum is available to
>>>support critical government functions."
>>
>> The NTIA has said words of the same general meaning for years.
>> So has the Pentagon. Both for years.
>
>So? This time it's the president himself. Who faces reelection in a little
over
>16 months, while the economy is stalled.

Why the expansion to national politics? Does your amateur license
now give you great powers in politics and economics? :-)

That the government agencies were all vying for their pieces
of the EM spectrum pie were known two administrations ago.
None of that is new.

Don't you remember the EM spectrum surveys mentioned in here?
I'll bet you didn't look them up or find out what they said. :-)

The Ho article came out on the eve of WRC-03 now in progress
in Geneva. WRC-03 has already started, the US administration
has all their ducks in a row and even has a special ambassador
to the WRC. You could have found all that out on the FCC web
site before Ho wrote that article.

>A president whose father's success in Gulf War 1 was overshadowed by a stalled
>economy, resulting in eight years of Mr. Clinton in the White House

Sounds like you aren't in favor of either party or any President.

Can you do better? :-)

>>>"unlock the economic value and entrepreneurial potential" can mean
>>>anything from some minor rules changes to wholesale reallocation.
>>>"U.S. spectrum assets" doesn't exclude the ham bands.
>>
>> Neither does it exclude CB, mass media radio, Part 95 R/C,
>> PLMRS, public safety radio services, etc., etc., etc.
>
>So? This is not a cb newsgroup, not a mass media radio newsgroup, nor a Part
95
>newsgroup, nor a public radio services newsgroup. It's an amateur radio
>newsgroup, dealing with amateur radio.

No kidding? Gosh, old-timer, from the Cries of Alarum and fingers
pointing to unseen black helicopters, I thought the thread was
about UFOs...Unseen Falt Out remarks. :-)

Amateur radio is NOT about American Presidents, choo-choo
trains, or a couple dozen other assorted items definitely not in
the amateur arena. Google will demonstrate that if you don't
have your AOL message settings at maximum. :-)

>But you're not involved in amateur radio, Len, other than your numerous
lengthy
>and generally pointless posts to amateur radio newsgroups..

Awww...you go back to talking about your amateur radio
choo-choo trains or national politics, then. Sorry I disturbed you.

:-)

>> One of the Big topics under rules formation right now is UWB.
>> There's over 250 MHz of UHF bandspace been released and
>> now under discussion for domestic US radio use, none of it
>> involving precious ham bands.
>

>So?

So sue.

You apparently have no independent judgement (away from ARRL
directives and pointers). You can't see the huge block of spectrum
at UHF awarded for non-amateur radio services.

>>>The threats are there, for anyone unbiased and realistic enough to see it.
>
>> is in all that danger? Since 1979 US amateurs have GAINED
>> bandspace, not lost it, will gain a bit more on 3 July.
>>
>>>But then again, you're not involved, Len.
>>
>> Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above.
>
>No, you're not, Len. You're not involved in amateur radio except for some
>newsgroup posts.

You ARE disturbed by non-feel-good postings not praising your
amateurism and amateur accomplishments. Too bad. I thought
you were made of sterner stuff than just spite and pique.

Don't worry. QST will soon come out with some editorial giving
you all the pointers on what to think, what to do, and then you
can be a fine backwards truthsayer "explaining it all" to others.

This newsgroup isn't ARRL-south, Jimmie, and you aren't the
moderator in here.

2388. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 05:27:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611012751.12501.00000114@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68538

In article <3EE6A32A.86F16ECF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Sure you have, Len. Wanna be Googled and be served up another generous
>portion of crow?

Colonel, you could copy over the entirety of Google's archive on
this newsgroup. That would serve no purpose other than making
you happy to put down another person you don't like...and you DO
like to put down certain people any which way you can...which
includes name-calling to the level of using "horse's ass."

You feel your amateur extra gives you some kind of "right" to do or
say anything you want, to act a "superior" any time you need your
ego boosted. That's been demonstrated time and again by yourself
in here.

You really ought to think hard about running for office, like being
executive president of ARRL for life. That would make you VERY
important. You could lord it over everyone once a month in QST
editorial pages and tell everyone how You KNOW How Hams
Should Be. No problem. :-)

Now go back to Living In The Past in Google. Be as vindictive as
you want to be...you are certainly "superior" in that regard.

It's not going to make a lot of other hams love you, Colonel. That
IS what you are after, isn't it? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

2389. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 05:27:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611012752.12501.00000116@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68536

In article <3EE6AACC.808DD329@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above. Pity that you
>> aren't involved. Enjoy old-fashioned working DX on HF with CW.
>> :-)
>
>Lennie means he has satellite TV! Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.

The Colonel is WRONG. Not a subscriber to any "satellite TV"
or "satellite radio." Digital cable TV service wired to the house.

You have NO idea of my UHF and above involvement, have NO
need to know, have NO authority to know.

Go to bed, Colonel. Be sure to take off your jackboots first.

2390. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 05:27:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611012752.12501.00000115@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68537

In article <3EE6AA09.5BADA217@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Darn, Len. You are NOT with the FCC and you have NO power to override
>the Constitution.

Colonel, you are NOT with the FCC and have NO authority over
anyone.

>You have nothing to do with amateur radio in any way
>yet you post to an amateur radio newsgroup in an effort to convince us
>that you have the answers for amateur radio.

I just state my opinions...when not replying to nastygrams from
control freaks like yourself demeaning all who have differing
opinions than yours. :-)

>You know best what the licensing criteria for radio amateurs should be.

No, I just state my opinions on what parts of US civil radio
regulations should be deleted...since those that should be
deleted are way out of date and should have been taken
out long ago in my opinion.

>On what would this knowledge of yours be based?

A half century's experience in telecommunications, radio
and electronics technology as design engineer, being able
to legally operate on a wider range of frequencies than any
US amateur and using far more modes and modulations
than are available to any US amateur.

>After all, you aren't involved in any way with amateur radio.

Still using that schtick, ey Colonel? :-)

>What are you--some kind of geezer with a control obsession?

No, you are. You need someone to Hit on to satisfy your
curious personality...especially since long ago when you were
criticized for poor procedure in US government radio
communications.

You just can't take negative criticsm, Colonel.

Now go to bed...and don't forget to remove your jackboots first.

2391. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 09:57:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306110157.990f0bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68540

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bc2f70$eimek$22@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...

>
> If we as a whole don't start using the bands.... we are gonna lose them.
> And I probably will be the first to say, "I told ya so!"

I hate to be a party-pooper here Ryan but somebody beat ya to "the I
told ya so first!" claim to fame at least a half century ago. Look
into the sordid history of 11M.

And long before that look what happened when hams had it all above 200
meters.

The pattern is clear. The ham bands are a sort of FCC "land bank".

We'll deal with it. As usual.

> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR

w3rv

2392. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 12:23:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611082320.04554.00000448@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68542

In article <20030611005336.02197.00000577@mb-m12.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> the Colonel and the Bwahahaha have both told me
> to "shut up."

Who are "the Colonel" and "the Bwahahaha"? I don't recall anyone identifying themselves that way here.

Where did anyone in this newsgroup tell you to shut up? Show us the postings where that happened.

Disagreeing with your faulty logic and pointing out your mistakes is not the same as telling you to shut up. Exposing your biased opinions and pointing out you non-involvement in amateur radio is not the same as telling you to shut up.

> The Colonel called me a "horse's ass" in public

Did he say you WERE a horse's ass, or that you behave like a horse's ass?

In what way is such a description inaccurate?

Show us the postings where all this allegedly happened.

> and
> Bwahahaha has called me several kinds of nasty names.

Really? And you never called anyone a nasty name first, huh? You've been a paragon of civil behavior here, right?

Perhaps we should make lists of all the names you've called various posters here, Len.

Let's see, I recall you calling me "Jimmie", "boy", "pedantic parson", and "minus j", just for starters.

2393. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 12:23:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611082321.04554.00000449@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68543

In article <bc640s$t3s$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(N2EY wrote:)

>> The requirement has to do with the license, not domestic use. It also
>> specifically requires a General or higher license for hams to use 60
>meters.

>However, I think the FCC could have allowed all hams, including
>novice and techs, to use the 5 channels without disturbing or
>violating the int'l treay.

>> > See: Japan.

>> Incorrect! Japanese amateurs are not limited to domestic use only.

>> Here's how the Japanese sytem works (reposted many times). This is Japan's
>> argument, not mine:

>> Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test. These
>> are "4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify
not
>> having a code test for them:

>> 1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and to
>> promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.

>Which would apply in the "low power" 5 MHz channels if the FCC wanted to.

Perhaps - but it's clear the FCC doesn't want to. FCC hasn't adopted Japan's
rationalizations for any other amateur band or license, so why should they do
so for 5 MHz?

>> 2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful interference
>> need to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all
>> countries, and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.
>
>Would be the same for the 5 MHz channels also.

Not really. The USA isn't an island nation. The 5 5 MHz channels are not
worldwide exclusive amateur.
>
>> 3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that are
>> worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is
>> prevented.
>
>In the 5 MHz case, the FCC has already taken into account the

>possible interference to non-amateurs.

That's the rationale for channelization, USB only and the power limit. Note that we do not know how well that scheme will actually work.

>> 4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on HF
>> (10 watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful
>> interference to amateurs of other countries is avoided.
>
>So how does the US and Canada mitigate interference between non-hams
>on various non-ham bands/frequencies?

All sorts of ways that don't apply to amateur radio.
>
>> Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its
>> measures re 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not
>> agree with Japan's
>> reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan on it
>> in at least the past 35 years.
>
>With but minor modification, the same arguments could fit the
>5 MHz channels...

I don't think so, Bill. The 5 MHz situation is different in at least three ways (more power, not exclusive amateur, USA not an island). There's also the issue of the written test.

Note that FCC did not authorize Novices or code-tested Techs to operate on the new channels, even though those hams have some HF 'phone privileges and a power level well above that allowed on 5 MHz.

>IF the FCC were to be so inclined.

And that's the real kicker. FCC is in the middle on this one. They were unanimous in approving the ARRL proposal for a new 150 kHz wide "traditional" ham band open to lots of modes and higher power. Then, AFTER comments had closed, NTIA sent a letter opposing the whole idea. What was FCC to do? The answer is the R&O.

Also, even if/when S25.5 goes away and FCC drops Element 1, there will still be the matter of a written test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2394. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 12:58:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611085845.16033.00000391@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68544

>Subject: Re: spectrum efficiency
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/10/03 6:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030610193343.23745.00000504@mb-m22.aol.com>

From N2EY:

>>The threats are there, for anyone unbiased and realistic enough to see
>>it.

To which Lennie retorts:

> Says Jimmie: "Well, just because nothing is mentioned, there's
> a great danger out there from loss of ham bands!"

He calls you "Len" and addresses you without emotionalism or derision.

Lennie calls him "Jimmie" despite repeated assertions he doesn't do that to people who don't do it to him.

One more documented example of the lies and rhetoric of Leonard H. Anderson, Bald-Faced Liar.

Steve, K4CAP

2395. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 12:59:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611085958.16033.00000392@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68545

>Subject: Re: spectrum efficiency
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/10/03 11:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE6AACC.808DD329@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above. Pity that you
>> aren't involved. Enjoy old-fashioned working DX on HF with CW.
>> :-)
>
>Lennie means he has satellite TV! Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.

And let's not forget the microwave oven and the TV infared remotes.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2396. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 13:02:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611090252.16033.00000393@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68546

>Subject: Re: spectrum efficiency
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/11/03 12:27 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030611012752.12501.00000116@mb-m04.aol.com>

>You have NO idea of my UHF and above involvement, have NO
> need to know, have NO authority to know.

The scumbag Lanark Liar has yet one more untold story of Rear Area Radio Clerk heroism to tell.

>Go to bed, Colonel. Be sure to take off your jackboots first.

Whoa...THAT was heavy.

>The Colonel is WRONG. Not a subscriber to any "satellite TV"
> or "satellite radio." Digital cable TV service wired to the house.

Something in that house is "wired", but it's not cable TV.

Mrs Putz cut off your cuddle time again, Lennie? Taking it out on us?

Steve, K4CAP

2397. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 13:07:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611090709.16033.00000394@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68547

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/10/03 11:53 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030611005336.02197.00000577@mb-m12.aol.com>

>>Nobody is telling you to shut up, Len. Even though you have told others to
>do
>>so.
>
> Sorry, Jimmie, the Colonel and the Bwahahaha have both told me
> to "shut up."

Yet another example of someone treating Lennie with civil courtesy, yet
Lennie denigrates the respondant.

Another LanarkLiar Rethorical quip.

Steve, K4CAP

2398. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 13:09:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611090902.16033.00000395@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68548

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/10/03 10:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE69F3C.F4377513@earthlink.net>

>> >As I recall, you haven't met the right "preety fem" yet either.
>>
>> I never said that.
>
>You've told us about your need for finding "preety fems", Vipul. If
>you've found one, you'd better hope she doesn't find out that you're
>still looking.

kaaa-BOING!

Steve, K4CAP

2399. Twisting The Putz's Tail

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 13:22:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611092216.16033.00000396@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68550

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/11/03 12:27 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030611012752.12501.00000115@mb-m04.aol.com>

>>Darn, Len. You are NOT with the FCC and you have NO power to override
>>the Constitution.
>
> Colonel, you are NOT with the FCC and have NO authority over
> anyone.

Ahhhhhhhh.but we DO have "power" over YOU, Lennie....You see, we took tests to allow us to operate radios...All sorts of radios...And that just twists your tail something awful. You too could be doing that, but to do so would make you a mere mortal, and your coward's pride won't "allow" that.

And the more fun we have with those radios the harder we rub YOUR nose in it, the more incensed and child-like YOU become...to wit your creating names like "The Colonel", Pedantic Parson", "Dill Sergeant", etc, in order to denigrate those who ARE what you will NEVER be.

> I just state my opinions...when not replying to nastygrams from
> control freaks like yourself demeaning all who have differing
> opinions than yours

And those "replies" are the very power WE have over YOU, Your Scumminess. Deny it all you want...We say "blue", and you have to jump in and say "red". I may believe in red, but by just saying "blue" I can watch you snivvle, rant and rave for weeks.

What a PUTZ!.

>No, I just state my opinions on what parts of US civil radio
> regulations should be deleted...since those that should be
> deleted are way out of date and should have been taken
> out long ago in my opinion.

Let's see...Your "opinion" (x) multiplied by your experience in Amateur Radio (zero) equals.......ZERO!

>>After all, you aren't involved in any way with amateur radio.
>
> Still using that schtick, ey Colonel?

Truth is truth. You are NOT involved in Amateur Radio.

>>What are you--some kind of geezer with a control obsession?
>
> No, you are.

Whoa! There's Sandlot 101 Debating if I ever heard it! Learn that in 14 years of night school did ya...???

>You just can't take negative criticsm, Colonel.

Pot/Kettle/Black...In spades.

Steve, K4CAP

2400. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 13:29:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611092938.16033.00000397@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68551

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/9/03 3:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bc2qtr$g4f$1@nd.eastky.net>

>> I know you disdain facts, Oh Scummy One, however it's not those
>unwashed
>> masses of licensed Amateurs who are "insisting" on keeping Morse Code
>> testing...
>
> You're joking, right?
>
>Quotes randomly culled from GoogleGroups:...(SNIP)

Sorry, Robert, or what ever your name is (since you didn't sign the post with a name, callsign, etc), but the FACTS are that the Federal Communications Commission, a panel of politically appointed civilians, makes/enforces the radio regulations by which we all must adhere.

That there are opinions that do not reflect that is obvious. Your quotes from Google are valid OPINIONS, no doubt, but carry no force of law.

>Well, enough of that.

Yep...enough of that. Unless you can show me a point of law which refutes it.

Steve, K4CAP

2401. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 13:46:49 UTC
From: Chuck / KE4ETH <chuck_hawks@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <_wEFa.30524$LX.21031@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68541
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

This person, or someone, using the anonamose remailer has been causing TROLL like behavior for a long time in the rec.radio.amateur.misc group.

Ignore him and maybe he will go away.

Chuck

"xganon" <remailer@xganon.com> wrote in message news:7fdc15a21dd3ef5c5dea7eb0c59549ed@xganon.com...
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders.

SNIPPED a lot of Rant

2402. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 14:17:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE73975.84698A71@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68552

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030610222436.04207.00000668@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030610175110.23307.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>The demand to BE INVOLVED or shut up is a bogus one, just
> >> another excuse to attempt winning message points.
> >
> >Nobody is telling you to shut up, Len. Even though you have told others to do
> >so.
>
> Sorry, Jimmie, the Colonel and the Bwahahaha have both told me
> to "shut up."

Sorry, that's incorrect, Foghorn.

The Colonel called me a "horse's ass" in public and
> Bwahahaha has called me several kinds of nasty names. You can
> find all that in Google. :-)

Last week I called a lawn mower a lawn mower. I was right on both
occasions.

> >We're simply pointing out that except for your newsgroup postings, and perhaps
> >your lengthy and anti-child reply comments to the FCC three years ago, you're
> >not involved in amateur radio at all.

> >Even though there's been an amateur radio license with no code test available
> >in the USA for more than 13 years, you haven't bothered to get one.
>
> Why is that necessary? It would make no difference to you
> in any event...you would still claim "superiority" from having
> taken and passed a morse code test. :-)

You've long disliked that there are others who have more experience in
something than you. In any endeavor, there are going to be people with
more experience than you, Leonard, old bean. In amateur radio, there
are a number of children with more experience than you. :-)

> I was legally communicating on HF a half century ago and
> passed a commercial test (first class) 47 years ago.

You weren't communicating on HF as a radio amateur and your commercial
test is irrelevant to amateur radio. If you want to be a radio amateur,

you'll have to start at the beginning.

> I don't need any "licenses" to discuss any federal regulations.

No, you don't. You need a license to be a part of amateur radio.
You aren't a part of amateur radio.

> The First Amendment of the US Constitution grants me that
> right. I defended that Constitution as a US military member
> for 8 years, remember? You've never served in the US military,
> remember?

Does the constitution protect you from laughter or derision?

> >Even though you told us almost 3-1/2 years ago you were going for Extra right
> >out of the box, you haven't even attempted any amateur radio license exams.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, I never said WHEN I would. :-)

Do the smiley faces cover your embarrassment over not having walked the
walk after talking the talk?

> You have NO real idea of anything "I attempted." Nada. Zip.

Len has a point, Jim. May I offer more precise wording such as, "you
haven't successfully attempted"?

> >(btw, in the context of the 2000 restructuring, 'right out of the box'
> >obviously meant as soon as the rules changed back on April 15, 2000.)
>
> No, Jimmie, you can't redefine older colloquialisms. "Out of the
> box" refers to taking all test elements at once, just one test
> session instead of coming up through all the classes like good
> little boys and girls of US amateur radio do.

Please direct us to such a definition, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

2403. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 14:17:43 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bc7dlv$9bc$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68607

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030611092938.16033.00000397@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....
> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
> >Date: 6/9/03 3:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bc2qtr$g4f$1@nd.eastky.net>
>
> >> I know you disdain facts, Oh Scummy One, however it's not those
> >unwashed
> >> masses of licensed Amateurs who are "insisting" on keeping Morse Code
> >> testing...
> >>
> > You're joking, right?
> >
> >Quotes randomly culled from GoogleGroups:...(SNIP)
>
> Sorry, Robert, or what ever your name is (since you didn't sign the
post
> with a name, callsign, etc),

That's my name and I've been using this e-mail for years. As to my
callsign, I'm not going to get into a debate about the wisdom of putting
one's name and address all over the 'net.

but the FACTS are that the Federal Communications
> Commission, a panel of politically appointed civilians, makes/enforces the
> radio regulations by which we all must adhere.

Yes, but that's not the point, is it? If the opinions of members of
the ARS and/or the public at large were irrelevant, there wouldn't be a time
period during which one submits those opinions on regulatory matters.

> That there are opinions that do not reflect that is obvious. Your
quotes
> from Google are valid OPINIONS, no doubt, but carry no force of law.

I seriously doubt the logic of a lot of 'em.

> >Well, enough of that.
>
> Yep...enough of that. Unless you can show me a point of law which
refutes
> it.

Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
public _opinion_?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.488 / Virus Database: 287 - Release Date: 6/5/2003

2404. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 14:38:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE73F1A.918BD779@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68553

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE6A32A.86F16ECF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Sure you have, Len. Wanna be Googled and be served up another generous
> >portion of crow?
>
> Colonel, you could copy over the entirety of Google's archive on
> this newsgroup. That would serve no purpose other than making
> you happy to put down another person you don't like...and you DO
> like to put down certain people any which way you can...which
> includes name-calling to the level of using "horse's ass."

Sure it would serve a purpose, *Foghorn. It would show that your
conveniently snipped statement is a false one. That means that you
simply aren't telling the truth.

You were called a **horse's ass because being a horse's ass is your
demonstrated pattern of behavior here. You don't play well with others.

> You feel your amateur extra gives you some kind of "right" to do or
> say anything you want, to act a "superior" any time you need your
> ego boosted. That's been demonstrated time and again by yourself
> in here.

Incorrect, Leonard. The same Constitution you often quote gives me the
right to state my views here. Further, since I am involved and have
been actively involved in amateur radio for forty years, my views
reflect experience. That, if nothing else, sets them apart from yours.

> You really ought to think hard about running for office, like being
> executive president of ARRL for life. That would make you VERY
> important. You could lord it over everyone once a month in QST
> editorial pages and tell everyone how You KNOW How Hams
> Should Be. No problem. :-)

See how little you know? League presidents don't even have regular QST
space. They don't attempt to "lord it over" anyone. What is any of
that to you? You aren't a ham and you aren't a League member.

> Now go back to Living In The Past in Google. Be as vindictive as
> you want to be...you are certainly "superior" in that regard.

Ahh! I think I see the source of your confusion. Google isn't some sort
of time warp. It is only an archive in which can be found almost all of
your posts to this newsgroup. Do you view seeing your current claims

compared to your previous statements as vindictive, Len? The words I'd quote would be accurate accounts of things you've actually stated here. Are you ashamed of them? Why else would you consider seeing them again as "vindictive"?

> It's not going to make a lot of other hams love you, Colonel. That
> IS what you are after, isn't it? :-)

Love me? What a peculiar thing to think, Foghorn*

*Foghorn: One of the nicknames Len receives when he resorts to names like "The Colonel" or "Jimmie". Foghorn Lenhorn is based on the loud know-it-all cartoon rooster from the Warner Brothers cartoons.

**Horse's Ass: The end of the horse farthest removed from the head. It is the portion producing road apples.

Dave K8MN

2405. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 14:43:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE7405C.6B0557C8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68554

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE6AACC.808DD329@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above. Pity that you
> >> aren't involved. Enjoy old-fashioned working DX on HF with CW.
> >> :-)
> >
> >Lennie means he has satellite TV! Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.
>
> The Colonel is WRONG. Not a subscriber to any "satellite TV"
> or "satellite radio." Digital cable TV service wired to the house.
>
> You have NO idea of my UHF and above involvement, have NO
> need to know, have NO authority to know.

But, Foghorn, just a few lines ago you commented that Jim isn't involved in "UHF and above" frequencies. Your latest statement is certainly reciprocal. It would mean that you have NO idea of his involvement in "UHF and above" frequencies. It would mean that you have NO need to know and NO authority to know. One thing is for certain: Whatever your involvement, it certainly isn't happening under Part 97. You have nothing to do with that.

> Go to bed, Colonel. Be sure to take off your jackboots first.

What are you--some kind of control freak with a Nazi paraphenalia fetish?

Dave K8MN

2406. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 14:55:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE74343.A2A11CF9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68555

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE6AA09.5BADA217@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Darn, Len. You are NOT with the FCC and you have NO power to override
> >the Constitution.
>
> Colonel, you are NOT with the FCC and have NO authority over
> anyone.

The movie must have started again. I think this is where I came in.

> >You have nothing to do with amateur radio in any way
> >yet you post to an amateur radio newsgroup in an effort to convince us
> >that you have the answers for amateur radio.
>
> I just state my opinions...when not replying to nastygrams from
> control freaks like yourself demeaning all who have differing
> opinions than yours. :-)

Naw, that's incorrect. You've never just stated your opinions here.
You've spent the bulk of your time doing the things which you accuse
others of doing.

> >You know best what the licensing criteria for radio amateurs should be.
>
> No, I just state my opinions on what parts of US civil radio
> regulations should be deleted...since those that should be
> deleted are way out of date and should have been taken
> out long ago in my opinion.

Others have differing opinions. You've frequently insulted them.

> >On what would this knowledge of yours be based?
>
> A half century's experience in telecommunications, radio
> and electronics technology as design engineer, being able
> to legally operate on a wider range of frequencies than any
> US amateur and using far more modes and modulations
> than are available to any US amateur.

I didn't see anything indicating that you have any experience in amateur
radio whatever during your half century. You don't sound like a very
good judge of what's best for amateur radio.

> >After all, you aren't involved in any way with amateur radio.
>
> Still using that schtick, ey Colonel? :-)

It is still as true today as ever, Foghorn.

> >What are you--some kind of geezer with a control obsession?
>
> No, you are. You need someone to Hit on to satisfy your
> curious personality...especially since long ago when you were
> criticized for poor procedure in US government radio
> communications.

These words seem to be a contradiction to your denial of a control obsession. You weren't any more involved in my government communications job than you are in amateur radio. It hasn't stopped you from trying to be an expert in either area. You're irrelevant to either subject; not involved; an onlooker.

> You just can't take negative criticsm, Colonel.

I needn't take it from someone who hasn't the qualifications for it, O Prince of Pontification, Guru of Gigaherz, Maharishi of Modulation.

> Now go to bed...and don't forget to remove your jackboots first.

See? An obsession with control...and nazi paraphenalia.

Dave K8MN

2407. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 14:57:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE74390.618BAA23@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68556

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The Ho article didn't mention US amateur radio or any amateur
> radio. Why do you insist there is some sinister intent in the
> words not written? :-)

How typical of Len to waste everyone's time belittling some Ho.

Dave K8MN

2408. Re: Why Is It?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 16:06:13 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE75375.3227A223@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68549

lk wrote:
>
> "Tom Jefferson" <tj@amercontsfreedom.org> wrote in message
> news:bbij59$i6l$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Why is it that Big Government Liberals believe the NRA is bad
> > because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
> > the ACLU is good because it supports certain parts of the
> > Constitution?
> >
> > Tom Jefferson
>
> Why is it that Small Government Conservaties believe the NRA is good
> because it supports certain parts of the U.S. Constitution, while
> the ACLU is bad because it supports certain parts of the
> Constitution?
>
> John Adams

There's a major difference. The NRA does NOT demand that freedom of speech, etc., be abridged nor any other constitutional right be denied anyone; but ACLU *does* demand the the right to keep and bear arms be infringed.

K3DWW

2409. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 16:09:49 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306110809.47370455@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68558

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306110157.990f0bf@posting.google.com>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bc2f70$eimek$22@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...

> > If we as a whole don't start using the bands.... we are gonna lose them.
> > And I probably will be the first to say, "I told ya so!"
>
> I hate to be a party-pooper here Ryan but somebody beat ya to "the I
> told ya so first!" claim to fame at least a half century ago. Look
> into the sordid history of 11M.

Quick history of hams on 11:

US hams got access to a band at 11 meters after WW2. It was shared with "ISM" (industrial-scientific-medical) users, which meant there were sometimes some really odd noises on the band. It was popular with some hams because it was less crowded than 10 meters, and was another "Class B" phone band. The actual band edges changed a few times in its history as a ham allocation. It was never as popular as 10 meters, though.

In the late 1950s it was reallocated to the new "Class D" citizens radio service, despite opposition from hams. FCC could do this because 11 was never a ham band by treaty agreement. FCC's counter argument to the loss of 11 was that since hams had gotten 15 meters worldwide exclusive amateur in 1954 as a result of the 1947 Atlantic City conference, 11 wasn't needed as much by hams.

> And long before that look what happened when hams had it all above 200
> meters.

Actually hams never really had it all above 200 meters in the USA. Instead, after 1912, amateurs were limited to wavelengths not greater than 200 meters. Those pioneering hams who opened the short-waves in 1923 had to get special station licenses to operate on the shorter wavelengths. All it took was a specific request. The first transatlantic QSO took place on about 110 meters, but the participants could have requested almost any wavelength shorter than 200.

Shortly after pioneering amateurs proved the usefulness of short-waves 80 years ago, others rushed to use them, and amateurs were herded into specific bands of frequencies.

> The pattern is clear. The ham bands are a sort of FCC "land bank".

Check out what the 1927 conference did to the amateur allocations.
It's not pretty.
>
> We'll deal with it. As usual.
>
Yup. The question to think about is "why aren't the bands used more?"

You're looking at part of the answer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2410. Re: Perjury (was *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! ***) |---------

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 18:03:47 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <bc7qu3$3ps$1@xuxa.iecc.com>
Source record: 68560
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.broadcasting

Rich Wood wrote: ....
>
> the official charges make no mention of her being a bitch. The say
> things like insider trading, lying to the FBI, altering evidence and
> things like that.

What bothers me is that lying to suspects and altering evidence is standard police behavior. Neither police nor courts consider it wrong, let alone illegal, to offer a suspect a plea bargain then tell him/her that they have witnesses that don't exist, that he failed a lie detector test he actually passed, or even show him doctored pictures to convince him to plead guilty, whether he is or not; never mind the real perp escapes. But if you lie it's obstruction of justice.

K3DWW

2411. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 18:48:47 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939796B1954DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68561

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030609202326.03929.00000116@mb-m28.aol.com:

> In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>
>>> Since WRC 2003 is likly to dump s25.5 in a few days, this is moot.
>>> It's a pity a 60m band is not on the WRC agenda.
>>
>>It should be be moot, but I would not bet on it until its sign and
>>sealed.
>
> And ratified by The Congress.
>
>>The requirement been on international life-support for a least ten
>>years.
>
> How do you figure?

Abolition of s25.5 was supposed to have been on the WARC agenda in 1992.
That conference was posponed to 1995, and then the item was taken off the
agenda. It would have passed in 1992, so that's why s25.5 is on borrowed
time.

>>
>>But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur
>>alllocation, could the FCC allow Techs to operate.
>
> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are
> not.
>
>>The band is already being used as an uppper SSB band by person without
>>CW proficiency.
>
> But they are not radio amateurs.
>>
>>The FCC already is allowing citizens without licenses to operate below
>>30 mhz on 40 channels using upper and lower side band, and AM modes.
>
> But they are not radio amateurs.
>>
>>In other word, is the code requirement a band requirement or licensee
>>requirement?
>
> It's a service requirement.

>
> The treaty says that anyone who is licensed to operate an amateur radio
> station must pass the code test if the license grants any privileges
> below 30 MHz. Nothing about power level, mode, etc.
>
>>Why would a person need CW proficiency to use a band the bars the use
>>of >CW?
>>
> It's only needed if the station is an amateur radio station.
>
> Consider this: Why do hams have to take written tests on radio theory
> in order to use manufactured, certified equipment? Many other users of
> the spectrum don't have to. No test or license required to run
> low-power AM or SSB on 11 meters, but to use the power SSB on 10 meters
> requires at least a Tech written, and to use AM anywhere on amateur
> HF/MF requires at least a General written.
>
> If/when the code test goes away, those writtens will still be in place.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2412. Re: Callsign changes on WRC agenda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 18:55:54 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939797E6A11FFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68562

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20030611005337.02197.00000578@mb-m12.aol.com:

> In article <ae406dc2.0306101823.c377fb0@posting.google.com>,
> elektros@yahoo.com (elektros) writes:
>
>>I took a look at the official WRC 2003 website. I was looking for info
>>on s.25, but all I found on that was that it's definitely on the
>>agenda. What I also found on the agenda was a proposal to change ham
>>callsigns to avoid running out of them. I couldn't find any more
>>details.
>>
>>Alun, N3KIP
>
> The agendas for amateur radio at WRC-03 are numbered 1.7.1,
> 1.7.2, 1.7.3. You can find the US administration positions on
> those at the FCC website, www.fcc.gov. Click on International
> Bureau, then click on World Radio Conference on the IB page.
> From there you can select from a large number of administration
> documents. There are even links to CITEL and the IARU web
> pages.
>
>

So, Len, if you know how to navigate the site, what is the proposed change
to callsigns?

2413. WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 19:19:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306111119.4d496eaf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68563

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/06/11/100/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

2414. Love code? How much?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 20:41:20 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE793F0.EC46801F@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68559

<http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3029192553&category=1502>

2415. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:17:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE79CAB.B2DDB953@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68565

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The problem is that few in the academic world ARE experienced
> in the field that they teach.

I don't believe you.

> Few instructors of political science have actually run for any
> government-level elective office.

Political science isn't the study of how to run for elective office.

> Few instructors of economics
> have used their "knowledge" to advance their own finances.

Really? How can we gain access to these spiffy facts? Where'd they
come from?

> Few instructors of history have ever set any history. :-)

...to your knowledge ;-)

As fascinating as all this has been, did you know that almost every
instructor of amateur radio licensing courses is a radio amateur?

> Students have to sit politely in classrooms and do their
> assignments obediently in order to secure the grades that will
> allow them to eventually graduate.

Is this part of your problem with authority, Leonard? You didn't want
to sit politely or do your assignments obediently?

> They also are required to
> respect their instructors no matter what...without that they
> get tossed out of class with loss of credits.

Did you have trouble showing respect to your instructors?

> I once took an extension course in digital logic at a large
> junior college here in Los Angeles. The instructor had about
> a tenth of the work experience I had at the time and his "industry
> examples" were at least 20 years old. Some of his class rules
> were quite strict such as never, ever thinking of an Exclusive-OR
> gate as a gate. Ex-ORs had to always be drawn made up out of
> ANDs and ORs and Inverters. He refused to unbend from that
> militant ruling despite being shown a Texas Instrument TTL
> package long on the market containing 4 Exclusive-ORs. All of
> us students had to work according to His rules on that. This
> instructor had a control-freak personality but one had to be nice

> to him or risk loss of credits. No real learning in such classes,
> none that couldn't be had from 20 year old textbooks carrying
> the same information.

Imagine a guy who wouldn't let you run the class.

Dave K8MN

2416. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:18:19 UTC
From: Merl Turkin <Terk@astroburp.net>
Message-ID: <80NFa.619$xt.96572@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 68564

On Sat, 07 Jun 2003 17:05:28 -0400, Tarapia Tapioco wrote:

> Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly CW coders. For serious rescue
> transmissions on Earth, THE solution is Internet, not CW.

You can't be serious! You have to be trolling.

> Anyway CW will be dead soon, D-DAY minus 48 hours for WRC-2003 !

Wrongo. They *may* do away with the requirment but it will never go away
on the bands.

Try again....

2417. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:31:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE7A00E.C8C0C7CF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68566

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030609230246.10018.00000227@mb-m26.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie
> >
> >>> > It takes a village...
> >>>
> >>> ...and in the (every) village, you'll find a
> >
> >I know that one. You'll find a village idiot.
> >
> >>I just can't resist.....a VIPUL!
> >
> >Thats not funny. By the way, Vipul means someone with vast knowledge. (I may
> >not live up to that, but thats what my name means).
>
> One problem with US amateur radio is its demographics indicating
> an overwhelming majority being white males of Judeo-Christian
> religious beliefs.

What makes that a problem, Leonard? Amateur radio is open to all races
and any of the several sexes. Hams tend to concentrate on their common
ground, not upon what makes them different from each other. But you
wouldn't know about that. You aren't involved.

> Such hams will have great fun putting down
> anyone not of Anglo-Saxon ancestry or "western" ethnics.

Build your own premise and you're sure to come up with your own
conclusion. Vipul isn't running into problems because of his ethnicity.
His difficulties come from faulty thinking.

> No "western" given name? Oh, wow, great opportunity for calling
> such all sorts of depreciatory names, making fun of them for not
> fitting in with "being American." That's getting more typical every
> day in US amateur radio.

I don't know if that's the case in amateur radio. I have acquaintances
the world over with non-western given names and surnames. They don't
get called depreciatory names. None of them are made fun of. Then
again, none of them attempt to argue things such as "amateur radio" and
"ham radio" being two separate things.

Things outside of amateur radio might be different. Let's take your situation as an example. While I've never observed you calling non-westerners depreciatory names, I've see you do quite a number of things with names like "Steve", "Jim", "Dave", "Larry", "Dick" and "Brian" among others. That must be a special reverse of the circumstance you described--maybe because you feel that YOU don't fit in or because you don't feel that we're sitting quietly at our desks, respecting you.

Dave K8MN

2418. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:37:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611173711.17770.00000198@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 68567

In article <Xns939796B1954DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20030609202326.03929.00000116@mb-m28.aol.com:
>
>> In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
>> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>>
>>>> Since WRC 2003 is likly to dump s25.5 in a few days, this is moot.
>>>> It's a pity a 60m band is not on the WRC agenda.
>>>
>>>It should be be moot, but I would not bet on it until its sign and
>>>sealed.
>>
>> And ratified by The Congress.
>>
>>>The requirement been on international life-support for a least ten
>>>years.
>>
>> How do you figure?
>
>Abolition of s25.5 was supposed to have been on the WARC agenda in 1992.
>That conference was posponed to 1995, and then the item was taken off the
>agenda. It would have passed in 1992, so that's why s25.5 is on borrowed
>time.

Nobody knows if it would have passed in 1992. Remember that back then the
maritime services were still using Morse code on both HF and MF.

The postponements improved the chances that S25.5 would be totally eliminated
rather than modified or rewritten.

WRC 2003 opened on Monday.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2419. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:40:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611174047.27469.00000526@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68568

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/11/03 9:17 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE73975.84698A71@earthlink.net>

>> You have NO real idea of anything "I attempted." Nada. Zip.
>
>Len has a point, Jim. May I offer more precise wording such as, "you
>haven't successfully attempted"?

Actually, Dave, I think this is Lennie's way of saying "I tried but I failed. But that 10 year old passed and I've been forever emotionally ruined by it...."

>> >Even though you told us almost 3-1/2 years ago you were going for Extra
>right
>> >out of the box, you haven't even attempted any amateur radio license
>exams.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, I never said WHEN I would. :-)
>
>Do the smiley faces cover your embarrassment over not having walked the
>walk after talking the talk?

Leonard, the Rear Area Radio Clerk War Hero is too cowardly and too prideful to place himself among mere mortals. He won't do it because he CAN'T do it on so many levels.

Yet Another LennieRant stated:

>> The First Amendment of the US Constitution grants me that
>> right. I defended that Constitution as a US military member
>> for 8 years, remember? You've never served in the US military,
>> remember?

I am so sick and tired of seeing crap like this from some of my fellow Veterans because patriotism and selflessness in service to America can be found at so many levels.

Patriotism and devotion to country do NOT start at Boot Camp nor manifest itself in a DD214.

This is yet another example of Lennie's two-facedness. On the one hand he scorns and scolds anyone who dares to say that HE has no place commenting about Amateur Radio despite having zero-point-zero days experience in it, yet he'll do the exact same thing to anyone who dares to express an opinion that even remotely demonstrates knowledge about the Armed Forces...

Of course Lennie also hopes no one notices the Armed Forces HE served in was over 46 years ago......Hardly "current events". His only "exposure" to current policy and procedures of the Armed Forces are the exact same websites and general media sources that any other mere mortal citizen has access to....Which means that other than offering "war stories" on Korean-era technology, he's no more knowledgeable than his mouse can make him.

Yet the snotty, "I Know Better Than You" rants go on, and he wastes his waning days trying to make a moot point in a newsgroup dedicated to an avocation he absolutely hates...

What a PUTZ.

Steve, K4CAP

2420. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:47:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611174700.27469.00000527@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68569

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/11/03 9:55 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE74343.A2A11CF9@earthlink.net>

>> I just state my opinions...when not replying to nastygrams from
>> control freaks like yourself demeaning all who have differing
>> opinions than yours. :-)
>
>Naw, that's incorrect. You've never just stated your opinions here.
>You've spent the bulk of your time doing the things which you accuse
>others of doing.

I just LOVE Lennie's "Since I'm Not A Licensee I Have A Better Perspective
Than You" twists. Goebbells would have loved him!

>> No, I just state my opinions on what parts of US civil radio
>> regulations should be deleted...since those that should be
>> deleted are way out of date and should have been taken
>> out long ago in my opinion.
>
>Others have differing opinions. You've frequently insulted them.

"Frequently", Dave...?!?! How about "Consistently"...?!?!

>> Now go to bed...and don't forget to remove your jackboots first.
>
>See? An obsession with control...and nazi paraphenalia.

I see Mrs Putz in Nazi regalia, whipping him into submission. Or not...

Steve, K4CAP

2421. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:49:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611174927.27469.00000528@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68570

>Subject: Re: spectrum efficiency
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/11/03 9:57 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE74390.618BAA23@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> The Ho article didn't mention US amateur radio or any amateur
>> radio. Why do you insist there is some sinister intent in the
>> words not written? :-)
>
>How typical of Len to waste everyone's time belittling some Ho.

Arrrrrrrrrrrgh! =) =) =)

Steve, K4CAP

2422. Re: Love code? How much?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 21:59:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc88mt$l95$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68571

I love continous wave sending devices....but not that much.

Dan/W4NTI

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EE793F0.EC46801F@crosslink.net...
>
<http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3029192553&category=1502
>

2423. Re: Love code? How much?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 22:23:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611182327.04207.00000683@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 68572

$1325 and climbing!

Mecographs are rare collector's items. Will probably wind up in a collection, rather than being used. Like any other collector's item, its value is whatever the market will bear.

Ever watch the "Antiques Roadshow"? Scary sometimes.

I didn't see the sounder in the pictures, either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2424. Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 22:45:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611184506.14248.00000797@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68575

Those of us who know better have been deluged with LennieRants asserting that Amateur Radio has no role in disaster preparedness in Southern California, and that Amateur Radio is "irrelevant" in the light of "professional" disaster relief providers therein.

Thankfully, The Ham God rolls us a bit of help once in a while in deflating yet another of Lennie's self-serving lies and demeaning rhetoric. In this case, word of yet another award bestowed on Amateur Radio volunteers who have once again proven that the trust given to us under Part 97.1 was not wasted.

From the ARRL Website:

QUOTE

California RACES team wins award for excellence: The Huntington Beach, California, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) a team has received an award for excellence in disaster preparedness from the Orange County chapter of the American Red Cross. The award recognizes companies and organizations for their superior emergency preparedness plans. The Huntington Beach RACES team works under the aegis of the Huntington Beach Fire Department. An award ceremony was held June 4 during the Orange County Red Cross' 19th annual Disaster Preparedness Academy at California State University--Fullerton. The Huntington Beach RACES group's emergency preparedness plan--incorporated into the city's emergency operations plan--includes contingency plans and procedures in the event of a public safety radio system failure. Huntington Beach Fire Department Emergency Services Coordinator Glorria Morrison, KE6ATG, called the RACES team "a model emergency response Amateur Radio group with outstanding leaders and membership." Last year, she said, RACES members volunteered thousands of hours to better prepare the community for emergencies. The plan and manual were created originally by Mel Goldberg, N6MEL. RACES members train for City emergencies on a regular basis and provide support for community events such as the annual Huntington Beach Fourth of July Parade, marathons and fund-raising activities. More information about the Huntington Beach RACES organization is available on its Web site.--Wayne Yoshida, KH6WZ

UNQUOTE

I can't wait to see how Lennie spins his way past the opinions of the American Red Cross, the Huntington Beach Fire Department and the City of Huntington Beach government... ! ! ! ! !

Steve, K4CAP

2425. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 22:45:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgc0gm0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68573
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
>class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
>code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.

But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:

(d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.

That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.

If ya' REALLY want me to file a Petition for Declaratory Ruling and
get an "officia;" answer, I gotta charge by the word... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2426. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 22:45:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgc0vl1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68574

On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 23:05:28 +0200 (CEST), Tarapia Tapioco wrote:

>
>Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
>CW coders.
>For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
>solution is Internet, not CW.

For serious emergencies, say Bye-Bye to the Internet - it won't be
usable.

The American Red Cross and major public safety entities use internet
for day-to-day administrative traffic, but when it comes to disaster
response and recovery, they do not rely on it. Every exercise that
my public safety and hospital radio clients do assumes that all
telephone and internet comms are not available. Ditto for cell-phones
(traffic jamming if not tower damage) as was proved in the 1989 San
Francisco earthquake.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2427. Re: Love code? How much?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 22:52:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611185207.14248.00000799@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68576

>Subject: Re: Love code? How much?
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 6/11/03 4:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bc88mt$l95$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>

>I love continous wave sending devices....but not that much.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
>news:3EE793F0.EC46801F@crosslink.net...
>>
><http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3029192553&category=1502

Do ya think if I leave my FT757 in the rain and get that rusty that I can
get $1300/+ for it too...?!?!

Sheeeesh...More evidence that some folks got more money than sense, I
guess....

Steve, K4CAP

2428. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 22:56:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611185624.14248.00000800@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68577

>Subject: Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 6/11/03 5:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgc0gm0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
>
> (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
>
> That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.

Hmmmmmm....You're right! I never did see a class of license attached to
that authorization in any version of Part 97!

Steve, K4CAP

2429. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 23:24:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68578

On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Nobody knows if it would have passed in 1992. Remember that back then the
>maritime services were still using Morse code on both HF and MF.

IIRC maritime CW was already on the way out - US vessels over 1600
gross tons which were making coastwise voyages in the open sea and
were therefore required by statute to have radiotelegraph stations
(and operators) were waivered by regulation if they were equipped
with all the gear that is now the requirement for the GMDSS. IIRC
the setup was even called the Future GMDSS. I may be off a year or
so on the date, but new vessels over 1600 gross tons whose keel-laid
date was after 1992 were required to have the full GMDSS setup, and
shortly after that, the waiver on the radiotelegraph installation
was extended to all US vessels over 1600 gross tons making
international voyages in the open sea if they were equipped with
GMDSS gear. The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
mid-1990s.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2430. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-11 23:36:52 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611193652.24627.00000391@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68579

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/11/03 10:38 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE73F1A.918BD779@earthlink.net>
>
writes about "Len Over 21"....
>
>You were called a **horse's ass because being a horse's ass is
>your demonstrated pattern of behavior here.

Mr. Heil,

Do you realize that you have just insulted horse's asses everywhere?

2431. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 00:00:59 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <niPFa.72762$Yv6.66873@fe06.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68580

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:

(cut) The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
> mid-1990s.

Maritime CW is still extensively used in the open seas. I was in the Philippines last year and everyone seemed to use it. It seems that the new equipment is too expensive and the Lines either cannot afford it or they don't want to waste their money. CW works fine for them.

73 de KR4AJ

2432. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 00:25:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611202535.25815.00000648@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68581

In article <3EE6AACC.808DD329@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> I AM involved in UHF and above.
>
>Lennie means he has satellite TV! Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.

Not at all, Dave.

Conventional NTSC UHF TV is still "UHF". HDTV, microwave ovens and 2.3 gig cordless phones, wireless LANs for the home computer network, cell phones, radar detectors for the car, FRS radios, scanners, infrared remotes and PDA links....the list of "UHF and above" things people can be "involved in" today just keeps on growing. Betcha most of us are more "involved in UHF and above" than we realize. Just like Len.....

--

btw, it turns out that I did NOT get rid of all the vinyl! Found a box in the basement that hadn't been opened since the move here. Moody Blues, Warren Zevon, John Hartford, Silly Wizard, Mike Cross, various classical stuff and, of course, Carly Simon.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2433. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 00:36:57 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <JWPFa.27332$ly.11375678@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 68582

Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0306111119.4d496eaf@posting.google.com...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/06/11/100/?nc=1
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2434. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 01:00:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611210015.06527.00000375@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 68583

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Amateur radio is open to all races
>and any of the several sexes.

True. Anyone can be a licenced radio amateur.

>Vipul isn't running into problems because of his ethnicity.

I have been to many Ham radio events and I have never had any mention of ethnicity. Also, Ham have always been courteous.

>His difficulties come from faulty thinking.

I disagree with that.

2435. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 01:14:11 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bc8k6i$g5ic7$1@ID-166180.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68584

To say nothing of the fact that I am now the Emergency Management Plans Officer for the largest Military Installation east of the Mississippi -- Gee, do you think I'll incorporate Amateur Radio (and CW capabilities) into our Emergency Management Plan? Oh, my bad -- already wrote it in.

Arnie -
KT4ST

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030611184506.14248.00000797@mb-m29.aol.com...
> Those of us who know better have been deluged with LennieRants asserting
> that Amateur Radio has no role in disaster preparedness in Southern California,
> and that Amateur Radio is "irrelevant" in the light of "professional" disaster
> relief providers therein.
>
> Thankfully, The Ham God rolls us a bit of help once in a while in
> deflating yet another of Lennie's self-serving lies and demeaning rhetoric. In
> this case, word of yet another award bestowed on Amateur Radio volunteers who
> have once again proven that the trust given to us under Part 97.1 was not
> wasted.
>
> From the ARRL Website:
>
> QUOTE
>
> California RACES team wins award for excellence: The Huntington Beach,
> California, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) a team has received
> an award for excellence in disaster preparedness from the Orange County chapter
> of the American Red Cross. The award recognizes companies and organizations for
> their superior emergency preparedness plans. The Huntington Beach RACES team
> works under the aegis of the Huntington Beach Fire Department. An award
> ceremony was held June 4 during the Orange County Red Cross' 19th annual
> Disaster Preparedness Academy at California State University--Fullerton. The
> Huntington Beach RACES group's emergency preparedness plan--incorporated into

> the city's emergency operations plan--includes contingency plans and
procedures
> in the event of a public safety radio system failure. Huntington Beach
Fire
> Department Emergency Services Coordinator Glorria Morrison, KE6ATG, called
the
> RACES team "a model emergency response Amateur Radio group with
outstanding
> leaders and membership." Last year, she said, RACES members volunteered
> thousands of hours to better prepare the community for emergencies. The
plan
> and manual were created originally by Mel Goldberg, N6MEL. RACES members
train
> for City emergencies on a regular basis and provide support for community
> events such as the annual Huntington Beach Fourth of July Parade,
marathons and
> fund-raising activities. More information about the Huntington Beach RACES
> organization is available on its Web site.--Wayne Yoshida, KH6WZ
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> I can't wait to see how Lennie spins his way past the opinions of the
> American Red Cross, the Huntington Beach Fire Department and the City of
> Huntington Beach government... ! ! ! ! !
>
> Steve, K4CAP

2436. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 01:28:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611212832.06527.00000377@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 68585

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>As fascinating as all this has been, did you know that almost every
>instructor of amateur radio licensing courses is a radio amateur?

>> The problem is that few in the academic world ARE experienced
>> in the field that they teach.
>
>I don't believe you.

Whether or not they know, they certainly don't teach the full perspective of a subject matter. Whether that is because of the educational system does not allow that, or because the teachers cannot give that perspective is another issue.

>> Few instructors of economics
>> have used their "knowledge" to advance their own finances.
>
>Really? How can we gain access to these spiffy facts? Where'd they
>come from?

How would you suggest an unbiased source find out this information? I would say that school administrators are a biased source. They would tend to endorse the end result. One example is those TV commercials claiming all they need is more funding and education will not suffer.

Even if you can find an unbiased source, it is still one's opinion on whether or not one should include non-traditional methods.

>As fascinating as all this has been, did you know that almost every
>instructor of amateur radio licensing courses is a radio amateur?

Every VE session must be hosted by a radio amateur of a higher class than what that test is for. For example, an Extra can teach the General class, but a Technician cannot teach the General class.

This is unfair since a Technician may have been an EE that just not wanted to learn code. So, the Extra, that just memorized the questions and answers and knows less than the EE, teaches the class.

2437. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 01:44:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611214415.06527.00000378@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 68586

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays

>Why should a high school or university offer a course in handling traveler's
>checks? Anyone that is dumb enough to need such a course is too dumb to
>learn the material anyway.

Traveler's checks is just one of the topics in a Banking course. CDs and credit cards could be other topics. Some people do not have this knowledge, and they are not dumb, but they had not experienced that before. They should offer such a course for people than need such information. Others may be able to test out of the course. This allows people to be more productive in society.

You don't seem to believe in the concept of the "whole person". It is possible to put these types of courses in a program and still end of with higher level "traditional" academic results also. I believe others want these types of skills also. Competition in schools would more likely result in those types of opportunities. Don't deny others that do want those skills that opportunity.

2438. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 01:55:58 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9397DF1E1C594elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68589

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in
news:niPFa.72762$Yv6.66873@fe06.atl2.webusenet.com:

>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> (cut) The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
>> mid-1990s.
>
> Maritime CW is still extensively used in the open seas. I was in the
> Philippines last year and everyone seemed to use it. It seems that the
> new equipment is too expensive and the Lines either cannot afford it or
> they don't want to waste their money. CW works fine for them.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ
>
>
>
>

CW at sea was officially phased out beginning in 1987 and ending in 2000.
Now, if shipping lines still want to use it, there's nothing stopping
them. However, coastal stations don't have to have anyone able to read CW
or maintain any watch on any CW frequencies, not even the 500 kHz distress
frequency, and other ships don't have to have operators capable of reading
CW. I'm not sure if GMDSS is now the only distress system, or if a watch
must still be kept at quarter to and quarter past the hour on 2182 kHz
USB. Does anyone know if that is gone too?

2439. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 01:59:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bc8n16$i73$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68590

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:niPFa.72762$Yv6.66873@fe06.atl2.webusenet.com...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> (cut) The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
> > mid-1990s.
>
> Maritime CW is still extensively used in the open seas. I was in the
> Philippines last year and everyone seemed to use it. It seems that the new
> equipment is too expensive and the Lines either cannot afford it or they
> don't want to waste their money. CW works fine for them.
> 73 de KR4AJ

Your point? Your comment changes nothing with regard
to Phil's comment/statement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2440. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:00:39 UTC
From: gaffo <gaffo@usenet.net>
Message-ID: <vefn5497e4eh3e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68587
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jay "Boogieman" Edwards <boogie350@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93946CD30B4D4boogie350NOSPAMyahoo@216.168.3.44...
>
> > Unlicensed Low-power FM broadcasting is growing by leaps
> > and bounds. Equipment is being sold at hamfests across the
> > country, and one can hear discussions about the subject on
> > VHF ham radio. Web sites which provide technical advice and
> > technical discussions are also growing in numbers with new web
> > sites coming on line all the time. Equipment can be purchased
> > via the internet at hundreds of web sites. Owners and operators
> > of such stations are being interviewed by newspapers and other
> > media. Public demand and support for this type of operation is
> > growing by quantum leaps. Unlicensed LPFM is not only here
> > to stay but is growing at an unprecedented rate.
>
> It seems more people are willing to take the risk in running an "illegal"
> transmitter nowdays, but for those who are still shy on the idea, there
was
> once a discussion somewhere regarding a "two channel, repeater approach"
to
> micropower broadcasting for those who fear FCC punishment.
>
> One transmitter originates the programming, then is picked up and
> retransmitted on a second frequency, and this is repeated infinitely
across
> the vicinity until all nulls and gaps are covered by both frequencies. The
> repeaters would simply be something like an inexpensive digital radio
> feeding an inexpensive transmitter. The whole works could be built into a
> watertight ammo can and could be totally self contained. All it would need
> is a little tweaking and a fresh battery now and then. If I'm not
mistaken,
> this is being tried in a couple areas already.
>
> It certainly can't compare in terms of quality to a single transmitter
> covering the entire area at a higher power, but it *would* work if someone
> does not want to risk running a large TX fron their home. It would be a
> multipath nightmare, but it would work to "bend the rules" and have a
> larger coverage area "legally".
>
> It would, however, require the cooperation of others in the community as
> far as locating transmitters is concerned.
>
> Of course, it would be much easier (and certainly preferable) to simply

> build a link and run a larger TX at a different location.

There was a gentleman in Austin who was with some folks who had this idea last yr.

Not sure what happened however.

Seems to me.....to be "legal" a group of folks could simply transmit at the legal limit of 1/0 watt on am and have a coordinated system (maybe a website feed from each site?) to transmit several 1/10 signals spaced throughout the town and at the same AM frequency to cover the whole area!!!!!!!!.....legally!!!!!!!!!!

One would need a coordinated network of buddies to pull this off though ;-/.

peace!....."jay" ;-).

2441. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:02:05 UTC
From: gaffo <gaffo@usenet.net>
Message-ID: <vefn7qsg4io260@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68588
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Huffy <uhflink@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:uhflink-24A98F.14054509062003@corp.newsfeeds.com...
> In article <1507896e.0306090859.6f8c01c5@posting.google.com>,
> charlesnewman1@attbi.com (Charles Newman) wrote:
>
> > "Jay \"Boogieman\" Edwards" <boogie350@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93946CD30B4D4boogie350NOSPAMyahoo@216.168.3.44>...
> > > > Unlicensed Low-power FM broadcasting is growing by leaps
> > > > and bounds. Equipment is being sold at hamfests across the
> > > > country, and one can hear discussions about the subject on
> > > > VHF ham radio. Web sites which provide technical advice and
> > > > technical discussions are also growing in numbers with new web
> > > > sites coming on line all the time. Equipment can be purchased
> > > > via the internet at hundreds of web sites. Owners and operators
> > > > of such stations are being interviewed by newspapers and other
> > > > media. Public demand and support for this type of operation is
> > > > growing by quantum leaps. Unlicensed LPFM is not only here
> > > > to stay but is growing at an unprecedented rate.
> > >
> > > It seems more people are willing to take the risk in running an
"illegal"
> > > transmitter nowdays, but for those who are still shy on the idea,
there was
> >
> >
> > Of course, you can increase the range of a part-15 device without
breaking
> > the law. All you need to do is to put a better antenna on. The right
kind of
> > directional antenna can greatly increase your range, without breaking
the
> > law.
> > In the 1990s, I hooked about 50 feet on antenna wire to my
SoundFeeder
> > SF-120
> > and was about to increase the range from 20 feet to nearly a mile, which
was
> > legal, becuase I only modified the antenna and not the innards of the
SF-120
>
> Uh, not true. The Part 15.239 rule specifies a maximum field strength
> measured 3 meters from the device, and the testing regimen requires
> testing at all possible angles of emission.

>
> Furthermore, it is not permissible to remove the antenna from a Part 15
> device and install a different antenna. This is controlled by requiring
> the antenna to either be permanently attached, or to use a special type
> of antenna connector that is not availble at RadioShack (or so the FCC
> tesing lab engineer will tell you). This is why you can buy reverse SMA
> connectors from Digikey, for example.
>
> Now, there is not much that they can do about you mounting a Part 15
> device (including its 6 inch rod antenna) at the focus of a 12 foot
> diameter satellite dish...
>
> --Huffy
>

Yep.....AM is the "ticket" if one wants "legality" and a
network to cover a town.

2442. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:05:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611220523.06527.00000379@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 68591

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>To say nothing of the fact that I am now the Emergency Management Plans
>Officer for the largest Military Installation east of the Mississippi --
>Gee, do you think I'll incorporate Amateur Radio (and CW capabilities) into
>our Emergency Management Plan? Oh, my bad -- already wrote it in.

This seems good for a bet. Who wants to make a bet on where (and when) Amateur Radio (and CW) capabilities will be used?

Also, you sure are brave. You just incriminated yourself in this post. Hopefully, noone will see your post.

2443. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:12:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611221223.03929.00000203@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68592

In article <ved25d8annkvf7@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.hga6md2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
>> Because Japan is in violation of S25.5 and no one has made a stink
>> about it doesn't make it OK for the US to do it.
>
>But according to others, Japan argues that they are not in violation.

Sure. Doesn't mean Japan is right or that the USA must do the same thing.

Besides - would you be happy with a US version of Japan's fourth-class license?
QRP power level, access to only those band segments which are worldwide
exclusive amateur, and distinctive callsigns?

>Apparent the FCC must have agreed or they simple did not care enough
>to complain.

Not the FCC's job to deal with other countries' violations of the treaty.
>
>But that is not the point of my question. Since 5mhz is not amateur band,
>the FCC could have create a new 5mhz emergency service license.

Which would not be an amateur radio license.

>New
>written exam, no use of amateur frequencies, and no S25.5 violation.

That exists already in connection with the Alaska emergency frequency. But the
licensees are not hams, and their stations are not amateur stations.
>
>All the FCC did was to expand a non-conforming use (5 USC 706)
>by extending the Morse code requirement to a non-amateur band,
>SSB mode only, no CW mode, and domestic use. (unnecessary)
>
>> You are starting to see where problems about amateur radio rank in
>> today's REAL international communications regulation scheme, where
>> money talks and big money talks loudest.
>
>I think the AR problems are of our own making.

Some of them, anyway.
>
>> We are lucky to get to keep what we have.
>

>If we can not use our frequencies for the public interest, we will lose
>them.
>
And if we don't use them, or don't use them responsibly, we'll lose them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2444. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:12:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030611221225.03929.00000204@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 68593

In article <3EE73975.84698A71@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030610222436.04207.00000668@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030610175110.23307.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> >>The demand to BE INVOLVED or shut up is a bogus one, just
>> >> another excuse to attempt winning message points.
>> >
>> >Nobody is telling you to shut up, Len. Even though you have told others to
>do
>> >so.
>>
>> Sorry, Jimmie, the Colonel and the Bwahahaha have both told me
>> to "shut up."
>
>Sorry, that's incorrect, Foghorn.

I'm still waiting to see the postings where anyone has told Len to shut up.
>
>> The Colonel called me a "horse's ass" in public and
>> Bwahahaha has called me several kinds of nasty names. You can
>> find all that in Google. :-)

Poor baby can't take a little tweak?
>
>Last week I called a lawn mower a lawn mower. I was right on both
>occasions.

I have a lawn mower, too.....

>> >We're simply pointing out that except for your newsgroup postings, and
>perhaps
>> >your lengthy and anti-child reply comments to the FCC three years ago,
>you're
>> >not involved in amateur radio at all.
>
>> >Even though there's been an amateur radio license with no code test
>available

>> >in the USA for more than 13 years, you haven't bothered to get one.
>>
>> Why is that necessary?

It's not necessary. The point is that Len is simply not involved.

>> It would make no difference to you
>> in any event...you would still claim "superiority" from having
>> taken and passed a morse code test. :-)

Do you have a crystal ball?
>
>You've long disliked that there are others who have more experience in
>something than you. In any endeavor, there are going to be people with
>more experience than you, Leonard, old bean. In amateur radio, there
>are a number of children with more experience than you. :-)

Exactly.
>
>> I was legally communicating on HF a half century ago and
>> passed a commercial test (first class) 47 years ago.
>
>You weren't communicating on HF as a radio amateur and your commercial
>test is irrelevant to amateur radio. If you want to be a radio amateur,
>you'll have to start at the beginning.

Anyone who has said a few words into a certified Part 95 27 MHz walkie-talkie
has communicated legally on HF. I recall that when I was about 8 years old,
some kids down the block had a pair of those things and used them to legally
communicate on HF.
>
>> I don't need any "licenses" to discuss any federal regulations.
>
>No, you don't. You need a license to be a part of amateur radio.
>You aren't a part of amateur radio.

Not Involved.

>> >Even though you told us almost 3-1/2 years ago you were going for Extra
>right
>> >out of the box, you haven't even attempted any amateur radio license
>exams.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, I never said WHEN I would. :-)

Still Not Involved.
>
>Do the smiley faces cover your embarrassment over not having walked the
>walk after talking the talk?
>
>> You have NO real idea of anything "I attempted." Nada. Zip.

I recall a recent post where Len said he had never taken any amateur radio exams. He claimed that the commercial license test he tough was somehow harder than any amateur radio exam, even though he'd never taken any amateur radio exam. Typical faulty logic.

Perhaps he has tried to pass an amateur radio exam since then.
>
>Len has a point, Jim. May I offer more precise wording such as, "you
>haven't successfully attempted"?

Sure. How about "Len has not succeeded in passing the tests for any amateur radio exam"?
>
>> >(btw, in the context of the 2000 restructuring, 'right out of the box'
>> >obviously meant as soon as the rules changed back on April 15, 2000.)
>>
>> No, Jimmie, you can't redefine older colloquialisms.

I'm not redefining anything. I'm defining the term.

>> "Out of the
>> box" refers to taking all test elements at once, just one test
>> session

You've had 3-1/2 years to work up that excuse, Len. Nobody's buying it.

> instead of coming up through all the classes like good
>> little boys and girls of US amateur radio do.

>Please direct us to such a definition, Leonard.
>
Don't hold yer breath, Dave.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2445. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:37:34 UTC
From: Lloyd <LJLJLJ@lloydljlj.com>
Message-ID: <bc8p11$f2i$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68594

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bc8n16$i73$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:niPFa.72762$Yv6.66873@fe06.atl2.webusenet.com...
> >
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> > (cut) The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
> > > mid-1990s.
> >
> > Maritime CW is still extensively used in the open seas. I was in the
> > Philippines last year and everyone seemed to use it. It seems that the
new
> > equipment is too expensive and the Lines either cannot afford it or they
> > don't want to waste their money. CW works fine for them.
> > 73 de KR4AJ
>
> Your point? Your comment changes nothing with regard
> to Phil's comment/statement.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
Awww Geeee, look everyone, Kane has a new sidekick.
Perhaps he too will learn one day to pontificate like Phil.

Lloyd

2446. Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:47:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306111847.64443a18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68595

Just what every HFer needs in his/her's shack. 'Specially when life gets down to snagging Zone 23 on 80 or 160.

http://www.customqsl.com/Neon.htm

w3rv

2447. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 02:58:41 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <xSRFa.656$9Z1.124@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68606

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bc8n16$i73$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...

> > Maritime CW is still extensively used in the open seas. I was in the
> > Philippines last year and everyone seemed to use it. It seems that the
new
> > equipment is too expensive and the Lines either cannot afford it or they
> > don't want to waste their money. CW works fine for them.
> > 73 de KR4AJ
>
> Your point? Your comment changes nothing with regard
> to Phil's comment/statement.

Bill, your post rings with resentment and I don't understand why. I was merely adding to the discussion, my point being that, lest we forget, other countries are not as affluent as the USA and not all are rushing to dump the CW mode. That's all.

Since CW is a part of the rich tradition of Ham radio, I am somewhat perplexed as to why a fellow ham would be so ready to "attack" a somewhat positive reference to the CW mode. Care to explain?

73 de KR4AJ

2448. Re: Callsign changes on WRC agenda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 03:08:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <X8SFa.2868$a7.955240@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68596

"elektros" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:ae406dc2.0306101823.c377fb0@posting.google.com...
> I took a look at the official WRC 2003 website. I was looking for info
> on s.25, but all I found on that was that it's definitely on the
> agenda. What I also found on the agenda was a proposal to change ham
> callsigns to avoid running out of them. I couldn't find any more
> details.
>
> Alun, N3KIP

Many items get on the agenda but never make it to the floor for a debate or vote. So just because an item is on the agenda doesn't mean anything is going to happen.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2449. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 03:21:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OkSFa.2869$a7.956792@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68597

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030611214415.06527.00000378@mb-m17.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays
>
> >Why should a high school or university offer a course in handling
traveler's
> >checks? Anyone that is dumb enough to need such a course is too dumb to
> >learn the material anyway.
>
> Traveler's checks is just one of the topics in a Banking course. CDs and
credit
> cards could be other topics. Some people do not have this knowledge, and
they
> are not dumb, but they had not experienced that before. They should offer
such
> a course for people than need such information. Others may be able to test
out
> of the course. This allows people to be more productive in society.
>

You can learn all this by working directly with your financial advisor at the bank. It doesn't take that long. Having an entire course in this stuff that you can learn in 1/2 an hour is a huge waste of time.

> You don't seem to believe in the concept of the "whole person". It is
possible
> to put these types of courses in a program and still end of with higher
level
> "traditional" academic results also. I believe others want these types of
> skills also. Competition in schools would more likely result in those
types of
> opportunities. Don't deny others that do want those skills that
opportunity.
>

I definitely believe in the concept of the "whole person". Baring significant handicaps, there are many things that go into becoming a "whole person," most of which you have previously stated that you consider worthless. Such a person needs to be widely read in the great literature of the world, including Shakespeare and many others . Such a person should have learned to play a musical instrument. A "whole person" should be able to change their own flat tire. They should have the basics in physics, biology, chemistry, math, and a whole slew of topics that you consider worthless.

It is up to the person to develop themselves as a "whole person." It takes time and effort. Schools can't cover everything. It's simply impossible. All they can do is provide a few basics and point the way.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2450. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 03:24:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <7oSFa.2870$a7.957219@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68598

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030611212832.06527.00000377@mb-m17.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >As fascinating as all this has been, did you know that almost every
> >instructor of amateur radio licensing courses is a radio amateur?
>
> >> The problem is that few in the academic world ARE experienced
> >> in the field that they teach.
> >
> >I don't believe you.
>
> Whether or not they know, they certainly don't teach the full perspective
of a
> subject matter. Whether that is because of the educational system does not
> allow that, or because the teachers cannot give that perspective is
another
> issue.
>
> >> Few instructors of economics
> >> have used their "knowledge" to advance their own finances.
> >
> >Really? How can we gain access to these spiffy facts? Where'd they
> >come from?
>
> How would you suggest an unbiased source find out this information? I
would say
> that school administrators are a biased source. They would tend to endorse
the
> end result. One example is those TV commercials claiming all they need is
more
> funding and education will not suffer.
>
> Even if you can find an unbiased source, it is still one's opinion on
whether
> or not one should include non-traditional methods.
>
> >As fascinating as all this has been, did you know that almost every
> >instructor of amateur radio licensing courses is a radio amateur?
>
> Every VE session must be hosted by a radio amateur of a higher class than
what
> that test is for. For example, an Extra can teach the General class, but a
> Technician cannot teach the General class.

You are getting teaching mixed up with testing. Anyone can teach it but only a person of the appropriate license class can administer the tests. Teaching and giving tests are totally separate items.

> This is unfair since a Technician may have been an EE that just not wanted to
> learn code. So, the Extra, that just memorized the questions and answers and
> knows less than the EE, teaches the class.
>

I repeat there is no requirement on who can teach only on who can administer the tests. Admittedly it would be hard to convince people, including the students that a Tech would be qualified to teach an Extra class but there is no rule prohibiting it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2451. Re: Love code? How much?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 05:40:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc93ov$46c$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 68599

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> I love continous wave sending devices....but not that much.

Just another collectable, altho a rare one. I've owned 'em just as old.
My current favorite was made in 1920.

2452. Re: Love code? How much?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 05:48:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc9477$6f9$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 68600

N2EY wrote:

> $1325 and climbing!
>
> Mecographs are rare collector's items. Will probably wind up in a collection,
> rather than being used. Like any other collector's item, its value is whatever
> the market will bear.
>
> Ever watch the "Antiques Roadshow"? Scary sometimes.
>
> I didn't see the sounder in the pictures, either.

I noticed that, too. The seller prolly doesn't know just what he has.

Story... A few years ago I was visiting relatives in Fresno, Ca and asked a friend of theirs who dropped in if he happened to know of any old telegraph "bugs". He looked at me a little odd and said " I threw out a box of them a year ago when I was cleaning out the garage, thinking surely no one would ever need them again. My uncle was a railroad telegrapher. There were several of his old "'wobble keys' in that box".

AAARGGGHHHH! No telling what he tossed!
And what frosted me was that I had become acqainted with that fellow before he did that, just hadn't thought of asking him such a question earlier.

Dick

2453. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 05:53:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 68601
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.
>
> But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
>
> (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
>
> That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
>

Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you had the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San Diego who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.

>
> If ya' REALLY want me to file a Petition for Declaratory Ruling and
> get an "officia;" answer, I gotta charge by the word... <ggg>

Check with the guys who want to make sure they can use it codefree. :-)

2454. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 05:56:32 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc94mg$79r$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 68602

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 23:05:28 +0200 (CEST), Tarapia Tapioco wrote:
>
> >
> >Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
> >CW coders.
> >For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
> >solution is Internet, not CW.
>
> For serious emergencies, say Bye-Bye to the Internet - it won't be
> usable.
>

I read somewhere that the WTC contained all the credit card authorizing hard and software on Sept 11 01. Evidently they had a good backup in place ready to go online. One wonders what would happen if they got both the primary and the backup. So much for the cashless society.

> The American Red Cross and major public safety entities use internet
> for day-to-day administrative traffic, but when it comes to disaster
> response and recovery, they do not rely on it. Every exercise that
> my public safety and hospital radio clients do assumes that all
> telephone and internet comms are not available. Ditto for cell-phones
> (traffic jamming if not tower damage) as was proved in the 1989 San
> Francisco earthquake.
>

SOP for disaster planning, Len of 21's rants to the contrary aside.

Dick

2455. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 05:59:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc94rb$79r$1@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 68603

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>
> I can't wait to see how Lennie spins his way past the opinions of the
> American Red Cross, the Huntington Beach Fire Department and the City of
> Huntington Beach government... ! ! ! ! !

Oh don't worry, he'll drum up some sort of conditioned response. No way you can confuse him with facts. He already "knows".

2456. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 06:02:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc951c$79r$2@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 68604

No CW Test wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 6/11/03 10:38 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EE73F1A.918BD779@earthlink.net>
> >
> writes about "Len Over 21"....
> >
> >You were called a **horse's ass because being a horse's ass is
> >your demonstrated pattern of behavior here.
>
> Mr. Heil,
>
> Do you realize that you have just insulted horse's asses everywhere?

Ah. I'm sure Dave will gladly apologize to all the world's horses
asses. Except one.

2457. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 06:05:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bc9576$79r$3@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 68605

Bert Craig wrote:

> Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)

All the hopeful comments of the codeless aside, there is no way to predict exactly how that will go until it has already gone. Horsetrading goes on throughout the conference, and all it would take is one country holding a couple of aces to trade who wants s25 kept.

2458. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 11:25:08 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bc9nud$5sm$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68609

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306111847.64443a18@posting.google.com...

> Just what every HFer needs in his/her's shack. 'Specially when life
> gets down to snagging Zone 23 on 80 or 160.
>
> http://www.customqsl.com/Neon.htm

Is the above what passes for "know-code, know-ham" logic? Ever heard
of an on-off switch? The simplistic principle of binary code _ought_ to be
thoroughly burned into your brain by now, so I'd _expect_ you to be able to
deal with light switches in your home, but apparently not.
In addition, if the concept really _is_ the brain-child of a no-code
tech, how is it a brain-fart? Unless he's also an SWL'r, it's not likely to
have much effect on _his_ gear, is it? But, since it's most likely not a
suitable accoutrement for _your_ shack, _he's_ having a "typical nocode
brainfart"?
You're a great spokesman for the hobby. Typical, too.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2459. Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 11:32:42 UTC
From: Mark McLisson <rasent@comentincradio.org>
Message-ID: <bc9occ$k6l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68608

What ever happened to Dick Bash? He was without a
doubt a gentleman and a scholar. Also the finest ham radio
operator ever to key a microphone.

73 de
Mark McLisson, M.B.A., Ph.D. P.E.
McLisson Consulting Partners
Regional & International Rep. for R-84C

2460. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 12:55:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306120455.e4e795@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68611
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72>...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.
> >
> > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> >
> > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> >
> > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
>
> Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> here, I see.

Doesn't it?

> So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> the frequency ---- and an emergency!

How else would you do it?

And be ready to explain why you had
> the radio station so long before the emergency,

Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
crime? You should read Orwell.

like the kid in San Diego
> who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.

Is the San Diego Sheriff using J3E and R3E on 5.1675 MHz? Did the kid
use J3E and R3E on 5.1675 MHz? If not, then its nothing like it.

> > If ya' REALLY want me to file a Petition for Declaratory Ruling and
> > get an "officia;" answer, I gotta charge by the word... <ggg>
>

> Check with the guys who want to make sure they can use it codefree. :-)

It is code-free. Don't you know what J3E and R3E are?

Good grief. Yet another case of a elderly, jealous, and vindictive ham PO'd at the next generation and how unworthy they might be to share in HIS hobby. If they can't hobble a radio together out of a foil chewing gum wrapper and a double edged razor blade then the hell with 'em. Now where did I put my microphone?

2461. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:05:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306120505.47822bb7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68612

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030610222437.04207.00000669@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <20030610175107.23307.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > Actually, the code TEST requirement applies to administrative
> > license granting, does not apply to any specific bands other
> > than "operating privileges below 30 MHz.".
>
> That's true.
> >
> > The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
> > to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
> > it is written now.
>
> No, that's not true.

It is true. See: Japan.

> The treaty, as FCC interporets it, requires a code test for any license that
> allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on any allocated
> frequency below 30 MHz. Since 5 MHz is below 30 MHz, the tests for a license
> that allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on those 5
> channels must include a code test.
>
> That is, until the treaty changes, or the FCC decides to violate the treaty.

For domestic use, as the ARRL requested, S25 need not apply. See: Japan.

2462. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:08:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306120508.5a73690@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68613

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hga6md2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 10 Jun 2003 05:28:31 -0700, Brian wrote:
>
> >> Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.
> > >
> > >The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.
> > >
> > >For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply. See: Japan.
> >
> > Oh? Does S25.5 say "except for domestic use only" ?
> >
> > Because Japan is in violation of S25.5 and no one has made a stink
> > about it doesn't make it OK for the US to do it.

Phil, concerning other FCC rules violations where there is "no stink"
about it, I have been lead to believe that where there is no stink,
there is no violation. Re: Farnsworth Vs Morse Codes.

2463. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:22:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306120522.dd814fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68614
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72>...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.
> >
> > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> >
> > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> >
> > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> >
>
> Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you had
> the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San Diego
> who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.

FWIW the little (FCC type accepted) FT-817 ham xcvr has been able to
transmit on 5.1675 out of the box ever since it was introduced. It's
the only ham xcvr which has incorporated the ability to make use of
the provisions of Sect 97.401(d) that I know about so far. And any
dweeb can walk into any HRO and buy an FT-817.

> >
> > If ya' REALLY want me to file a Petition for Declaratory Ruling and
> > get an "officia;" answer, I gotta charge by the word... <ggg>
>
> Check with the guys who want to make sure they can use it codefree. :-)

w3rv

2464. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:30:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612093001.08432.00001531@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68615

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/11/03 9:17 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bc7dlv$9bc$1@nd.eastky.net>

>That's my name and I've been using this e-mail for years. As to my
>callsign, I'm not going to get into a debate about the wisdom of putting
>one's name and address all over the 'net.

I'm sorry then. I have a hard time taking anyone seriously who can't put thier name, call, etc behind thier posts. Most of the "regular" posters here have been doing that very same thing and have never had one second's worth of trouble, myself included. Such excuses are just that...excuses for not standing up 100% behind one's opinions.

> but the FACTS are that the Federal Communications
>> Commission, a panel of politically appointed civilians, makes/enforces the
>> radio regulations by which we all must adhere.
>
> Yes, but that's not the point, is it?

That's EXACTLY the point. Lennie the Lame insists that "we" ae keeping the Code tests. The Commission has clearly stated that they would drop it today if not for International treaties that require it.

>If the opinions of members of
>the ARS and/or the public at large were irrelevant, there wouldn't be a time
>period during which one submits those opinions on regulatory matters.

Those opinions have been expressed. The FCC has determined that the move is away from Morse Code testing. There are those who don;t like it, myself included, however the time for deciding has passed, ergo it's time to move on.

>> That there are opinions that do not reflect that is obvious. Your
>quotes
>> from Google are valid OPINIONS, no doubt, but carry no force of law.
>
> I seriously doubt the logic of a lot of 'em.

I seriously doubt logic has anything to do with it.

>> Yep...enough of that. Unless you can show me a point of law which
>refutes
>> it.
>
> Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
>public _opinion_?

Yep. And as pointed out by one man in here who worked with the FCC for years, after they hold such "hearing", they can do what they see fit.

Steve, K4CAP

2465. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:31:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612093146.08432.00001532@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68616

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/11/03 8:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030611210015.06527.00000375@mb-m17.aol.com>

>>His difficulties come from faulty thinking.
>
>I disagree with that.

You would. You shouldn't.

Steve, K4CAP

2466. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:36:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612093624.08432.00001533@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68617

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 6/11/03 9:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030611221225.03929.00000204@mb-m28.aol.com>

>Anyone who has said a few words into a certified Part 95 27 MHz walkie-talkie
>has communicated legally on HF. I recall that when I was about 8 years old,
>some kids down the block had a pair of those things and used them to legally
>communicate on HF.

Whoa! Deja vu!

My Dad bought me a set of LaFayette 11 meter HT's when I was a kid. I
remember being called by one of my Dad's friends across town one time while we
were playing and talking for a couple minutes "all that way"...!

73

Steve, K4CAP

2467. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:39:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612093957.08432.00001534@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68619

>Subject: Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/11/03 9:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030611220523.06527.00000379@mb-m17.aol.com>

>>To say nothing of the fact that I am now the Emergency Management Plans
>>Officer for the largest Military Installation east of the Mississippi --
>>Gee, do you think I'll incorporate Amateur Radio (and CW capabilities) into
>>our Emergency Management Plan? Oh, my bad -- already wrote it in.
>
>This seems good for a bet. Who wants to make a bet on where (and when)
>Amateur
>Radio (and CW) capabilities will be used?

Let's just hope that except for drills, those skills are never called on
for the real thing. However it's a good bet they will be, CW or not.

>Also, you sure are brave. You just incriminated yourself in this post.
>Hopefully, noone will see your post.

Vipul, you have NO BUSINESS suggesting anyone "incriminated" themselves in
a USENET post. The idiocy of many of your posts suggest some really GPD
thinking.

Steve, K4CAP

2468. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:40:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306120540.90349bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68618

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306110809.47370455@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306110157.990f0bf@posting.google.com>...

>
> > The pattern is clear. The ham bands are a sort of FCC "land bank".
>
> Check out what the 1927 conference did to the amateur allocations.
> It's not pretty.

Even within my time on the bands I remember the days when the spectrum
above some freq (3 gHz?) was unallocated and open for "experimental
use". Now look at that space. A predictable replay of 1927, only the
location of the decimal points changed.

> >
> > We'll deal with it. As usual.
> >
> Yup. The question to think about is "why aren't the bands used more?"
>
> You're looking at part of the answer.

I wuz also there when hams got kicked off 11M. The ARRL sponsored an
11M contest to promote activity on the band as a shot at "saving it".
Nobody showed up for the party.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2469. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 13:45:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612094543.08432.00001535@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68620

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/12/03 8:05 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306120505.47822bb7@posting.google.com>

>> > The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
>> > to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
>> > it is written now.
>>
>> No, that's not true.
>
>It is true. See: Japan.

What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US policy or
regulations.

>> That is, until the treaty changes, or the FCC decides to violate the
>treaty.
>
>For domestic use, as the ARRL requested, S25 need not apply. See: Japan.

What Japan did oand how it did it have nothing to do with US policy or
regulations.

Steve, K4CAP

2470. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 14:01:30 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <veh250ktise8a5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message >
> > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
>
> How else would you do it?
>
> And be ready to explain why you had
> > the radio station so long before the emergency,
>
> Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
> crime? You should read Orwell.

There are still a number of people that think it is illegal to own a piece
of
radio gear.

As far as I know, there are only two exceptions (one being cell stuff).

There is NO requirement for permits, licenses, visas, whatever, to
POSSESS equipment for receiving or transmitting in the US.

I see the BS about you 'MUST' have a HAM license to purchase. But
that is a seller policy. It is NOT law.

Oh, the other exception? Technically... If you have a CB set with
'expanded' capabilities, possession is considered proof of use.
UNLESS you have a HAM ticket AND the equipment is only hooked
up as HAM equipment. Like using a modified CB set as the core of
a 2M transverter to get on 2M SSB. But then, once you do that,
the CB set isn't really a CB set anymore, is it? It's just 'parts' that are
now 'rebuilt' into a 2M SSB setup. (Which is how I have an old
TRC-457 hooked up to a homebuilt Hamtronics transverter setup.)
Although technically just having it could still get you in trouble I
suppose...

Mike

2471. QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 15:02:31 UTC
From: John Sielke <w2agnNOSPAM@w2agn.net>
Message-ID: <5g5hevgubuesbpjqgvbtvrlvt37jumremp@4ax.com>
Source record: 68622

It is getting increasingly frustrating, trying to at least limit SPAM. For example, for those of you members of QCWA, in the Summer newsletter, it shows the QCWA BoD voted in October to SELL the member's database to a bulk email outfit! I contacted the GM and President, as I have been a Life Member for 20+ years. Sure enough, it was true, but they cancelled the plan...not because of concern for member's privacy, but because it turned out "they didn't need the money." Needless to say I told them to expunge my records and cancel my membership. Probably useless, but it's bad enough having spammers gathering our data with robots, but having a trusted organization SELLING it was too much.

2472. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 15:17:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE8998E.7050402@psu.edu>
Source record: 68623

Tarapia Tapioco wrote:

> Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
> CW coders.
> For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
> solution is Internet, not CW.

Ahh, yes. Next time a hurricane or quake or flood takes out all the power in your area, just hop on your computer and send an email letting people know about it.

Better yet, use your cell phone to let them know. Brilliant, just brilliant.

- Mike -

2473. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 15:23:07 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE89ADB.BB03AC20@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68610

Mark McLisson wrote:
>
> What ever happened to Dick Bash?

Good question. His books helped my XYL pass her General written test to become a Tech then go on to Extra when nothing else did.

73, K3DWW

2474. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 15:25:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306120725.3c19873f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68624

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bc7dlv$9bc$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030611092938.16033.00000397@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
> > >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
> > >Date: 6/9/03 3:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <bc2qtr$g4f$1@nd.eastky.net>
>
> > >> I know you disdain facts, Oh Scummy One, however it's not those
> unwashed
> > >> masses of licensed Amateurs who are "insisting" on keeping Morse Code
> > >> testing...
> > >
> > > You're joking, right?
> > >
> > >Quotes randomly culled from GoogleGroups:...(SNIP)
> >
> > Sorry, Robert, or what ever your name is (since you didn't sign the
> post
> > with a name, callsign, etc),
>
> That's my name and I've been using this e-mail for years. As to my
> callsign, I'm not going to get into a debate about the wisdom of putting
> one's name and address all over the 'net.
>
> but the FACTS are that the Federal Communications
> > Commission, a panel of politically appointed civilians, makes/enforces the
> > radio regulations by which we all must adhere.
>
> Yes, but that's not the point, is it? If the opinions of members of
> the ARS and/or the public at large were irrelevant, there wouldn't be a time
> period during which one submits those opinions on regulatory matters.
>
>
> > That there are opinions that do not reflect that is obvious. Your
> quotes
> > from Google are valid OPINIONS, no doubt, but carry no force of law.
>
> I seriously doubt the logic of a lot of 'em.
>
> > >Well, enough of that.
> >
> > Yep...enough of that. Unless you can show me a point of law which
> refutes

> > it.
>
> Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
> public _opinion_?

Yes. Then they can turn right around, ignore the debates and public
hearings and do whatever they damned well want to do.

'Snot a democratic process, not even close.

> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.488 / Virus Database: 287 - Release Date: 6/5/2003

w3rv

2475. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 15:28:26 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939874B97481elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68625

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bc9576$79r$3@208.206.142.72:

>
>
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
>> Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)
>
> All the hopeful comments of the codeless aside, there is no way to
> predict exactly how that will go until it has already gone. Horsetrading
> goes on throughout the conference, and all it would take is one country
> holding a couple of aces to trade who wants s25 kept.
>

Psychologists have a word for this. Can you spell d-e-n-i-a-l ?

2476. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 16:42:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306120842.4e83b9cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68626

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<niPFa.72762$Yv6.66873@fe06.atl2.webusenet.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> (cut) The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
> > mid-1990s.

Actually, Phil wrote that, not me.

The date March 31, 1995 comes to mind as to when the USCG ended Morse
operations. December 31, 1997 was the last day of the requirement for
ships of any size. Oddly enough, on that last day, the freighter MV
Oak sent an SOS and a rescue effected.
>
> Maritime CW is still extensively used in the open seas. I was in the
> Philippines last year and everyone seemed to use it. It seems that the new
> equipment is too expensive and the Lines either cannot afford it or they
> don't want to waste their money. CW works fine for them.

Cost of labor vs. cost of capital is the big factor. What the maritime
operators really wanted is to eliminate the radio operators on board
ship. As long as there was a requirement for Morse capability, they
were required to have qualified crewpersons aboard dedicated primarily
(if not solely) to radio communications. GMDRSS eliminated all that,
for the cost of the new equipment.
Depending on the balance sheet, that may or may not be a savings.

On the other hand, use of Morse/CW by radio amateurs continues all
over the world. Participation by hams in contests is increasing, as
evidenced by more logs being received - but only for CW contests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2477. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 17:01:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306120901.6edef8bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68627

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030610004149.25815.00000589@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <20030609082312.14458.00000141@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030609000826.02222.00000089@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>You are welcome to explain the WHY of such "learned folk"
> >> insisting on that code test...but I don't think you can bring up any
> >> new arguments for keeping it. :-)
> >>
> >Why are new arguments needed when many of the existing ones are still valid?
>
> The existing arguments in favor of code test retention are
> NOT valid.

Sure they are. Here's one:

"Code tests must continue because FCC's interpretation of the ITU-R
treaty requires them".

Until the treaty or FCC's interpretation of it changes, that's a valid
argument.

Here's another:

"Since Morse code is widely and extensivley used by radio amateurs,
particularly on the HF/MF amateur bands, it makes complete sense to
require at least a basic Morse code test for an amateur license that
permits operation on those bands".
>
> The only "validity" is that the already-licensed extras

"Already-licensed extras"? Isn't that redundant? Anyone with an Extra
license is, by definition, already licensed. Same for any other
license class. You, Len, are not licensed, and never have been.

There are radio amateurs of all license classes, as well as unlicensed
persons, who support code testing. And there are radio amateurs of all
license classes, as well as unlicensed persons, who oppose code
testing. You're not a radio amateur. You're Not Involved.

> had to
> take such a test and they seem to insist that everyone else
> must do so, too.

Not at all. Only those who want an amateur license with certain
privileges are required to PASS such a test.

You, Len, are not licensed, and have never passed such a test.
>
> That's just emotional self-righteousness of a very personal
> kind, not at all applicable to the US agency that grants such
> amateur licenses.

Typical ad hominem from you, Len. Try listening instead of judging.

The only "emotional self-righteousness of a very personal kind" going
on emanates from someone who is Not Involved with amateur radio in any
meaningful way....

Here's a tip, Len: Try being positive in your postings here, instead
of negative. You project an extremely negative persona and energy. The
headshrinkers have a term for it: 'toxic personality'.

You're always talking about what's wrong, what has to be eliminated,
how bad others are, how awful Morse code and its tests are, making
accusations of fraud, getting all worked up over typos, defending the
"honor" of worthless, thieving, lying long-dead robber-barons, name
calling, insulting, ridiculing, yada, yada, yada. What a sourpuss!

The negative kharma you've acquired must be staggering...

You never talk about how much FUN amateur radio is, how great a lot of
hams are as people, how many accomplishments hams have made...

oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
way....

2478. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 17:16:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcae8u$p9u$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0306120455.e4e795@posting.google.com...

> Good grief. Yet another case of a elderly, jealous, and vindictive
> ham PO'd at the next generation and how unworthy they might be to
> share in HIS hobby. If they can't hobble a radio together out of a
> foil chewing gum wrapper and a double edged razor blade then the hell
> with 'em. Now where did I put my microphone?

Don't sweat it Brian....I tried that razor blade deal.....just couldn't make
it work on SSBsc.

Dan/W4NTI

2479. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 17:19:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcae8v$p9u$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:veh250ktise8a5@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message >
> > > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
> >
> > How else would you do it?
> >
> > And be ready to explain why you had
> > > the radio station so long before the emergency,
> >
> > Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
> > crime? You should read Orwell.
>
> There are still a number of people that think it is illegal to own a piece
> of
> radio gear.
>
> As far as I know, there are only two exceptions (one being cell stuff).
>
> There is NO requirement for permits, licenses, visas, whatever, to
> POSSESS equipment for receiving or transmitting in the US.
>
> I see the BS about you 'MUST' have a HAM license to purchase. But
> that is a seller policy. It is NOT law.
>
> Oh, the other exception? Technically... If you have a CB set with
> 'expanded' capabilities, possession is considered proof of use.
> UNLESS you have a HAM ticket AND the equipment is only hooked
> up as HAM equipment. Like using a modified CB set as the core of
> a 2M transverter to get on 2M SSB. But then, once you do that,
> the CB set isn't really a CB set anymore, is it? It's just 'parts' that
are
> now 'rebuilt' into a 2M SSB setup. (Which is how I have an old
> TRC-457 hooked up to a homebuilt Hamtronics transverter setup.)
> Although technically just having it could still get you in trouble I
> suppose...
>
> Mike
>
>
>

>
>

OH NO !!! Tell me it ain't so !!! Does that mean my modified ya'all come back CB jobber that does 12 watts output PEP on TEN METERS is illegal ???? I gotta destroy the evidence quick.

Dan/W4NTI

2480. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 17:27:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcae91$p9u$3@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68630

Yep....that really does suck.

Dan/W4NTI

"John Sielke" <w2agnNOSPAM@w2agn.net> wrote in message
news:5g5hevgubuesbpjqgvbtvrlvt37jumremp@4ax.com...
> It is getting increasingly frustrating, trying to at least limit SPAM.
> For example, for those of you members of QCWA, in the Summer newsletter,
> it shows the QCWA BoD voted in October to SELL the member's database to a
> bulk email outfit! I contacted the GM and President, as I have been a
> Life Member for 20+ years. Sure enough, it was true, but they cancelled
> the plan...not because of concern for member's privacy, but because it
> turned out "they didn't need the money." Needless to say I told them to
> expunge my records and cancel my membership. Probably useless, but it's
> bad enough having spammers gathering our data with robots, but having a
> trusted organization SELLING it was too much.
>

2481. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 17:30:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcae92$p9u$4@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68631

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EE8998E.7050402@psu.edu...
> Tarapia Tapioco wrote:
>
> > Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
> > CW coders.
> > For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
> > solution is Internet, not CW.
>
> Ahh, yes. Next time a hurricane or quake or flood takes out all the
> power in your area, just hop on your computer and send an email letting
> people know about it.
>
> Better yet, use your cell phone to let them know. Brilliant, just
> brilliant.
>
> - Mike -
>

Here is a phrase I like....I believe it applies to that goofball;

'One thing about it...ya just cain't fix STUPID'

Dan/W4NTI

2482. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 17:42:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcae93$p9u$5@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68632

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0306120842.4e83b9cc@posting.google.com...

> On the other hand, use of Morse/CW by radio amateurs continues all
> over the world. Participation by hams in contests is increasing, as
> evidenced by more logs being received - but only for CW contests.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Or it could mean the SSB contesters are getting sick of it and going to CW.

Dan/W4NTI

2483. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:20:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612152031.07705.00000687@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68635

>Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/12/03 12:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0306120901.6edef8bc@posting.google.com>

>Here's a tip, Len: Try being positive in your postings here, instead
>of negative. You project an extremely negative persona and energy. The
>headshrinkers have a term for it: 'toxic personality'.

I liked the term Dave Heil had for it, myself.

>You never talk about how much FUN amateur radio is, how great a lot of
>hams are as people, how many accomplishments hams have made...

How can he, Jim? No Experience.

>oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
>way....

THERE ya go!

Steve, K4CAP

2484. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:32:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306121132.1cef0d08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68637

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030612094543.08432.00001535@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/12/03 8:05 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306120505.47822bb7@posting.google.com>
>
> >> > The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
> >> > to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
> >> > it is written now.
> >>
> >> No, that's not true.
> >
> >It is true. See: Japan.
>
> What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US policy or
> regulations.

With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.

> >> That is, until the treaty changes, or the FCC decides to violate the
> >treaty.
> >
> >For domestic use, as the ARRL requested, S25 need not apply. See: Japan.
>
> What Japan did oand how it did it have nothing to do with US policy or
> regulations.
>
> Steve, K4CAP

With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.

See: Japan.

2485. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:39:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306121139.6dd8730c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68638

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030612093957.08432.00001534@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 6/11/03 9:05 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030611220523.06527.00000379@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
> >>To say nothing of the fact that I am now the Emergency Management Plans
> >>Officer for the largest Military Installation east of the Mississippi --
> >>Gee, do you think I'll incorporate Amateur Radio (and CW capabilities) into
> >>our Emergency Management Plan? Oh, my bad -- already wrote it in.
> >
> >This seems good for a bet. Who wants to make a bet on where (and when)
> >Amateur
> >Radio (and CW) capabilities will be used?
>
> Let's just hope that except for drills, those skills are never called on
> for the real thing. However it's a good bet they will be, CW or not.
>
> >Also, you sure are brave. You just incriminated yourself in this post.
> >Hopefully, noone will see your post.
>
> Vipul, you have NO BUSINESS suggesting anyone "incriminated" themselves in
> a USENET post. The idiocy of many of your posts suggest some really GPD
> thinking.
>
> Steve, K4CAP

Operations Plans are typically classified: SECRET or higher. Its
probably not wise to discuss them on usenet... unless you're a code
advocate then even FOUO, EEFI, and close hold don't apply.

2486. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:40:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 68639

Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer access the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new (temporary) number provided by AT&T. The destruction of the twin towers severely impacted AT&T and the Rochester, NY, area felt that impact for a number of weeks. I think the key here is 'backup'. A single band HT won't do it. A single HF rig might, given a backup generator (or mobile installation). What will do it is a lot of amateurs with many ways of communicating (and many various sources of power). Same can be said of computers; backing up to another partition on a hard drive is very close to not having a back up. You back up on a separate drive *plus* CD rom (and other techniques, depending upon how critical the data are). The CD rom works for me with only home applications (I've got all the installation disks; only need to protect some data and digital photographs). No one simple answer.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc0vl1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 23:05:28 +0200 (CEST), Tarapia Tapioco wrote:
>
> >
> > For serious emergencies, say Bye-Bye to the Internet - it won't be
> > usable.
>
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/03

2487. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:44:44 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <NK4Ga.51114$Pc5.45770@fed1read01>
Source record: 68640

Hey I like that tax, except they (whoever they are) wud tax our e-mails
too -- don't ya know !

QCWA is Quarter Century Wireless Association, Inc.
URL: http://www.qcwa.org/

--

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EE8FBE4.C8818101@crosslink.net...
> John Sielke wrote:
> >
> > It is getting increasingly frustrating, trying to at least limit SPAM.
>
> There is a very simple answer. Put a 2-cent tax on every email sent.
> That wouldn't cost me (or you?) $5/month but it'd make spamming
> prohibitively expensive.
>
> What's a QCWA?
>
> 73, K3DWW

2488. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:45:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306121145.24b2effe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68641

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bc9nud$5sm$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306111847.64443a18@posting.google.com...
>
> > Just what every HFer needs in his/her's shack. 'Specially when life
> > gets down to snagging Zone 23 on 80 or 160.
> >
> > http://www.customqsl.com/Neon.htm
>
> Is the above what passes for "know-code, know-ham" logic? Ever heard
> of an on-off switch? The simplistic principle of binary code _ought_ to be
> thoroughly burned into your brain by now, so I'd _expect_ you to be able to
> deal with light switches in your home, but apparently not.
> In addition, if the concept really _is_ the brain-child of a no-code
> tech, how is it a brain-fart? Unless he's also an SWL'r, it's not likely to
> have much effect on _his_ gear, is it? But, since it's most likely not a
> suitable accoutrement for _your_ shack, _he's_ having a "typical nocode
> brainfart"?
> You're a great spokesman for the hobby. Typical, too.

Go easy on the blowhard. He's got real military experience, without
having actually served.

2489. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:47:00 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <VM4Ga.51115$Pc5.50091@fed1read01>
Source record: 68642

More on QCWA

http://www.qcwa.org/who.htm

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EE8FBE4.C8818101@crosslink.net...
> John Sielke wrote:
> >
> > It is getting increasingly frustrating, trying to at least limit SPAM.
>
> There is a very simple answer. Put a 2-cent tax on every email sent.
> That wouldn't cost me (or you?) $5/month but it'd make spamming
> prohibitively expensive.
>
> What's a QCWA?
>
> 73, K3DWW

2490. Speaking Of Foxhunting...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:55:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612155509.07705.00000694@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68643

Day before yesterday (10 June) we had a line of thunderstorms roll through here in the late afternoon. On my way to work I heard a "thump-thump-thump" on the local EMS channel of 155.340. This is also known as the HEAR frequency for "Hospital Ambulance Emergency Radio" channel.

Late Tuesday night it was apparent that it wasn't going away. It was irregular and without modulation and was recycling at a 1-2 pulse-per-second rate. When I got off shift at 0700 Wednesday morning, it was still there. I got some initial bearings using my FT-2600 and a hand held yagi, but due to the valley we are in, it was difficult to avoid the ghosting. I finally got a decent steer from a prominent local "scenic view" site below Sewanee, TN. But having been up all night overtook me and I headed for the barn.

At the 0200Z ARES net that evening, NCS gave me the net for a while, and stations from around the area were asked to check 155.340 and report thier findings. After 15 minutes on the net we'd narrowed this down from a 125 square-mile area to a 30 mile area just west of Shelbyville, TN.

I hit the road around 1400Z and started north from Winchester towards Tullahoma, TN and took bearings from the airport. Sure enough, northwest was the plan. I stopped at the Motlow Fire Tower and took a bering from the tower which confirmed my findings from the airport. I continued west until the signal started to drop and then would find the next northbound highway. Eventually I made my way to Lewisburg, TN.

The signal to this point had never been more than half scale on the s-meter, even with the RF squelch off and the AF squelch wide open. Within minutes it was full scale with the RF squelch at "FULL ON" and nothing but a paper clip in the SO-239. Sure enough, I wound up at the door of Marshall County Medical Center. I had thought earlier that it proably was a hospital, but it could have just as easily been an EMS station or a VFD department so I tried to not let myself be swayed by the blue "H" signs, although every time a turn was dictated, there was a sign!

I ID'd myself to the ER staff, first as a fellow nurse then explained why I was there. Sure enough, they said they'd not been able to use the radio for two days and had "griped" it to thier maint department, but they were not aware it was latched in transmit! The maint department man and I walked up the hill to the shed at the base of the tower, and as he opened the door I could hear the "click-click-click" of a ratcheting relay. He pulled the plug and the thumping in my HT went silent!

In retrospect, I would have got this done a lot faster had I had a good step-attenuator at my disposal. Also, the "Lil-Elper" DF unit we use in CAP was not capable of using alternate RF sources, so that was of no use. I think I'll look into the "Vectronics" unit.

Just thought I'd share. It was a really beautiful day to be driving in Middle Tennessee.

73

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2491. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 19:59:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612155913.07705.00000695@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68644

>Subject: Re: QCWA Sell-Out!
>From: Vito vito@crosslink.net
>Date: 6/12/03 5:17 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EE8FBE4.C8818101@crosslink.net>

>What's a QCWA?

(Q)uarter
(C)entury
(W)ireless
(A)ssociation

For those Amateurs who can show that they were first licensed over 25
years prior. You do not need to have been licensed for that entire time.

73

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2492. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:04:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE8DCCC.5040605@psu.edu>
Source record: 68646

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3EE8998E.7050402@psu.edu...
>
>>Tarapia Tapioco wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
>>>CW coders.
>>>For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
>>>solution is Internet, not CW.
>>
>>Ahh, yes. Next time a hurricane or quake or flood takes out all the
>>power in your area, just hop on your computer and send an email letting
>>people know about it.
>>
>>Better yet, use your cell phone to let them know. Brilliant, just
>>brilliant.
>>
>>- Mike -
>>
>
>
> Here is a phrase I like....I believe it applies to that goofball;
>
> 'One thing about it...ya just cain't fix STUPID'

And you can't polish a turd either. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2493. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:08:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612160838.07705.00000697@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68645

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/12/03 2:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306121132.1cef0d08@posting.google.com>

>> What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US policy or
>> regulations.
>
>With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.

In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has nothing to
do with US policy or regulations.

>With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
>
>See: Japan.

In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has nothing to
do with US policy or regulations.

Japan is a soverign nation. It will do as it sees fit for it's own
purposes. Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
regulation. Japan does not have a representitve on the FCC, nor does a member
of the FCC have a say in Japan's Post's Ministry.

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2494. Re: FCC (was Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:10:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE8DE4B.4080101@psu.edu>
Source record: 68647

Vito wrote:
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>>"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote
>>
>>> Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
>>>public _opinion_?
>>
>>Yes. Then they can turn right around, ignore the debates and public
>>hearings and do whatever they damned well want to do.
>
>
> That's a problem with all "commissions".

<snip>

Actually, that is the rationale used by the people who do not "win" the issue. Whe I was running an association, the board often took input from interested people. I was up front that we may make a decision that was contrary to what they wanted. But being (at least) two sides to every issue, some people are just not going to have things go their way.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2495. Re: Speaking Of Foxhunting...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:29:19 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <vehokv8vvqvd72@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68648

That's a nice story. I like DFing too. We do a lot of transmitter hunts in my area(recreational). We haven't had to use our DFing skills for real yet, but we'll be ready when called on.

KB7ADL

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in news:20030612155509.07705.00000694@mb-m18.aol.com:

> Day before yesterday (10 June) we had a line of thunderstorms
> roll through
> here in the late afternoon. On my way to work I heard a
> "thump-thump-thump" on the local EMS channel of 155.340. This is also
> known as the HEAR frequency for "Hospital Ambulance Emergency Radio"
> channel.
>
> Late Tuesday night it was apparent that it wasn't going away. It
> was
> irregular and without modulation and was recycling at a 1-2
> pulse-per-second rate. When I got off shift at 0700 Wednesday
> morning, it was still there. I got some initial bearings using my
> FT-2600 and a hand held yagi, but due to the valley we are in, it was
> difficult to avoid the ghosting. I finally got a decent steer from a
> prominent local "scenic view" site below Sewanee, TN. But having been
> up all night overtook me and I headed for the barn.
>
> At the 0200Z ARES net that evening, NCS gave me the net for a
> while, and
> stations from around the area were asked to check 155.340 and report
> thier findings. After 15 minutes on the net we'd narrowed this down
> from a 125 square-mile area to a 30 mile area just west of
> Shelbyville, TN.
>
> I hit the road around 1400Z and started north from Winchester
> towards
> Tullahoma, TN and took bearings from the airport. Sure enough,
> northwest was the plan. I stopped at the Motlow Fire Tower and took a
> bering from the tower which confirmed my findings from the airport. I
> continued west until the signal started to drop and then would find
> the next northbound highway. Eventually I made my way to Lewisburg,
> TN.
>
> The signal to this point had never been more than half scale on
> the
> s-meter, even with the RF squelch off and the AF squelch wide open.

> Within minutes it was full scale with the RF squelch at "FULL ON" and
> nothing but a paper clip in the SO-239. Sure enough, I wound up at
> the door of Marshall County Medical Center. I had thought earlier
> that it proably was a hospital, but it could have just as easily been
> an EMS station or a VFD department so I tried to not let myself be
> swayed by the blue "H" signs, although every time a turn was dictated,
> there was a sign!
>
> I ID'd myself to the ER staff, first as a fellow nurse then
> explained why
> I was there. Sure enough, they said they'd not been able to use the
> radio for two days and had "griped" it to thier maint department, but
> they were not aware it was latched in transmit! The maint department
> man and I walked up the hill to the shed at the base of the tower, and
> as he opened the door I could hear the "click-click-click" of a
> ratcheting relay. He pulled the plug and the thumping in my HT went
> silent!
>
> In retrospect, I would have got this done a lot faster had I had
> a good
> step-attenuator at my disposal. Also, the "Lil-Elper" DF unit we use
> in CAP was not capable of using alternate RF sources, so that was of
> no use. I think I'll look into the "Vectronics" unit.
>
> Just thought I'd share. It was a really beautiful day to be
> driving in
> Middle Tennessee.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ
>

2496. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:29:47 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcanrliaf1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68718

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> Go easy on the blowhard. He's got real military experience, without
> having actually served.

Uh-oh.....;)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2497. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:36:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcaodsuoa1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68649

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:xSRFa.656$9Z1.124@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bc8n16$i73$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> > > Maritime CW is still extensively used in the open seas. I was in the
> > > Philippines last year and everyone seemed to use it. It seems that the
> new
> > > equipment is too expensive and the Lines either cannot afford it or
they
> > > don't want to waste their money. CW works fine for them.
> > > 73 de KR4AJ
> >
> > Your point? Your comment changes nothing with regard
> > to Phil's comment/statement.
>
> Bill, your post rings with resentment and I don't understand why. I was
> merely adding to the discussion, my point being that, lest we forget,
other
> countries are not as affluent as the USA and not all are rushing to dump
the
> CW mode. That's all.

As a "matter-of-fact" statement, then that's
fine. Your intent in the posting was not clear
to me until your response above.

> Since CW is a part of the rich tradition of Ham radio, I am somewhat
> perplexed as to why a fellow ham would be so ready to "attack" a somewhat
> positive reference to the CW mode. Care to explain?

Because I see no need to require CW knowledge for
hams anymore. Other's in the newsgroup are quite aware
of my position on code testing. I care not a bit as to
USE of CW. Use it all one likes, just let's end the
test requirement. Once code testing ends as a requirement,
then folks that want CW to continue as a mode will
have to champion its use and recruit newcomers to
learn. I have no problem with that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2498. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:41:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcaospfk1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
>
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.
> >
> > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> >
> > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> >
> > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> >
>
> Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you had
> the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San Diego
> who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.

The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to
be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
Part 97.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2499. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:42:00 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68713

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...

> Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer access
> the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> (temporary) number provided by AT&T.

OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you _effectively_
UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was about,
this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far as
the internet is concerned.)
The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they were
talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes. An
old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
"The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."
Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason,
you're off-line.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2500. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 20:44:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcaosqfk2@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:veh250ktise8a5@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message >
> > > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
> >
> > How else would you do it?
> >
> > And be ready to explain why you had
> > > the radio station so long before the emergency,
> >
> > Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
> > crime? You should read Orwell.
>
> There are still a number of people that think it is illegal to own a
> piece of radio gear.

They can think whatever they want.

> As far as I know, there are only two exceptions (one being cell stuff).
>
> There is NO requirement for permits, licenses, visas, whatever, to
> POSSESS equipment for receiving or transmitting in the US.

Correct.

> I see the BS about you 'MUST' have a HAM license to purchase. But
> that is a seller policy. It is NOT law.

Correct

> Oh, the other exception? Technically... If you have a CB set with
> 'expanded' capabilities, possession is considered proof of use.
> UNLESS you have a HAM ticket AND the equipment is only hooked
> up as HAM equipment. Like using a modified CB set as the core of
> a 2M transverter to get on 2M SSB. But then, once you do that,
> the CB set isn't really a CB set anymore, is it? It's just 'parts' that
are
> now 'rebuilt' into a 2M SSB setup. (Which is how I have an old
> TRC-457 hooked up to a homebuilt Hamtronics transverter setup.)
> Although technically just having it could still get you in trouble I
> suppose...

Correct.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2501. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 21:23:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306121323.3d1096d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68652

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306120505.47822bb7@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030610222437.04207.00000669@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030610175107.23307.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > > Actually, the code TEST requirement applies to administrative
> > > license granting, does not apply to any specific bands other
> > > than "operating privileges below 30 MHz.".
> >
> > That's true.
> > >
> > > The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
> > > to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
> > > it is written now.
> >
> > No, that's not true.
>
> It is true.

No, it's not true.

> See: Japan.

Has Japan allowed its hams on 5 MHz?
>
> > The treaty, as FCC interprets it, requires a code test for any license that
> > allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on any allocated
> > frequency below 30 MHz. Since 5 MHz is below 30 MHz, the tests for a license
> > that allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on those 5
> > channels must include a code test.
> >
> > That is, until the treaty changes, or the FCC decides to violate the
> > treaty.
>
> For domestic use, as the ARRL requested, S25 need not apply.

Where in the treaty does it say that?

How can anyone guarantee that the 5 MHz signals will not leave the
USA?

> See: Japan.

Has Japan allowed its hams on 5 MHz?

The requirement has to do with the license, not domestic use. It also specifically requires a General or higher license for hams to use 60 meters.

Japanese amateurs are not limited to domestic use only.

Here's how the Japanese sytem works (reposted many times). This is Japan's
argument, not mine:

Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test. These are
"4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify not
having a code test for them:

1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and to
promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.

2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful interference need
to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all countries,
and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.

3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that are
worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is prevented.

4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on HF (10
watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful interference
to amateurs of other countries is avoided.

Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its measures re
4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not agree with Japan's
reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan on it in
at least the past 35 years.

Note that the other three classes of Japanese amateur radio license DO require
a code test.

Note also that Japanese 4th classers only have privs on freqs that are
worldwide exclusive amateur. (See 3), above). That leaves out 60 meters.

If/when the code test is eliminated, a General class or higher license will

still be required to access 60 meters unless the rules change.

Would you be satisfied with a US equivalent of the Japanese 4th class license? QRP power and no access to shared allocations?

2502. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 21:24:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306121324.99997fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68653

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bcae93$p9u$5@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0306120842.4e83b9cc@posting.google.com...
>
> > On the other hand, use of Morse/CW by radio amateurs continues all
> > over the world. Participation by hams in contests is increasing, as
> > evidenced by more logs being received - but only for CW contests.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Or it could mean the SSB contesters are getting sick of it and going to CW.

Maybe, Dan, but either way amateur use of Morse/CW in contests is UP.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2503. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 21:28:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306121328.3287ee3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68654

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306120540.90349bc@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306110809.47370455@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306110157.990f0bf@posting.google.com>...
>
> >
> > > The pattern is clear. The ham bands are a sort of FCC "land bank".
> >
> > Check out what the 1927 conference did to the amateur allocations.
> > It's not pretty.
>
> Even within my time on the bands I remember the days when the spectrum
> above some freq (3 gHz?)

30 GHz

> was unallocated and open for "experimental
> use". Now look at that space.

Sure.

> A predictable replay of 1927, only the
> location of the decimal points changed.
>
'zactly.
>
> > >
> > > We'll deal with it. As usual.
> > >
> > Yup. The question to think about is "why aren't the bands used more?"
> >
> > You're looking at part of the answer.
>
> I wuz also there when hams got kicked off 11M. The ARRL sponsored an
> 11M contest to promote activity on the band as a shot at "saving it".
> Nobody showed up for the party.

Lotta reasons for that. 11 wasn't worldwide amateur, so the DX was
limited. 10 was right next door, and more active. 11 wasn't
harmonically related to any other band, back in the days when
multiplier rigs and xtal control were common.

Plus there were the weird noises from vacuum formers and diathermies.
>

Speaking of GHz, an IEEE convention was in town the past few days.
Lotta neat stuff, lotta emphasis on microwaves. All that RF plumbing
looks like an ME's delight...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2504. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 22:02:52 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE8F88C.93B4029C@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68633

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org said:

> > but the FACTS are that the Federal Communications
> >> Commission, a panel of politically appointed civilians, makes/enforces the
> >> radio regulations by which we all must adhere.
> >
> > Yes, but that's not the point, is it?
>
> That's EXACTLY the point. Lennie the Lame insists that "we" ae keeping
> the Code tests. The Commission has clearly stated that they would drop it
> today if not for International treaties that require it.

You're both right. Today's FCC doesn't drop the Morse requirement
because international treaties still require it. But when WARC wanted to
drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied long
and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might get
licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.

73 to y'all K3DWW

2505. Re: FCC (was Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 22:12:22 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE8FAC6.B9BF33F8@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68634

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote
> > Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
> > public _opinion_?
>
> Yes. Then they can turn right around, ignore the debates and public
> hearings and do whatever they damned well want to do.

That's a problem with all "commissions". Let's say you just got elected and had to appoint a commission to regulate the coffee industry. You'd naturally appoint people who had supported you and hopefully knew something about coffee. Where would you find them? Well, most likely in mid-management in the coffee industry. Trouble is these appointments are temporary. When you leave office your appointees are going to have to go to their old bosses to find jobs. Need I say that they're likely to feather their nests while commissioners? Wouldn't you?

2506. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 22:17:08 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE8FBE4.C8818101@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68636

John Sielke wrote:
>
> It is getting increasingly frustrating, trying to at least limit SPAM.

There is a very simple answer. Put a 2-cent tax on every email sent.
That wouldn't cost me (or you?) $5/month but it'd make spamming
prohibitively expensive.

What's a QCWA?

73, K3DWW

2507. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-12 22:35:45 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Y47Ga.8505$LG5.6795@fe09.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68655

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bcaodsuoa1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> Because I see no need to require CW knowledge for
> hams anymore. Other's in the newsgroup are quite aware
> of my position on code testing. I care not a bit as to
> USE of CW. Use it all one likes, just let's end the
> test requirement. Once code testing ends as a requirement,
> then folks that want CW to continue as a mode will
> have to champion its use and recruit newcomers to
> learn. I have no problem with that.

Still sounds a little bitter to me. Did you have problems learning Morse code? What is the underlying problem here? Frankly, I personally use the Morse code that I studied for the test a lot more than any new 'technical information' I learned studying for the test (particularly since I am a BSEE). What makes you are so militant? Did the act of studying Morse cord cause an irreparable trauma to your self-confidence? Did it destroy your sense of self-worth because other people learned it faster and better than you? Somewhere deep down, there is a story here. Let's hear it so we can help you to deal with it. But you must take the first step.

73 de KR4AJ

2508. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 00:04:39 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcb4eg$n6m$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68717

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote

> Still sounds a little bitter to me. Did you have problems learning Morse
> code? What is the underlying problem here? Frankly, I personally use the
> Morse code that I studied for the test a lot more than any new 'technical
> information' I learned studying for the test (particularly since I am a
> BSEE). What makes you are so militant? Did the act of studying Morse cord
> cause an irreparable trauma to your self-confidence? Did it destroy your
> sense of self-worth because other people learned it faster and better than
> you? Somewhere deep down, there is a story here. Let's hear it so we can
> help you to deal with it. But you must take the first step.

So far around here, it looks like the score is:

Pro-testers insulting, belittling and otherwise avoiding the issue of
testing: All of 'em.

Pro-testers providing rational supporting argument: Zero

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2509. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 00:24:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612202402.25815.00000663@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68657

In article <20030608152458.27503.00000412@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hg51b44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
><Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
>>On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 19:32:35 -0500, H. Adam Stevens wrote:
>>
>>>Hey folks.
>>>Armstrong gave up and jumped; Look it up.
>>
>> The main reason leading to Armstrong's depression and suicide was
>> his pal, David Sarnoff, stealing his patents.
>
> Sorry, but there is a great deal missing in that claim.

No, there isn't.
>
> In 1920 Armstrong sold rights to two of his patents to Westinghouse
> for $335,000. He traded rights to the superregenerative receiver for
> a big block of (then new) RCA Corporation stock.

Those aren't the patents that Sarnoff stole.

> Leaving the US
> Army with rank of Major and the recipient of the French Legion of
> Honor, Armstrong wasn't exactly a pauper then.
>
Does that mean you think it was OK for Sarnoff to steal from him?

> Armstrong was emeshed in a big patent fight with Lee deForest
> from 1922 to 1934, eventually leading to a Supreme Court case
> (Armstrong lost). Both Westinghouse and RCA Corporation were
> on Armstrong's side. Professional associations didn't go along with
> the federal courts and honored Armstrong for his achievements (he
> was the first recipient of IRE's medal).

Those aren't the stolen patents, either. The deForest mess was about
regeneration.
>
> From 1934 on to 1940 Armstrong was involved in several different
> patent fights with others, even while developing wideband FM
> broadcasting. The FM quality was not yet recognized due to an
> unfortunate early supposition of technical quality from some AT&T
> types thinking that it would not be static free (they hadn't thought
> about the limiter effect enough).

Armstrong turned theory into practice.

> 1940 FCC decision to move FM broadcasting up from the 40 MHz
> region to its present band was a financial burden to Armstrong's
> fledgling BC organization.

And it happened because Davey had more influence.

> Armstrong had funded most of that
> development with his own money.
>
> Various patent suits continued on into the post-WW2 period. Ed's
> wife got tired of all that court battling and left him. That and some
> physical illnesses left Armstrong very depressed. He suicided on
> January 31, 1954.

Sarnoff is repoted to have said that he didn't kill Armstrong...
>
>> Had he waited, he would have been vindicated when Sarnoff/RCA was
>> found liable for same shortly after and was ordered to pay
>> Armstrong's estate a sizeable sum.
>
> In actuality, Armstrong's widow eventually won no less that 21
> patent infrigement suits against as many corporations and won
> about $10 million total restitution.

That's a good thing.
>
> Continuing to portray RCA Corporation and David Sarnoff in a bad
> light is incorrect.

Who said anything bad about RCA? Sarnoff was the thief. He also stole from
Philo T. Farnsworth.

> RCA had backed Armstrong in pre-WW2 suits
> and Armstrong continued to earn dividends from RCA stock.

Does that mean you think it was OK for Sarnoff to steal from him?
>
> If it is any consolation, remember that Sarnoff was a morseman

So was Armstrong, who also designed the 1BCG transmitter used in the 1921
Transatlantic Tests.

> and that RCA Corporation was a creation from part of General
> Electric...the same corporation that bought RCA in the 1980s.
> :-)

2510. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 00:24:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612202404.25815.00000664@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68656

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hg51b44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sat, 7 Jun 2003 19:32:35 -0500, H. Adam Stevens wrote:
>
>>Hey folks.
>>Armstrong gave up and jumped; Look it up.
>
> The main reason leading to Armstrong's depression and suicide was
> his pal, David Sarnoff, stealing his patents.

Yup. The Major was in good company: Sarnoff stole from Philo T. Farnsworth's patents as well. Lil' Davey S. thought patent laws were for others, not him.

The falling out started way back in the early '30s, when Davey said he never listened to the radio anymore because the "static" (meaning both manmade and natural noise) was so bad much of the time. He asked Armstrong if something couldn't be done about it. Armstrong did experiments and basically invented practical FM broadcasting in a lab near the top of the Empire State Building. Transmitters, receivers, preemphasis, the whole works were brought to practical operation by Armstrong.

Trouble was, his new FM required all-new receivers, transmitters, and antennas. What Sarnoff had wanted was some sort of gadget that could be tacked onto existing BC sets to eliminate "static", not a whole new system. He wanted the next big purchase people made to be a TV set, not an FM receiver. So he kicked Armstrong out of the ESB and told him to forget about FM.

The Major responded by setting up the Yankee Network, all over New England. He had found an ideal transmitter location at Alpine, NJ, and had a 420 foot tower erected. Rather than depend on 'phone lines or transcriptions, the broadcasts were relayed across New England by VHF radio.

Sarnoff used his influence with the FCC to get the FM BC band moved, so all existing FM receivers became useless. As a consolation prize to Armstrong, FCC required that TV sound be FM. But Sarnoff would not pay the patent royalties, saying RCA circuits did not encroach on Armstrong's patents. Similar tactics were used against Farnsworth.

Real nice guy, huh? Remember, this is the same guy who grossly exaggerated his role in the Titanic disaster...

> Had he waited, he would have been vindicated when Sarnoff/RCA was
> found liable for same shortly after and was ordered to pay
> Armstrong's estate a sizeable sum.
>
Yup. He also lost out in patent suits to Farnsworth. But it all took years and

millions to win.

They say that Sarnoff had tears in his eyes when he was forced to hand over the check. Poor baby...

Armstrong's tower in Alpine still stands, and is still in use. After the WTC towers were destroyed, the TV stations who used to broadcast from them had to find a new location. Some of them went to the company that runs the Alpine tower, and rented space. NBC (descended from Sarnoff's dynasty) had to go hat-in-hand to the Alpine folks for tower space.

Turns out that the coverage from the Alpine tower is superior to what it was from WTC. Major Armstrong had found the ideal site 70 years ago, and it's still in use.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2511. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 00:51:54 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bcb7aj$hdbav$1@ID-166180.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68658

SECRET, huh? FOUO even? Wow, that's news to me. Typically, Emergency Management Plans (like hurricane evacuation plans) are not classified at all -- and for good reason (they need to be shared with civilian Emergency Management Agencies so that a coordinated effort is possible) For example, ALL local EMAs have a copy of our plan (including the Red Cross) type in FS 500-2 in a Yahoo search and see what pops up ... You and Vshah's lack of knowledge on this specific subject is just astounding.
(Oh, BTW, the ARS WILL be used for liaison to local EMAs -- in the plan) We are currently reworking it to make the ARS piece even more robust. Vshah -- you lose the bet.

Arnie -
KT4ST

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0306121139.6dd8730c@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030612093957.08432.00001534@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....
> > >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> > >Date: 6/11/03 9:05 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <20030611220523.06527.00000379@mb-m17.aol.com>
> >
> > >>To say nothing of the fact that I am now the Emergency Management
Plans
> > >>Officer for the largest Military Installation east of the
Mississippi --
> > >>Gee, do you think I'll incorporate Amateur Radio (and CW capabilities)
into
> > >>our Emergency Management Plan? Oh, my bad -- already wrote it in.
> > >
> > >This seems good for a bet. Who wants to make a bet on where (and when)
> > >Amateur
> > >Radio (and CW) capabilities will be used?
> >
> > Let's just hope that except for drills, those skills are never
called on
> > for the real thing. However it's a good bet they will be, CW or not.
> >
> > >Also, you sure are brave. You just incriminated yourself in this post.
> > >Hopefully, noone will see your post.
> >
> > Vipul, you have NO BUSINESS suggesting anyone "incriminated"
themselves in
> > a USENET post. The idiocy of many of your posts suggest some really GPD

> > thinking.
> >
> > Steve, K4CAP
>
> Operations Plans are typically classified: SECRET or higher. Its
> probably not wise to discuss them on usenet... unless you're a code
> advocate then even FOUO, EEFI, and close hold don't apply.

2512. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! ***

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 01:00:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bcb7mq$ir7@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 68659

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030610212656.09580.00000706@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <bc2f6u$eimek$21@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry,
> >
> >1. Re-read the line where it says "similar wish as to intention." It
does
> >not state that this person wished for IDENTICAL action to the no-coders.
> >Again, similar does not equal exact.
> >
> >2. If the line stated "Seems like I remember Larry Roll
> >offering....." instead of the word "someone" I would be more than
> >happy to offer an apology. How do you know I was or was not referring to
> >you? Guilty conscience??? How do you know I wasn't referring to another
> >person here????
> >
>
> Ryan:
>
> OK, fine. Provide the quote which identifies this "someone."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Still at it, eh? ROFLMAO!!!!

Kim W5TIT

2513. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 01:05:46 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9398D6999BFA6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68660

<SNIP>
>> Armstrong was emeshed in a big patent fight with Lee deForest
>> from 1922 to 1934, eventually leading to a Supreme Court case
>> (Armstrong lost). Both Westinghouse and RCA Corporation were
>> on Armstrong's side. Professional associations didn't go along with
>> the federal courts and honored Armstrong for his achievements (he
>> was the first recipient of IRE's medal).
>
> Those aren't the stolen patents, either. The deForest mess was about
> regeneration.
<SNIP>

It's pretty clear to me (and I am a patent agent and an EE) that DeForrest really was first with regeneration. It's described in his patent for the 'audion' (the triode in modern terminology), and this patent issued four years before Armstrong even claimed to have come up with regeneration. Much is made in 'Empire of the Air' (the book as well as the TV series) of the statement that DeForrest didn't understand regeneration and couldn't explain it in court. This may be true, but it doesn't alter the fact that he came up with it before Armstrong.

The problems between Sarnoff and Armstrong are another matter entirely. I think it is fitting that Armstrong's name is remembered the whole world over. Even people who don't know that he invented FM have heard of the Armstrong method of detection. OTOH, if you mention Sarnoff's name outside the US, the response is likely to be : 'Who? Sorry, never heard of him.' And that's as it should be.

2514. Even More Publicity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 02:23:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030612222329.01315.00000206@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68661

http://www.theconnection.org/shows/2003/06/20030612_b_main.asp

2515. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 02:29:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306121829.6ec647c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68662
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bcaospfk1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
> >
> >
> > Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > >
> > > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.
> > >
> > > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> > >
> > > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> > >
> > > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> > >
> >
> > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> > here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you had
> > the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San Diego
> > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
>
> The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to
> be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
> Part 97.

Disagree. The rule WRT to Techs is no Techs below 30 mHz except for
coded Techs who can operate down to 28.000. Sect. 97.401(d) does not
include an exception to that rule. Ditto Novices by virtue of their
set of restrictions.

>
> Cheers,

> Bill K2UNK

w3rv

2516. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 02:41:26 UTC
From: Herb <H27x@sherbsantz.net>
Message-ID: <bcbdk6cep0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68663

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Nobody knows if it would have passed in 1992. Remember that back then the
> >maritime services were still using Morse code on both HF and MF.
>
> IIRC maritime CW was already on the way out - US vessels over 1600
> gross tons which were making coastwise voyages in the open sea and
> were therefore required by statute to have radiotelegraph stations
> (and operators) were waivered by regulation if they were equipped
> with all the gear that is now the requirement for the GMDSS. IIRC
> the setup was even called the Future GMDSS. I may be off a year or
> so on the date, but new vessels over 1600 gross tons whose keel-laid
> date was after 1992 were required to have the full GMDSS setup, and
> shortly after that, the waiver on the radiotelegraph installation
> was extended to all US vessels over 1600 gross tons making
> international voyages in the open sea if they were equipped with
> GMDSS gear. The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
> mid-1990s.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
The amount of misinformation that is spewed out on a daily
basis in this forum defies the imagination. Just got off the phone
with W.O. Johnson at USCG , and was informed that C.W.
is far from a dead issue with the Coast Guard. In fact, they (USCG)
are still training personnel to copy and send C.W.

Herb

2517. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 02:58:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EE93DD2.5010106@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68664

>
>
>It's pretty clear to me (and I am a patent agent and an EE) that DeForrest
>really was first with regeneration. It's described in his patent for the
>'audion' (the triode in modern terminology), and this patent issued four
>years before Armstrong even claimed to have come up with regeneration.
>Much is made in 'Empire of the Air' (the book as well as the TV series) of
>the statement that DeForrest didn't understand regeneration and couldn't
>explain it in court. This may be true, but it doesn't alter the fact that
>he came up with it before Armstrong.
>
>
As I understand patents, all you need do is come up with a "recipe" for
building something
that is not obvious or done before. You don't have to understand
everything about it,
you just have to describe it in a way that someone experienced in the
art can reproduce
it. So DeForest probably didn't know all the physics of the innards of
vacuum tubes,
but produce working tubes and circuits. Not at the optimum levels one
could achieve
if one did undertand the physics behind it, though. But all you need is
that it works at
all....

2518. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 03:37:10 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9398F043A6878elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68665

"Herb" <H27x@sherbsantz.net> wrote in news:bcbdk6cep0@pita.alt.net:

>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgc23l2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On 11 Jun 2003 21:37:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >Nobody knows if it would have passed in 1992. Remember that back then
>> >the maritime services were still using Morse code on both HF and MF.
>>
>> IIRC maritime CW was already on the way out - US vessels over 1600
>> gross tons which were making coastwise voyages in the open sea and
>> were therefore required by statute to have radiotelegraph stations
>> (and operators) were waivered by regulation if they were equipped
>> with all the gear that is now the requirement for the GMDSS. IIRC
>> the setup was even called the Future GMDSS. I may be off a year or
>> so on the date, but new vessels over 1600 gross tons whose keel-laid
>> date was after 1992 were required to have the full GMDSS setup, and
>> shortly after that, the waiver on the radiotelegraph installation
>> was extended to all US vessels over 1600 gross tons making
>> international voyages in the open sea if they were equipped with
>> GMDSS gear. The USCG stopped keeping watch on 500 kHz in the
>> mid-1990s.
>>
>> --
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>>
> The amount of misinformation that is spewed out on a daily
> basis in this forum defies the imagination. Just got off the phone
> with W.O. Johnson at USCG , and was informed that C.W.
> is far from a dead issue with the Coast Guard. In fact, they (USCG)
> are still training personnel to copy and send C.W.
>
> Herb
>
>
>
>

That may be so, and other posts indicate that CW is still used at sea.
However, the ITU plan was to phase it out by 2000, and the international
code test requirement for ship's radio operators is gone, as is the
requirement for shore stations to listen for distress calls on 500 kHz CW.

2519. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 03:38:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcbgvv$is1$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 68666

Vito wrote:

> when WARC wanted to
> drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied long
> and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might get
> licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.

We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is running a VE team for the first eight years of VE testing and during that time some large majority of examinees came from the ranks of CBers.

What distinguished them was that almost all had decided to become ham radio operators, and study to meet the requirements for their license. Just like we did before there was such a thing as CB.

The sole part of what you say that is factual is that there were indeed some "CBers" who were deemed as undesirables and who were better left out of ham radio. Since most all of those were also opposed to learning Morse code, the result wasn't difficult to understand. They didn't want to become hams if it involved learning Morse code, and knew that studying the question pools for the written tests were no big problem. So yes, there was an attitude against welcoming that segment of CB which was largely known to be lawbreaking Freebanding troublemakers, into ham radio. It should be noted that some of these same troublemaking folks did indeed learn the code and get HF ham radio licenses. Most of them just got no-code tech tickets, and some of them ignored the rules and used those tech tickets to operate on HF, very much against the rules but in that day such violations were poorly enforced, if at all.

Other than that, the rest of your rant is no more than an RRAP urban legand.

2520. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 03:39:09 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9398F0996728Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68667

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:3EE93DD2.5010106@ix.netcom.com:

>>
>>
>>It's pretty clear to me (and I am a patent agent and an EE) that
>>DeForrest really was first with regeneration. It's described in his
>>patent for the 'audion' (the triode in modern terminology), and this
>>patent issued four years before Armstrong even claimed to have come up
>>with regeneration. Much is made in 'Empire of the Air' (the book as
>>well as the TV series) of the statement that DeForrest didn't
>>understand regeneration and couldn't explain it in court. This may be
>>true, but it doesn't alter the fact that he came up with it before
>>Armstrong.
>>
>>
> As I understand patents, all you need do is come up with a "recipe" for
> building something
> that is not obvious or done before. You don't have to understand
> everything about it,
> you just have to describe it in a way that someone experienced in the
> art can reproduce
> it. So DeForest probably didn't know all the physics of the innards of
> vacuum tubes,
> but produce working tubes and circuits. Not at the optimum levels one
> could achieve
> if one did undertand the physics behind it, though. But all you need
> is that it works at
> all....
>

You are correct.

2521. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 03:42:55 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcbh7v$is1$1@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 68668

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3EE8998E.7050402@psu.edu...
> > Tarapia Tapioco wrote:
> >
> > > Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
> > > CW coders.
> > > For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
> > > solution is Internet, not CW.
> >
> > Ahh, yes. Next time a hurricane or quake or flood takes out all the
> > power in your area, just hop on your computer and send an email letting
> > people know about it.
> >
> > Better yet, use your cell phone to let them know. Brilliant, just
> > brilliant.
> >
> > - Mike -
> >
>
> Here is a phrase I like....I believe it applies to that goofball;
>
> 'One thing about it...ya just cain't fix STUPID'

I prefer "Beauty is only skin deep, but stupid goes all the way to the
bone".

2522. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 03:53:48 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcbhsc$is1$2@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 68669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:

>
> > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> > here, I see.
>
> Doesn't it?
>

What he said???

> > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
>
> How else would you do it?

What he said???

>
>
> And be ready to explain why you had
> > the radio station so long before the emergency,
>
> Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
> crime? You should read Orwell.

You should read about the kid in San Diego, a licensed ham who transmitted on the Sheriffs frequency when he thought he had a valid emergency reason.

>
>
> like the kid in San Diego
> > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
>
> Is the San Diego Sheriff using J3E and R3E on 5.1675 MHz? Did the kid
> use J3E and R3E on 5.1675 MHz? If not, then its nothing like it.

Ah. More of what passes for Brain logic. Somehow FCC seems to view it as a different manner.
No surprises there, either,

>
>
> > > If ya' REALLY want me to file a Petition for Declaratory Ruling and
> > > get an "officia;" answer, I gotta charge by the word... <ggg>
> >

> > Check with the guys who want to make sure they can use it codefree. :-)
>
> It is code-free.

Just like Bear Brian -make that Teddy Bear Brain.

> Don't you know what J3E and R3E are?

Don't you know what license qualifications are? Evidently not. No more than you know what permission is.

>
>
> Good grief. Yet another case of a elderly, jealous, and vindictive
> ham PO'd at the next generation and how unworthy they might be to
> share in HIS hobby. If they can't hobble a radio together out of a
> foil chewing gum wrapper and a double edged razor blade then the hell
> with 'em. Now where did I put my microphone?

Oh, it's surely right there with your code key, right.

I see you're still numbnuts, as always.

2523. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 03:53:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcbhse$is1$3@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 68670
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
> >
> >
> > Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > >
> > > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.
> > >
> > > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> > >
> > > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> > >
> > > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> > >
> >
> > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> > here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you had
> > the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San Diego
> > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
>
> The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to
> be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
> Part 97.

I dont' think so, Bill. More like *anyhone* can use 5.1675 without regard to whether or not they're licensed at all. Of course that isn't true of the five new 60 meter channels.

2524. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 03:53:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcbhsg$is1$4@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 68671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
> news:veh250ktise8a5@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message >
> > > > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > > > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
> > >
> > > How else would you do it?
> > >
> > > And be ready to explain why you had
> > > > the radio station so long before the emergency,
> > >
> > > Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
> > > crime? You should read Orwell.
> >
> > There are still a number of people that think it is illegal to own a
> > piece of radio gear.
>
> They can think whatever they want.

Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case mentioned.
In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his "oepned up" 2-meter
walkie talkie to call the San Diego county sheriff's office on their channel
when he had what he considered to be an appropriate emergency.
Not only did the FCC office in San Diego confiscate his radio, they made
statements to the effect that the mere possession of a radio capable of doing
that was not legal.
Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.

2525. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 06:21:55 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcbqim$vo3$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68716

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcbgvv$is1$0@208.206.142.95...
>
>
> Vito wrote:
>
> > when WARC wanted to
> > drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied long
> > and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might get
> > licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.
>
> We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is
running a VE
> team for the first eight years of VE testing and during that time some
large
> majority of examinees came from the ranks of CBers.
>
> What distinguished them was that almost all had decided to become ham
radio
> operators, and study to meet the requirements for their license. Just like
we did
> before there was such a thing as CB.
>
> The sole part of what you say that is factual

Well, you're rebuttal isn't even logical. How does the fact that
some people learned code prove that the idea that there was a
pro-code-testing 'movement' is urban legend? Boiled down to its logical
components, your statement is:

"Some number of CB'ers learned Morse Code,"

Therefore,

"There is no pro-code-testing group of hams."

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2526. help for terms and conditions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 06:52:32 UTC
From: brijesh@divinetaccess.com
Message-ID: <7bccde45.0306122252.5a4aedf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68672

i am looking out for samples of legal terms and conditions, usage
liabilities and warranty, caution descriptions etc for lease and sale
of electronic communication devices in broad band section
please help me as it is an urgent requirement
regards
brijesh

2527. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 10:41:24 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <vejaqoc2l0h573@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case
mentioned.
> In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his "oepned up" 2-meter
> walkie talkie to call the San Diego county sheriff's office on their
channel
> when he had what he considered to be an appropriate emergency.
> Not only did the FCC office in San Diego confiscate his radio, they made
> statements to the effect that the mere possession of a radio capable of
doing
> that was not legal.
> Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.

Far as I recall, IF it is the incident you're referring to, it was just a
motorist assistance. There was no immediate danger to property or
life involved, just a car off the road.

If the story I heard at the time was accurate, the kid deserved to have
his radio taken, and probably his license.

Mike

2528. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 12:38:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130438.7bdeff7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bcae8v$p9u$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
> news:veh250ktise8a5@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message >
> > > > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > > > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
> > >
> > > How else would you do it?
> > >
> > > And be ready to explain why you had
> > > > the radio station so long before the emergency,
> > >
> > > Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
> > > crime? You should read Orwell.
> >
> > There are still a number of people that think it is illegal to own a piece
> > of
> > radio gear.
> >
> > As far as I know, there are only two exceptions (one being cell stuff).
> >
> > There is NO requirement for permits, licenses, visas, whatever, to
> > POSSESS equipment for receiving or transmitting in the US.
> >
> > I see the BS about you 'MUST' have a HAM license to purchase. But
> > that is a seller policy. It is NOT law.
> >
> > Oh, the other exception? Technically... If you have a CB set with
> > 'expanded' capabilities, possession is considered proof of use.
> > UNLESS you have a HAM ticket AND the equipment is only hooked
> > up as HAM equipment. Like using a modified CB set as the core of
> > a 2M transverter to get on 2M SSB. But then, once you do that,
> > the CB set isn't really a CB set anymore, is it? It's just 'parts' that
> are
> > now 'rebuilt' into a 2M SSB setup. (Which is how I have an old
> > TRC-457 hooked up to a homebuilt Hamtronics transverter setup.)
> > Although technically just having it could still get you in trouble I
> > suppose...
> >
> > Mike
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> OH NO !!! Tell me it ain't so !!! Does that mean my modified ya'all come
> back CB jobber that does 12 watts output PEP on TEN METERS is illegal ????
> I gotta destroy the evidence quick.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, that would depend on what you use it for. If you use it to tawk
to Bruce on CB or "freeband," then its illegal.

2529. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 12:41:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130441.391f5675@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bcae8u$p9u$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0306120455.e4e795@posting.google.com...
>
> > Good grief. Yet another case of a elderly, jealous, and vindictive
> > ham PO'd at the next generation and how unworthy they might be to
> > share in HIS hobby. If they can't hobble a radio together out of a
> > foil chewing gum wrapper and a double edged razor blade then the hell
> > with 'em. Now where did I put my microphone?
>
> Don't sweat it Brian....I tried that razor blade deal.....just couldn't make
> it work on SSBsc.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Works much better at removing whiskers.

2530. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 12:58:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130458.37f5b070@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcbhsc$is1$2@208.206.142.95>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> > > here, I see.
> >
> > Doesn't it?
> >
>
> What he said???

Exactly.

> > > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
> >
> > How else would you do it?
>
> What he said???

Exactly.

> > And be ready to explain why you had
> > > the radio station so long before the emergency,
> >
> > Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now a
> > crime? You should read Orwell.
>
> You should read about the kid in San Diego, a licensed ham who transmitted on the
Sheriffs
> frequency when he thought he had a valid emergency reason.

I did.

> > like the kid in San Diego
> > > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
> >
> > Is the San Diego Sheriff using J3E and R3E on 5.1675 MHz? Did the kid
> > use J3E and R3E on 5.1675 MHz? If not, then its nothing like it.
>
> Ah. More of what passes for Brain logic. Somehow FCC seems to view it as a different
manner.
> No surprises there, either,

DICK, the FCC views the J3E and R3E Alaska frequency on 5.1675 MHz
differently than the San Diego Sheriff's frequency on VHF. Really.
That's why its codified in Part 97, which you might want to read
sometime.

For you to imply that there is any connection between licensed
amateurs in Alaska using 5.1675 for an emergency in Alaska, and the
use of the San Diego Sheriff's VHF frequency only shows that you're
not a very bright fellow.

> > > > If ya' REALLY want me to file a Petition for Declaratory Ruling and
> > > > get an "officia;" answer, I gotta charge by the word... <ggg>
> > >
> > > Check with the guys who want to make sure they can use it codefree. :-)
> >
> > It is code-free.
>
> Just like Bear Brian -make that Teddy Bear Brain.

DICK, when the FCC states J3E and R3E, they don't mean A1A. Really.

> > Don't you know what J3E and R3E are?
>
> Don't you know what license qualifications are? Evidently not. No more than you know what
> permission is.

DICK, Alaska hams have permission to use J3E and R3E on 5.1675 MHz for
emergency purposes. At least the FCC thinks so. Really.

> > Good grief. Yet another case of a elderly, jealous, and vindictive
> > ham PO'd at the next generation and how unworthy they might be to
> > share in HIS hobby. If they can't hobble a radio together out of a
> > foil chewing gum wrapper and a double edged razor blade then the hell
> > with 'em. Now where did I put my microphone?
>
> Oh, it's surely right there with your code key, right.
>
> I see you're still numbnuts, as always.

You're still a stupid DICK.

2531. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 13:08:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130508.389bd296@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68680

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030612160838.07705.00000697@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/12/03 2:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306121132.1cef0d08@posting.google.com>
>
> >> What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US policy or
> >> regulations.
> >
> >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
>
> In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has nothing to
> do with US policy or regulations.
>
> >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> >
> >See: Japan.
>
> In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has nothing to
> do with US policy or regulations.

Such a paradox. You say it does then you say it doesn't.

> Japan is a soverign nation.

Except for the international treaties it has signed.

> It will do as it sees fit for it's own purposes.

Are you absolutely certain of this? Is this unique to Japan, or can
any other soverign nation violate international treaty for domestic
purposes?

> Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
> regulation.

It merely affects the non-adherence to ITU S25 for domestic use, and
sets a precedence for any other treaty nation.

Japan does not have a representitve on the FCC, nor does a member
> of the FCC have a say in Japan's Post's Ministry.
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

Wonder whatever happened to all those US callsigns issued for Japan.

2532. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 13:26:12 UTC
From: Erasmo Hernandez <HTV@buenoispsvcs.org>
Message-ID: <bccjd8imi0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68681
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>
> Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case
mentioned.
> In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his "oepned up" 2-meter
> walkie talkie to call the San Diego county sheriff's office on their
channel
> when he had what he considered to be an appropriate emergency.
> Not only did the FCC office in San Diego confiscate his radio, they made
> statements to the effect that the mere possession of a radio capable of
doing
> that was not legal.
> Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.
>
>
>

FCC San Diego has a big problem with competence.
It is staffed by unprofessional moronic boobs, who don't know a
volt from a ohm, let alone how to interpret communications law.
There is also a major issue involving prejudice at this office
against the local Hispanic community.

Erasmo Hernandez
Hispanic Community TV/Radio Assn.

2533. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 13:30:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130530.1060e285@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68682

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306121323.3d1096d9@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306120505.47822bb7@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030610222437.04207.00000669@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> > > In article <20030610175107.23307.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > > (Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > > > Actually, the code TEST requirement applies to administrative
> > > > license granting, does not apply to any specific bands other
> > > > than "operating privileges below 30 MHz.".
> > >
> > > That's true.
> > > >
> > > > The FCC could have allocated use of the five 60m frequencies
> > > > to all US amateur classes without upsetting anything in S25 as
> > > > it is written now.
> > >
> > > No, that's not true.
> >
> > It is true.
>
> No, it's not true.

It is true.

> > See: Japan.
>
> Has Japan allowed its hams on 5 MHz?

Ask them.

> > > The treaty, as FCC interprets it, requires a code test for any license that
> > > allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on any allocated
> > > frequency below 30 MHz. Since 5 MHz is below 30 MHz, the tests for a license
> > > that allows the licensee to operate an amateur radio station on those 5
> > > channels must include a code test.
> > >
> > > That is, until the treaty changes, or the FCC decides to violate the
> > > treaty.
> >
> > For domestic use, as the ARRL requested, S25 need not apply.
>
> Where in the treaty does it say that?

See: Japan. In the absense ITU treaty violation with respect to S25,
use of HF by non-code tested amateurs for domestic use is an
acceptable practice.

> How can anyone guarantee that the 5 MHz signals will not leave the
> USA?

See: Japan. How do they contain their signals to Japan?

> > See: Japan.
>
> Has Japan allowed its hams on 5 MHz?

Ask them.

> The requirement has to do with the license, not domestic use. It also
> specifically requires a General or higher license for hams to use 60
> meters.

It didn't have to be that way. It could have been anything we wanted
it to be.

> Japanese amateurs are not limited to domestic use only.

Then why would the PCTA blast me for working JA's?

Oh, I forgot about the double-standard.

> Here's how the Japanese sytem works (reposted many times).

Reposted many times? Then how did the PCTA that blasted me for
working JA's miss this?

Oh, I forgot about the double-standard. Sorry, I've been away for a
while.

> This is Japan's argument, not mine:
>
> Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test.
> These are
> "4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify
> not
> having a code test for them:
>
> 1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and
> to
> promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.
>
> 2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful
> interference need
> to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all
> countries,
> and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.
>
> 3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that

> are
> worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is
> prevented.
>
> 4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on
> HF (10
> watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful
> interference
> to amateurs of other countries is avoided.
>
> Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its
> measures re
> 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not agree
> with Japan's
> reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan
> on it in
> at least the past 35 years.

Hmmm. No challenges? Not even one?

Then it must be accepted as a valid variance to the treaty.

And if no one has challenged it in over 35 years, is S25 even a valid requirement?

> Note that the other three classes of Japanese amateur radio license DO
> require
> a code test.

Note that the US has licenses that require a code test, but no license that allows non-code tested amateurs on HF at any power level, even though we could.

> Note also that Japanese 4th classers only have privs on freqs that are
> worldwide exclusive amateur. (See 3), above). That leaves out 60
> meters.

Then Japan must not be allowing their 4th classers any privs on 5 MHz.

> If/when the code test is eliminated, a General class or higher license
> will
> still be required to access 60 meters unless the rules change.

Typical of the FCC to box themselves in to all kinds of administrative changes to Part 97 when S25 goes away.

> Would you be satisfied with a US equivalent of the Japanese 4th class
> license? QRP power and no access to shared allocations?

I think such a license would be useful to any number of people.

Don't you?

2534. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 13:32:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130532.491e70f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68683

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306101657.1682d3fa@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306100428.f228e54@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030609202326.03929.00000116@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <vea07l10qci17d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
> > > writes:
>
> > > >But my question to Phil Kane was, since it not an ITU amateur alllocation,
> > > >could the FCC allow Techs to operate.
> > >
> > > Not unless FCC is willing to violate the ITU treaty. Which they are not.
> >
> > The ARRL requested the 60M band allocation for domestic use only.
> >
> > For domestic use only, the code requirement does not apply. See: Japan.
> >
> > Brian
>
> Part 97 clearly states that domestic nocodes cannot operate below the
> bottom edge of 6M. Period. Have you seen any exceptions to this rule
> published?
>
> Kindly notes that what Japanese hams can do in Japan means squat to
> the FCC.
>
> w3rv

It means they could have, but didn't. But they will, eventually.

2535. Re: Even More Publicity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 13:34:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130534.70d9abd0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68684

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030612222329.01315.00000206@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> http://www.theconnection.org/shows/2003/06/20030612_b_main.asp

Photo caption reads: "An early homemade radio transmitter and MICROPHONE"

Do you think the microphone is the same period as the transmitter?

2536. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 13:41:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306130541.4a40bc28@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68685

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bcb7aj$hdbav$1@ID-166180.news.dfncis.de>...
> SECRET, huh? FOUO even? Wow, that's news to me. Typically, Emergency
> Management Plans (like hurricane evacuation plans) are not classified at
> all -- and for good reason (they need to be shared with civilian Emergency
> Management Agencies so that a coordinated effort is possible) For example,
> ALL local EMAs have a copy of our plan (including the Red Cross) type in FS
> 500-2 in a Yahoo search and see what pops up ... You and Vshah's lack of
> knowledge on this specific subject is just astounding.
> (Oh, BTW, the ARS WILL be used for liaison to local EMAs -- in the plan) We
> are currently reworking it to make the ARS piece even more robust. Vshah --
> you lose the bet.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

Arnie, do you confine your emergency operations to domestic natural emergencies only? What do you do when attacked? What is the disposition of your aircraft and rolling stock? Where do you reconstitute? Do you even know which oplans you're tasked under?

You're apparently in the feel good, good neighbor mode. Good luck to you.

2537. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 14:02:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcclq0$q1f$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68686

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0306130508.389bd296@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030612160838.07705.00000697@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 6/12/03 2:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306121132.1cef0d08@posting.google.com>
> >
> > >> What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US
policy or
> > >> regulations.
> > >
> > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> >
> > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
nothing to
> > do with US policy or regulations.
> >
> > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> > >
> > >See: Japan.
> >
> > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
nothing to
> > do with US policy or regulations.
>
> Such a paradox. You say it does then you say it doesn't.
>
> > Japan is a soverign nation.
>
> Except for the international treaties it has signed.

Signing a treaty doesn't change the fact that Japan is a
soverign nation.

> > It will do as it sees fit for it's own purposes.
>
> Are you absolutely certain of this? Is this unique to Japan, or can
> any other soverign nation violate international treaty for domestic
> purposes?

The fact that Japan has had a code-free domestic
license is well known. The rest of the countries that are part of the
ITU treaty apparently don't see Japan's position as being

in violation of the treaty... or, even if some do, they have long
since defaulted to approval by simply doing nothing.

> > Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
> > regulation.
>
> It merely affects the non-adherence to ITU S25 for domestic use, and
> sets a precedence for any other treaty nation.

True, yet there hasn't been any wholesale non-adhearance.
Again, perhaps other countires administrations see no harm
nor violation in Japan's position.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2538. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 14:16:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306130616.bfb1b94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68687

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306121328.3287ee3d@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306120540.90349bc@posting.google.com>...

> >
> > I wuz also there when hams got kicked off 11M. The ARRL sponsored an
> > 11M contest to promote activity on the band as a shot at "saving it".
> > Nobody showed up for the party.
>
> Lotta reasons for that. 11 wasn't worldwide amateur, so the DX was
> limited. 10 was right next door, and more active. 11 wasn't
> harmonically related to any other band, back in the days when
> multiplier rigs and xtal control were common.

The old multiplier rig days were pretty much history by then. My 75A4
and Johnson Valiant could operate as-built on 11M for instance. My
point is that hams lost the band but despite the uproar in the ham
magazines and in Newington very few hams actually gave a hoot about
11M. I expect that will be the case again when the FCC shifts chunks
of our seldom-used high bands to the commercials. The NPRM will show
up, the usual compulsive electropolitically correct huge PR and
flag-waving flap will immediately follow, then the FCC will do the
preordained anyway. And once again it'll be a snoozer in the general
ham population.

> Plus there were the weird noises from vacuum formers and diathermies.

For certain. But in that timeframe the FCC also put the clamps on that
type of equipment WRT to allowable EMI/RFI. That was the real flap in
that part of the spectrum because it affected big bucks corporate
fixed investments in capital equipment which suddenly became illegal
to use. The ham side of the overall 11M uproar wasn't even on the
chart in comparison. And the FCC enforced it. They basically cleaned
up 11M for the CBers.

> >
> Speaking of GHz, an IEEE convention was in town the past few days.
> Lotta neat stuff, lotta emphasis on microwaves. All that RF plumbing
> looks like an ME's delight...

It is, been there, done it in volume. It's mostly a manufacturing
engineering challenge. The field is overpoulated with goofy EEs who
don't know which end of a wrench ya grab and come off the wall with
the weirdest . . "What's the problem Kelly?" All ya gotta do is drill
a bunch of square holes." "Yeah, with a square hole drill right?"

Ah, never mind . . !

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2539. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 14:16:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bccmighkq1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68688

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:Y47Ga.8505$LG5.6795@fe09.atl2.webusenet.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bcaodsuoa1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Because I see no need to require CW knowledge for
> > hams anymore. Other's in the newsgroup are quite aware
> > of my position on code testing. I care not a bit as to
> > USE of CW. Use it all one likes, just let's end the
> > test requirement. Once code testing ends as a requirement,
> > then folks that want CW to continue as a mode will
> > have to champion its use and recruit newcomers to
> > learn. I have no problem with that.
>
> Still sounds a little bitter to me.

Not bitter at all... simply to the point?

> Did you have problems learning Morse code?

Not at all. I was an Advanced (13wpm) when the FCC rules changed.
I did not pursue 20wpm before that because the cost in hours of practice
versus
the benefits of additional spectrum didn't merit my investing the time to
go to 20wpm.

> What is the underlying problem here?

There is no rational to sustain a mandated code test anymore
for any ham license. Those that want to promote code use
should be free to do so, but not via a mandated code
requirement.

> Frankly, I personally use the
> Morse code that I studied for the test a lot more than any new 'technical
> information' I learned studying for the test (particularly since I am a
> BSEE).

I have no desire to end your use of morse code. The issue is
the test requirement only.

> What makes you are so militant? Did the act of studying Morse cord
> cause an irreparable trauma to your self-confidence? Did it destroy your
> sense of self-worth because other people learned it faster and better than
> you? Somewhere deep down, there is a story here. Let's hear it so we can
> help you to deal with it. But you must take the first step.

Use the code, learn the code, whatever makes you happy.
The fact remains that learning and using code is no longer
a justifiable licensing requirement. For those that learn and
use code I have nothing but respect...much as I repect
people with many other skills I have no desire to learn (golf, tennis,
etc.) Where things change is in my attitude towards folks who
want to demand that everyone else must subscribe to a
requirement just because they do or did.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2540. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 14:21:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bccn7d$mb9$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68690
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcbhsg$is1$4@208.206.142.95...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
> > news:veh250ktise8a5@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message >
> > > > > So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > > > > the frequency ---- and an emergency!
> > > > >
> > > > How else would you do it?
> > > > >
> > > > And be ready to explain why you had
> > > > > the radio station so long before the emergency,
> > > > >
> > > > Premeditated emergency preparedness. What was once a virtue is now
a
> > > > crime? You should read Orwell.
> > >
> > > There are still a number of people that think it is illegal to own a
> > > piece of radio gear.
> >
> > They can think whatever they want.
>
> Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case
mentioned.
> In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his "opened up" 2-meter
> walkie talkie to call the San Diego county sheriff's office on their
channel
> when he had what he considered to be an appropriate emergency.
> Not only did the FCC office in San Diego confiscate his radio, they made
> statements to the effect that the mere possession of a radio capable of
doing
> that was not legal.
> Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.

I believe the police confiscated the radio...not the FCC.
If the FCC made the statements you claim, why then would
the radio be confiscated and never returned?
```

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2541. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 14:26:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bccn7f$mb9$2@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306121829.6ec647c8@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bcaospfk1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
> > >
> > >
> > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > >
> > > > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > > > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > > > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in
Canada.
> > > >
> > > > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> > > >
> > > > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > > > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > > > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > > > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > > > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> > > >
> > > > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > > > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > > > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency"
applies
> > > here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of
transmitting on
> > > the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you
had
> > > the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San
Diego
> > > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
> > >
> > The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to
> > be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
> > Part 97.

>
> Disagree. The rule WRT to Techs is no Techs below 30 mHz except for
> coded Techs who can operate down to 28.000. Sect. 97.401(d) does not
> include an exception to that rule. Ditto Novices by virtue of their
> set of restrictions.

Yet we all seem to agree if it is a true emergency, which is the purpose
of the rule, then anyone can use it. Anyone should include
novices and techs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2542. Ham Educational Source - Semiconductor Physics Course

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 14:27:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306130627.7dd67000@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68689

For those who need to get up to speed on what actually makes our radios tick.

http://britneyspears.ac/lasers.htm

w3rv

2543. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 15:01:48 UTC
From: Leo J <ljustins1011@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ee9e751$1@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 68692
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thank you for bringing this recent news of
the decision by QCWA to our attention.

I would qualify for QCWA membership in Nov
of this Year, but after reading this, as far as I am
concerned QCWA can "go someplace" along with the
grey horse they rode in upon....

Leo
National Corp Radio Collector
Mill Surplus Radios Collectors
http://www.syzen.com/milradio/RelatedSites.html
http://www.rarchams.org/links.htm

"John Sielke" <w2agnNOSPAM@w2agn.net> wrote in message
news:5g5hevgubuesbpjqgvbtvrlvt37jumremp@4ax.com...
> It is getting increasingly frustrating, trying to at least limit SPAM.
> For example, for those of you members of QCWA, in the Summer newsletter,
> it shows the QCWA BoD voted in October to SELL the member's database to a
> bulk email outfit! I contacted the GM and President, as I have been a
> Life Member for 20+ years. Sure enough, it was true, but they cancelled
> the plan...not because of concern for member's privacy, but because it
> turned out "they didn't need the money." Needless to say I told them to
> expunge my records and cancel my membership. Probably useless, but it's
> bad enough having spammers gathering our data with robots, but having a
> trusted organization SELLING it was too much.
>

2544. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 15:16:14 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <vejqvnbdn6ioad@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> OH NO !!! Tell me it ain't so !!! Does that mean my modified ya'all come
> back CB jobber that does 12 watts output PEP on TEN METERS is illegal ????
> I gotta destroy the evidence quick.
>

Actually, common sense prevails.

Once you modify the equipment, it no longer has it's 'type acceptance'
or whatever it's called these days and is no longer legal for CB use.
Even ON valid CB frequencies at valid CB parameters. It is just a
pie of parts that you now can use as HAM equipment, if you so choose.

There is nothing wrong using it on 10M as long as the use of it adheres
to valid amateur restrictions.

Mike

2545. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 15:39:12 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE9F020.F6DBAD7@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68676

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Vito wrote:
>
> > when WARC wanted to
> > drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied long
> > and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might get
> > licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.
>
> We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is running a
> VE team ...

Yes Dick, "we" did. You have no memory of it for the same reason I have
no memory of WW I, but that doesn't mean it never happened.
>
> The sole part of what you say that is factual ...

Everything I said is factual. The world didn't begin with your
unfortunate birth. Get back to me when you grow up enough to be civil.

K3DWW

2546. Re: FCC (was Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 15:45:57 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE9F1B5.F5960E04@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68677

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Vito wrote:
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> >>"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote
> >>
> >>> Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
> >>>public _opinion_?
> >>
> >>Yes. Then they can turn right around, ignore the debates and public
> >>hearings and do whatever they damned well want to do.
> >
> >
> > That's a problem with all "commissions".
>
> <snip>
>
> Actually, that is the rationale used by the people who do not "win" the
> issue. Whe I was running an association,....

Actually, my statements have nothing to do with winning or loosing nor
does running an association unless you had to seek employment from
people you possibly disappointed. Apples vs oranges.
K3DWW

2547. Re: Even More Publicity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 15:47:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE9F211.8080405@psu.edu>
Source record: 68694

Really nice program, Jim. One part I found was a little amusing was the fellow who was talking about the ARS being degraded, and when the asked him further about it, ne confesed he didn't have a license. Great show overall.

N2EY wrote:

2548. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 15:49:50 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EE9F29E.9ABC8EC2@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68678

AMHAM73 wrote:
>
> Hey I like that tax, except they (whoever they are) wud tax our e-mails
> too -- don't ya know !

Sure, but a 2 cent/email tax wouldn't run my bill up $2/mo. OTOH (heh,
heh, heh) it would bankrupt the spammers who send millions of emails a
day.
>
> QCWA is Quarter Century Wireless Association, Inc.
> URL: http://www.qcwa.org/

Thanks much,
K3DWW

2549. Re: FCC (was Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 15:53:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EE9F38B.2090908@psu.edu>
Source record: 68695

Vito wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Vito wrote:
>>
>>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
>>>>>public _opinion_?
>>>>
>>>>Yes. Then they can turn right around, ignore the debates and public
>>>>hearings and do whatever they damned well want to do.
>>>
>>>
>>>That's a problem with all "commissions".
>>
>> <snip>
>>
>> Actually, that is the rationale used by the people who do not "win" the
>>issue. Whe I was running an association,....
>
>
> Actually, my statements have nothing to do with winning or loosing nor
> does running an association unless you had to seek employment from
> people you possibly disappointed. Apples vs oranges.
> K3DWW

Seems to me that it is relevant. I hear it all the time. Joe B. wants a rule changed or a new rule not added because it's so wrong or whatever (not to mention it gives ol'Joe some kind of advantage) When it isn't changed, ol' Joe whines about how the dirty so and so's just won't listen.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2550. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 16:36:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bccui9$5po$0@208.207.71.159>
Source record: 68696
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mike Yetsko wrote:

> > Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case
> mentioned.
> > In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his "oepned up" 2-meter
> > walkie talkie to call the San Diego county sheriff's office on their
> channel
> > when he had what he considered to be an appropriate emergency.
> > Not only did the FCC office in San Diego confiscate his radio, they made
> > statements to the effect that the mere possession of a radio capable of
> doing
> > that was not legal.
> > Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.
>
> Far as I recall, IF it is the incident you're referring to, it was just a
> motorist assistance. There was no immediate danger to property or
> life involved, just a car off the road.
>
> If the story I heard at the time was accurate, the kid deserved to have
> his radio taken, and probably his license.

Wrong story. This case was when a hiker fell in the mountains with a
disabling injury, and the ham called on the sheriffs channel after trying a few
ham repeaters and getting no answer. The injury evidently turned out to be not
so serious, and the sheriff was PO'ed because the ham used his frequency. The
story received a lot of publicity at the time. Popular Communications also had
a story on it.
Of course it's difficult to separate the facts from the spin, but the FCC
SanDiego district Director was quoted as stating that the ham had no authority
to possess the radio capable of transmitting on the sheriff's channel.

2551. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 16:40:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bccuq7$69u$0@208.207.71.159>
Source record: 68697

Vito wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > Vito wrote:
> >
> > > when WARC wanted to
> > > drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied long
> > > and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might get
> > > licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.
> >
> > We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is running a
> > VE team ...
>
> Yes Dick, "we" did. You have no memory of it for the same reason I have
> no memory of WW I, but that doesn't mean it never happened.
> >
> > The sole part of what you say that is factual ...
>
> Everything I said is factual. The world didn't begin with your
> unfortunate birth. Get back to me when you grow up enough to be civil.

Geez, Vito, it sure is disappointing that you consider THAT uncivil just because it clashes with your faulty "memory". I do believe I've lived through more of this history than you.

The really sad part of all this is the numbers of you folks who wound up so "damaged" by the simple requirement of a code test. Sure looks like more of an attitude problem than anything else.

2552. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 16:44:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306130844.1e7815cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68698

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030612152031.07705.00000687@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/12/03 12:01 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <c2356669.0306120901.6edef8bc@posting.google.com>
>
> >Here's a tip, Len: Try being positive in your postings here, instead
> >of negative. You project an extremely negative persona and energy. The
> >headshrinkers have a term for it: 'toxic personality'.
>
> I liked the term Dave Heil had for it, myself.

With all due respect, I think my term is more accurate. Here's why:
The equine anatomy described by Dave serves a beneficial function. The
product of said anatomy may be unpleasant but it is not usually toxic
in the medical sense (I'll defer to your toxicology background on
that). And said product has beneficial uses.

Can you say the same thing about....
>
> >You never talk about how much FUN amateur radio is, how great a lot of
> >hams are as people, how many accomplishments hams have made...
>
> How can he, Jim? No Experience.
>
> >oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
> >way....
>
> THERE ya go!

'zactly.

--

Ever notice how there are some people who are just plain nice to have
around? They may not be the smartest, or the richest, or the most
attractive, or the most accomplished, but when you spend some time
with them you feel better than you did before, for all sorts of
reasons.

Among them are people from whom you can always learn something useful,
people who are always there to help out, people with whom you can
communicate freely and honestly, people who have an innate common
sense, people with a good sense of humor, and a whole list of other
traits and combinations of traits. People who are slow to criticize

and quick to praise, slow to anger and quick to smile, etc. People who see the glass as half full rather than half empty, and then they go and get a smaller glass. People who ask little and give much. People whose example inspires and uplifts you to be a better person.

You know people like that, don't you, Steve? They may not have all of the above, and they may not be perfect, but the overall effect they have on those around them is generally pleasant, uplifting and positive.

Then you have folks who are exactly the opposite. You know people like that, too, I suppose.

Why not spend more time on the first group and less time on the second?

73 de Jim, N2EY

"Don't waste the thousand marbles"

WWHD

2553. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 16:47:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bccv77$6v2$0@208.207.71.159>
Source record: 68699

Brian wrote:

> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message n

>
> > > For domestic use, as the ARRL requested, S25 need not apply.
> >
> > Where in the treaty does it say that?
>

>
> See: Japan. In the absense ITU treaty violation with respect to S25,
> use of HF by non-code tested amateurs for domestic use is an
> acceptable practice.
>

And now we see how you came to believe that you actually had permission.

The old "If it works there it has to automatically work here, too" routine.

Whatta dweeb!

> > How can anyone guarantee that the 5 MHz signals will not leave the
> > USA?
>
> See: Japan. How do they contain their signals to Japan?
>
> > > See: Japan.
> >
> > Has Japan allowed its hams on 5 MHz?
>
> Ask them.
>
> > The requirement has to do with the license, not domestic use. It also
> > specifically requires a General or higher license for hams to use 60
> > meters.
>
> It didn't have to be that way. It could have been anything we wanted
> it to be.
>
> > Japanese amateurs are not limited to domestic use only.
>
> Then why would the PCTA blast me for working JA's?
>
> Oh, I forgot about the double-standard.
>

> > Here's how the Japanese sytem works (reposted many times).
>
> Reposted many times? Then how did the PCTA that blasted me for
> working JA's miss this?
>
> Oh, I forgot about the double-standard. Sorry, I've been away for a
> while.
>
> > This is Japan's argument, not mine:
> >
> > Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test.
> > These are
> > "4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify
> > not
> > having a code test for them:
> >
> > 1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and
> > to
> > promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.
> >
> > 2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful
> > interference need
> > to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all
> > countries,
> > and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.
> >
> > 3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that
> > are
> > worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is
> > prevented.
> >
> > 4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on
> > HF (10
> > watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful
> > interference
> > to amateurs of other countries is avoided.
> >
> > Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its
> > measures re
> > 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not agree
> > with Japan's
> > reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan
> > on it in
> > at least the past 35 years.
>
> Hmmm. No challenges? Not even one?
>
> Then it must be accepted as a valid variance to the treaty.
>
> And if no one has challenged it in over 35 years, is S25 even a valid

> requirement?
>
> > Note that the other three classes of Japanese amateur radio license DO
> > require
> > a code test.
>
> Note that the US has licenses that require a code test, but no license
> that allows non-code tested amateurs on HF at any power level, even
> though we could.
>
> > Note also that Japanese 4th classers only have privs on freqs that are
> > worldwide exclusive amateur. (See 3), above). That leaves out 60
> > meters.
>
> Then Japan must not be allowing their 4th classers any privs on 5 MHz.
>
> > If/when the code test is eliminated, a General class or higher license
> > will
> > still be required to access 60 meters unless the rules change.
>
> Typical of the FCC to box themselves in to all kinds of administrative
> changes to Part 97 when S25 goes away.
>
> > Would you be satisfied with a US equivalent of the Japanese 4th class
> > license? QRP power and no access to shared allocations?
>
> I think such a license would be useful to any number of people.
>
> Don't you?

2554. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 16:58:01 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bccvqp$7so$0@208.207.71.159>
Source record: 68700

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0306130508.389bd296@posting.google.com...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<20030612160838.07705.00000697@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 6/12/03 2:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306121132.1cef0d08@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > > >> What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US
> policy or
> > > >> regulations.
> > > >
> > > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> > >
> > > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
> nothing to
> > > do with US policy or regulations.
> > >
> > > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> > > >
> > > >See: Japan.
> > >
> > > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
> nothing to
> > > do with US policy or regulations.
> >
> > Such a paradox. You say it does then you say it doesn't.
> >
> > > Japan is a soverign nation.
> >
> > Except for the international treaties it has signed.
>
> Signing a treaty doesn't change the fact that Japan is a
> soverign nation.
>
> > > It will do as it sees fit for it's own purposes.
> >
> > Are you absolutely certain of this? Is this unique to Japan, or can
> > any other soverign nation violate international treaty for domestic
> > purposes?
>

> The fact that Japan has had a code-free domestic
> license is well known. The rest of the countries that are part of the
> ITU treaty apparently don't see Japan's position as being
> in violation of the treaty... or, even if some do, they have long
> since defaulted to approval by simply doing nothing.
>
> > > Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
> > > regulation.
> >
> > It merely affects the non-adherence to ITU S25 for domestic use, and
> > sets a precedence for any other treaty nation.
>
> True, yet there hasn't been any wholesale non-adhearance.
> Again, perhaps other countires administrations see no harm
> nor violation in Japan's position.

You codehaters are really something else!

Japan chose, for reasons and with justifications detailed by N2EY, to institute a domestic HF codeless license. No other countries have protested on the same basis-there are no negative effects noted on them. No other country has to "consider" Japan's decision in any way. No other country is invoved. If Japan wants to do that, no one else is involved.

So our FCC does not decide to do the same. One could glean from all these plaintive posts that FCC is somehow thus considered derelict.
. What nonsense! The dereliction is on the part of those who refuse to meet the existing qualifications because they happen to "feel" they aren't "proper". It's disgusting!

2555. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 17:05:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcd097$8jb$0@208.207.71.159>
Source record: 68801

Bill Sohl wrote:

>Where things change is in my attitude towards folks who

> want to demand that everyone else must subscribe to a
> requirement just because they do or did.

The old codehater's mantra just won't go away. Never mind the lost communcations capacity, just hang with the phony "Just because we had to" That is the most lame of a variety of lame excuses.

EVERY ham should have to learn basic Morse code. Sure, FCC doesn't care, it's just more work for them. Anything involved in licensing is more work for them.

2556. Re: Even More Publicity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 17:48:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EEA0E70.5040809@psu.edu>
Source record: 68802

Sheesh, It looks like my typing skills could use a little work!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Really nice program, Jim. One part I found was a little amusing was the
> fellow who was talking about the ARS being degraded, and when the asked
> him further about it, ne confesed he didn't have a license. Great show
> overall.
>
> N2EY wrote:
>

2557. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 18:00:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EEA113F.3070409@psu.edu>
Source record: 68803

N2EY wrote:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030612152031.07705.00000687@mb-m18.aol.com>...

<Some snippage>
>
> With all due respect, I think my term is more accurate. Here's why:
> The equine anatomy described by Dave serves a beneficial function. The
> product of said anatomy may be unpleasant but it is not usually toxic
> in the medical sense (I'll defer to your toxicology background on
> that). And said product has beneficial uses.

I've been around horses for a long time, and why people refer to nasty disagreeable people as thier posteriors is beyond me. There are plenty of better candidates for that!

> Can you say the same thing about....

No

>>>You never talk about how much FUN amateur radio is, how great a lot of
>>>hams are as people, how many accomplishments hams have made...
>>
>> How can he, Jim? No Experience.
>>
>>
>>>oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
>>>way....
>>
>> THERE ya go!
>
>
> 'zactly.
>
> --
>
> Ever notice how there are some people who are just plain nice to have
> around? They may not be the smartest, or the richest, or the most
> attractive, or the most accomplished, but when you spend some time
> with them you feel better than you did before, for all sorts of
> reasons.

> Among them are people from whom you can always learn something useful,
> people who are always there to help out, people with whom you can
> communicate freely and honestly, people who have an innate common
> sense, people with a good sense of humor, and a whole list of other

> traits and combinations of traits. People who are slow to criticize
> and quick to praise, slow to anger and quick to smile, etc. People who
> see the glass as half full rather than half empty, and then they go
> and get a smaller glass. People who ask little and give much. People
> whose example inspires and uplifts you to be a better person.
>
> You know people like that, don't you, Steve? They may not have all of
> the above, and they may not be perfect, but the overall effect they
> have on those around them is generally pleasant, uplifting and
> positive.
>
>
> Then you have folks who are exactly the opposite. You know people like
> that, too, I suppose.

The only positive thing I can say about that type is that I am in awe
of the amount of energy they must posess. Such hatred consumes so much.

> Why not spend more time on the first group and less time on the
> second?

I have a saying on my wall:

Everyone who comes here makes me happy,

Some when they come in,

Some when they leave.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2558. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 18:36:30 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcd5t4$h58$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68714

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> The old codehater's mantra just won't go away.

Who's participating in this thread that "hates" code?

>Never mind the lost
> communcations capacity, just hang with the phony "Just because we had to"
> That is the most lame of a variety of lame excuses.

Yeah, it is pretty lame....

> EVERY ham should have to learn basic Morse code.

Low comedy, this. But anyway, tell me why.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2559. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 19:17:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <urpGa.1575$0A6.35@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 68804

Gadzooks! I'm just waiting 'till 2012 and maybe there will be a HCWA (!).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030612155913.07705.00000695@mb-m18.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: QCWA Sell-Out!
> >From: Vito vito@crosslink.net
> >Date: 6/12/03 5:17 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EE8FBE4.C8818101@crosslink.net>
>
> >What's a QCWA?
>
> (Q)uarter
> (C)entury
> (W)ireless
> (A)ssociation
>
> For those Amateurs who can show that they were first licensed over 25
> years prior. You do not need to have been licensed for that entire time.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/03

2560. Re: Ham Educational Source - Semiconductor Physics Course

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 19:56:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306131156.6915dbc8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68805

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306130627.7dd67000@posting.google.com>...
> For those who need to get up to speed on what actually makes our radios tick.
>
> http://britneyspears.ac/lasers.htm
>
Groovy, baby! But it's not the first time. You oughta see the manuals
for the Southgate Type 7 and its predecessors...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2561. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 21:29:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcdfn6$3g3$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 68808
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306121829.6ec647c8@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<bcaospfk1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > > > > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > > > > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in
> Canada.
> > > > >
> > > > > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> > > > >
> > > > > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > > > > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > > > > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > > > > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > > > > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> > > > >
> > > > > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > > > > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > > > > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency"
> applies
> > > > here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of
> transmitting on
> > > > the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you
> had
> > > > the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San
> Diego
> > > > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
> > > >
> > > The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to

> > > be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
> > > Part 97.
> >
> > Disagree. The rule WRT to Techs is no Techs below 30 mHz except for
> > coded Techs who can operate down to 28.000. Sect. 97.401(d) does not
> > include an exception to that rule. Ditto Novices by virtue of their
> > set of restrictions.
>
> Yet we all seem to agree if it is a true emergency, which is the purpose
> of the rule, then anyone can use it. Anyone should include
> novices and techs.

So, bottom line: Novices and Tecs have exactly the same authority as unlicensed individuals in this instance.
It's a simple statement of fact.

2562. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 21:36:23 UTC
From: nospam@home.com
Message-ID: <3eea4378.87024692@news.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 68809
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

When they sent me the spam to join QCWA, I told 'em I wasn't old
enough. A ham since 1957, I'm ONLY 57!

QCWA and ARRL trying to take ham radio back to 1938 is just wrong and
will lead to its early demise.

73, Larry W4CSC

On Fri, 13 Jun 2003 11:01:48 -0400, "Leo J" <ljustins1011@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>
>Thank you for bringing this recent news of
>the decision by QCWA to our attention.
>
>I would qualify for QCWA membership in Nov
>of this Year, but after reading this, as far as I am
>concerned QCWA can "go someplace" along with the
>grey horse they rode in upon....
>
>Leo
>National Corp Radio Collector
>Mill Surplus Radios Collectors
>http://www.syzen.com/milradio/RelatedSites.html
>http://www.rarchams.org/links.htm
>
>
>"John Sielke" <w2agnNOSPAM@w2agn.net> wrote in message
>news:5g5hevgubuesbpjqgvbtvrlvt37jumremp@4ax.com...
>> It is getting increasingly frustrating, trying to at least limit SPAM.
>> For example, for those of you members of QCWA, in the Summer newsletter,
>> it shows the QCWA BoD voted in October to SELL the member's database to a
>> bulk email outfit! I contacted the GM and President, as I have been a
>> Life Member for 20+ years. Sure enough, it was true, but they cancelled
>> the plan...not because of concern for member's privacy, but because it
>> turned out "they didn't need the money." Needless to say I told them to
>> expunge my records and cancel my membership. Probably useless, but it's
>> bad enough having spammers gathering our data with robots, but having a
>> trusted organization SELLING it was too much.
>>
>
>

2563. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 21:48:02 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcdgqi$6m4$0@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 68810

Vito wrote:

> OTOH I deeply resent people using unrealistic barriers to keep
> others from sharing what is, after all, public property.

Seems like you blame all longtime licensed hams (all of whom are Morse qualified, thus suspect) for the actions of the FCC. Sorry, FCC doesn't pay much attention to anything I have to say, best as I can determine. I suspect that may be cuz I don't spend the big bucks in places that gets their attention. But I see they do seem to follow international treaties fairly well. Guess that must have a lot to do with their actions.

But your next paragraph is even more troubling..

> Requiring Morse
> before allowing people to talk on recreational (amateur) bands is the
> same as requiring a flint-and-steel campfire before renting a hotel room
> in a national forest.
>

That simply shows that the fellow that wrote it doesn't know much about the subject. Radiotelegraphy is a quite efficient communications mode, that is when those persons attempting to communicate with it have learned how to go about it. Under your rant/scenario no such thing is even implied.

> Have a good weekend,
> K3DWW

Likewise to you.

Dick W0EX

2564. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 22:11:03 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <yXrGa.5226$EF.103@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68811

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcd097$8jb$0@208.207.71.159...
to"
> That is the most lame of a variety of lame excuses.
>
> EVERY ham should have to learn basic Morse code. Sure, FCC doesn't care,
it's
> just more work for them. Anything involved in licensing is more work for
them.
>
This is very true. Every ham who has a license for <30MHz really has a moral responsibility to society to learn Morse code because society has bestowed upon them a Federal license to use this rare and valuable spectrum. When the occasion arises for the ability to communicate in this manner, in an emergency, or even for health and welfare, it is the Ham who is given the privilege in our society to donate his/her time and efforts to lend a helping hand to communicate with others, whether it be the Caribbean, Mexico, Central America and/or other places where CW is the only economically affordable mode.

Would today's Hams be ready to answer the call if asked? Not all, that's for sure. If not, why bother giving him/her the privilege to use bands capable of long distance CW propagation? What is it, really, that differentiates us from CB operators (not to knock them). What? Technical knowledge? Not with today's exams.

73 de KR4AJ

2565. Re: Even More Publicity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 22:23:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030613182359.01315.00000226@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68812

In article <f45722ac.0306130534.70d9abd0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Photo caption reads: "An early homemade radio transmitter and MICROPHONE"

No it doesn't. The word "microphone" isn't all capitals.

There were hams on AM 'phone back in the 1920s. There were even some hams like
Ray Moore, W6DEI, on SSB (or as they knew it, SSSC) in the early 1930s.
>
>Do you think the microphone is the same period as the transmitter?

I know it is. The transmitter dates from the '30s or '40s. The D-104 was
produced as early as 1934.

2566. Re: Yet Another LennieRant Bites The Dust....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 22:35:37 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bcdjpe$icrfh$1@ID-166180.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68813

"Brian" wrote ...

> Arnie, do you confine your emergency operations to domestic natural
> emergencies only? What do you do when attacked? What is the
> disposition of your aircraft and rolling stock? Where do you
> reconstitute? Do you even know which oplans you're tasked under?
>
> You're apparently in the feel good, good neighbor mode. Good luck to
> you.

And you are apparently in smartass mode, Brian. You know as well as I do that we have plans that cover all of the above. The one I chose to talk about has an ARS piece, a need to be shared with local EMAs, and is (most importantly) unclassified. Emergency Management covers a wide spectrum of contingency planning, mitigation strategies, and post-disaster/incident response models. You can't explain why a Hurricane Evac plan isn't classified, so you try the old smoke and mirrors to deflect the argument. Why am I not surprised?

Arnie -

2567. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 22:53:02 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA55CE.89BDF117@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68806

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Geez, Vito, it sure is disappointing that you consider THAT uncivil...

You're right. I forget that what's considered genteel in some areas
might get one shot in another. My apologies.
>
> The really sad part of all this is the numbers of you folks who wound up so
> "damaged" by the simple requirement of a code test. Sure looks like more of an
> attitude problem than anything else.

Yes it is an attitude problem. I have nothing against Morse as a hobby
mode, in fact I hope to use it alot when I retire - maybe even get good
at it. OTOH I deeply resent people using unrealistic barriers to keep
others from sharing what is, after all, public property. Requiring Morse
before allowing people to talk on recreational (amateur) bands is the
same as requiring a flint-and-steel campfire before renting a hotel room
in a national forest.

Have a good weekend,
K3DWW

2568. Re: FCC (was Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 22:55:29 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA5661.F806E15A@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68807

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Seems to me that it is relevant. I hear it all the time. Joe B. wants a
> rule changed or a new rule not added ...

We're on different freq's Mike. You're talking individuals trying to
influence a commission, I'm talking about major corp's.

73, K3DWW

2569. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 23:39:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcdngq$p1v$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68814

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bccvqp$7so$0@208.207.71.159...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0306130508.389bd296@posting.google.com...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> > news:<20030612160838.07705.00000697@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > >Date: 6/12/03 2:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306121132.1cef0d08@posting.google.com>
> > > >
> > > > >> What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US
> > policy or
> > > > >> regulations.
> > > > >
> > > > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> > > >
> > > > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
> > nothing to
> > > > do with US policy or regulations.
> > > >
> > > > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> > > > >
> > > > >See: Japan.
> > > >
> > > > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
> > nothing to
> > > > do with US policy or regulations.
> > >
> > > Such a paradox. You say it does then you say it doesn't.
> > >
> > > > Japan is a soverign nation.
> > >
> > > Except for the international treaties it has signed.
> >
> > Signing a treaty doesn't change the fact that Japan is a
> > soverign nation.
> >
> > > > It will do as it sees fit for it's own purposes.
> > >
```

> > > Are you absolutely certain of this? Is this unique to Japan, or can
> > > any other soverign nation violate international treaty for domestic
> > > purposes?
> >
> > The fact that Japan has had a code-free domestic
> > license is well known. The rest of the countries that are part of the
> > ITU treaty apparently don't see Japan's position as being
> > in violation of the treaty... or, even if some do, they have long
> > since defaulted to approval by simply doing nothing.
> >
> > > > Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
> > > > regulation.
> > >
> > > It merely affects the non-adherence to ITU S25 for domestic use, and
> > > sets a precedence for any other treaty nation.
> >
> > True, yet there hasn't been any wholesale non-adhearance.
> > Again, perhaps other countires administrations see no harm
> > nor violation in Japan's position.
>
> You codehaters are really something else!

Dick,
Time for chill pill.

> Japan chose, for reasons and with justifications detailed by N2EY, to
> institute a domestic HF codeless license. No other countries have
protested
> on the same basis-there are no negative effects noted on them. No other
> country has to "consider" Japan's decision in any way. No other country is
> invoved. If Japan wants to do that, no one else is involved.

So you believe a codeless ham's signal in Japan can never be heard
anywhere but Japan?

> So our FCC does not decide to do the same. One could glean from all these
> plaintive posts that FCC is somehow thus considered derelict.

????
That's certainly not something I've posted.

> . What nonsense! The dereliction is on the part of those who refuse to
> meet the existing qualifications because they happen to "feel" they aren't
> "proper".

If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
It's disgusting!

2570. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 23:43:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcdnovsac1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68815

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcd097$8jb$0@208.207.71.159...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Where things change is in my attitude towards folks who
>
> > want to demand that everyone else must subscribe to a
> > requirement just because they do or did.
>
> The old codehater's mantra just won't go away. Never mind the lost
> communcations capacity,

That argument didn't sell with the FCC.

> just hang with the phony "Just because we had to"
> That is the most lame of a variety of lame excuses.

The "excuse" is that neither you nor anyone else
has provided any ratioinal reason to mandate a
code test anymore. The only reason one exists today is the
ITU treaty.

> EVERY ham should have to learn basic Morse code.

Because?

> Sure, FCC doesn't care, it's
> just more work for them.

No...it is because you have NO valid reason to require that
EVERY ham should have to learn code.

> Anything involved in licensing is more work for them.

So you claim.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2571. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 23:47:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcdo00$gg5$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68816

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:yXrGa.5226$EF.103@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bcd097$8jb$0@208.207.71.159...
> to"
> > That is the most lame of a variety of lame excuses.
> >
> > EVERY ham should have to learn basic Morse code. Sure, FCC doesn't
care,
> it's
> > just more work for them. Anything involved in licensing is more work for
> them.
> >
> This is very true. Every ham who has a license for <30MHz really has a
moral
> responsibility to society to learn Morse code because society has bestowed
> upon them a Federal license to use this rare and valuable spectrum.

Well hey, that's being creative. A "moral" responsibility?
Sell that to the FCC.

> When the
> occasion arises for the ability to communicate in this manner, in an
> emergency, or even for health and welfare, it is the Ham who is given the
> privilege in our society to donate his/her time and efforts to lend a
> helping hand to communicate with others, whether it be the Caribbean,
> Mexico, Central America and/or other places where CW is the only
> economically affordable mode.

I could make the same argument with regardto hams having
to learn Spanish. As to moral obligations...sorry, there is
no such obligation for any ham to ever even listen to CW
signals.

> Would today's Hams be ready to answer the call if asked? Not all, that's
for
> sure. If not, why bother giving him/her the privilege to use bands capable
> of long distance CW propagation? What is it, really, that differentiates
us
> from CB operators (not to knock them). What? Technical knowledge? Not
with
> today's exams.

Yawn,

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2572. Re: QCWA Sell-Out!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-13 23:57:08 UTC
From: Jeffrey D Angus <jangus@socal.rr.com>
Message-ID: <3EEA64FE.3020505@socal.rr.com>
Source record: 68817
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Leo J wrote:
> Thank you for bringing this recent news of
> the decision by QCWA to our attention.
>
> I would qualify for QCWA membership in Nov
> of this Year, but after reading this, as far as I am
> concerned QCWA can "go someplace" along with the
> grey horse they rode in upon....

Pay attention and take it back onto the QCWA refelctor or digest.
The issue has been resolved.

Jeff

--
"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." Benjamin Franklin
"A life lived in fear is a life half lived."
Tara Morice as Fran, from the movie "Strictly Ballroom"

2573. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:20:08 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcdpopost1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68715

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bcdo00$gg5$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:yXrGa.5226$EF.103@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com...
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bcd097$8jb$0@208.207.71.159...
> > to"
> > > That is the most lame of a variety of lame excuses.
> > >
> > > EVERY ham should have to learn basic Morse code. Sure, FCC doesn't
> care,
> > it's
> > > just more work for them. Anything involved in licensing is more work
for
> > them.
> > >
> > This is very true. Every ham who has a license for <30MHz really has a
> moral
> > responsibility to society to learn Morse code because society has
bestowed
> > upon them a Federal license to use this rare and valuable spectrum.
>
> Well hey, that's being creative. A "moral" responsibility?
> Sell that to the FCC.

[snip] Bill, I think Dan's commentary was what they used to call "Heavy
Sarcasm" on Saturday Night Live......

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2574. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:23:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030613202353.09580.00000803@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68818

In article <d22b54c3.0306130616.bfb1b94@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0306121328.3287ee3d@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0306120540.90349bc@posting.google.com>...
>
>
>> >
>> > I wuz also there when hams got kicked off 11M. The ARRL sponsored an
>> > 11M contest to promote activity on the band as a shot at "saving it".
>> > Nobody showed up for the party.
>>
>> Lotta reasons for that. 11 wasn't worldwide amateur, so the DX was
>> limited. 10 was right next door, and more active. 11 wasn't
>> harmonically related to any other band, back in the days when
>> multiplier rigs and xtal control were common.
>
>The old multiplier rig days were pretty much history by then. My 75A4
>and Johnson Valiant could operate as-built on 11M for instance.

The Valiant was a multiplier rig, not a heterodyne type. In fact EFJ only made three or four heterodyne-type ham rigs - the Pacemaker, the Invader/Invader 2000, and the Avenger.

>My
>point is that hams lost the band but despite the uproar in the ham
>magazines and in Newington very few hams actually gave a hoot about
>11M.

Yup. But the Newington folks knew that if they didn't make a stink, they'd be derelict in their duty. Plus FCC might be encouraged to try it again.

One big factor was the Great About Face of December, 1952, which gave all hams except Novices and Techs full operating privs, plus the opening of 15 and the addition of a 'phone subband to 40 (both about 1954). Before those changes, Generals and Conditionals could only do 'phone above 25 MHz and on what was left of 160. So way back then 11 and 10 were really popular with the 'phone folks, particularly those interested in mobile and dx.

>I expect that will be the case again when the FCC shifts chunks
>of our seldom-used high bands to the commercials. The NPRM will show
>up, the usual compulsive electropolitically correct huge PR and
>flag-waving flap will immediately follow, then the FCC will do the
>preordained anyway. And once again it'll be a snoozer in the general

>ham population.

Probably. But if no resistance is offered, what canl be said when they want
half of 20? Besides, for a lot of amateur purposes (satellite, EME, etc.) it's
better to have a few MHz exclusive-amateur rather than a lot of shared MHz.
>
>> Plus there were the weird noises from vacuum formers and diathermies.
>
>For certain. But in that timeframe the FCC also put the clamps on that
>type of equipment WRT to allowable EMI/RFI. That was the real flap in
>that part of the spectrum because it affected big bucks corporate
>fixed investments in capital equipment which suddenly became illegal
>to use.

Yup.

One relatively unknown story is how diathermies disappeared all of a sudden.
Once upon a time they thought high-intensity RF exposure was good for ya!

Some of those old diatehrmy machines wound up as parts soureces for ham finals.
'Specially the power supplies and big tubes.

>The ham side of the overall 11M uproar wasn't even on the
>chart in comparison. And the FCC enforced it. They basically cleaned
>up 11M for the CBers.

Yup.

>> Speaking of GHz, an IEEE convention was in town the past few days.
>> Lotta neat stuff, lotta emphasis on microwaves. All that RF plumbing
>> looks like an ME's delight...
>
>It is, been there, done it in volume.

I figured as much.

>It's mostly a manufacturing
>engineering challenge. The field is overpoulated with goofy EEs who
>don't know which end of a wrench ya grab and come off the wall with
>the weirdest . . "What's the problem Kelly?" All ya gotta do is drill
>a bunch of square holes." "Yeah, with a square hole drill right?"

HAW!
>
>Ah, never mind . . !
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2575. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:23:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030613202354.09580.00000804@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 68819

In article <bccvqp$7so$0@208.207.71.159>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Japan chose, for reasons and with justifications detailed by N2EY, to
>institute a domestic HF codeless license.

I'm not sure what this "domestic" stuff is about. AFAIK, there's no limit on
any Japanese ham working DX.

>No other countries have protested
>on the same basis-there are no negative effects noted on them.

Historic note: Way back in the '50s, there was some sort of problem, because
the JA nocode license allowed higher power. Japan responded by lowering the
power level to QRP levels.

>No other
>country has to "consider" Japan's decision in any way. No other country is
>invoved. If Japan wants to do that, no one else is involved.

Actually, any other nation can protest. But to my knowledge nobody has.

The lack of a protest or penalty does not mean no violation has occurred.

Besides, guess where most hams' rigs were made? Wonder if that has anything to
do with it.....

It's interesting to note that the number of Japanese ham stations peaked in
1995 and has been going downhill ever since. (Japanese operator licenses never
expire, only station licenses). In a few years we may pass them in numbers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2576. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:35:50 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <hbmkevolmkv0ij5d4i4djd2jr88dbomsot@4ax.com>
Source record: 68701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

*** post for FREE via your newsreader at post.newsfeed.com ***

On Mon, 9 Jun 2003 22:25:39 -0500, xganon <remailer@xganon.com> wrote:

>I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
>group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies
>from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
>We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions.

Congratulations. Now, how about learning the finer points of operating
according to applicable regulations?

>We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know technical
>issues as well or better.

But apparently not the proper way to spell "Yaesu" and "Icom"...not
that this is all that relevant to the point you're trying to make.

>However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
>rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens.
>This should not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.

Correct. However, it isn't the Constitution that grants hams the
privileges that our licenses grant us. Nowhere in the Constitution nor
any of its Amendments does it mention anything about ham radio.

Notice if you will that I am saying "privileges" rather than "rights"
because I believe there is a difference.

Furthermore, along with rights (and privileges too, for that matter)
come responsibilities, including the responsibility to operate your
equipment in accordance with applicable regulations when you exercise
your privileges to operate that equipment.

In fact, if you are not licensed to operate from 27.405 to 28.000,
then you have NO operating "rights" to be there at all. Thus, you
relegate yourselves to the status of second class citizens by
demonstrating to all who care to observe, that you have no respect for
the law. This is why you get verbally b***h-slapped, not only by hams
but also by law-abiding 11m CB operators, every time you sound off
about operating where you have no business being. We're not trying to
be rude. We're not trying to be condescending. We simply perceive that
you, unlike the majority of us, fail to understand that if we carry
your logic to its fullest exdtent, the result is absolute anarchy. The
rest of your post - and my comments added below - more fully
illustrate my point:

>For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is
>a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license.

For those who do not wish to be under the thumb of the Internal
Revenue Service, robbing banks and liquor stores is a viable
alternative to getting a job and paying income taxes.

> What I am saying is
>that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to talk with
>him before you condemn him.

I'm not necessarily condemning you. I am condemning your illegal
activities. I'll leave the business of condemning you to the legal
system if you're ever court - it's their job, not mine.

How do you feel about Tim McVeigh, Jeffrey Dahmer, and John Wayne
Gacy? Most decent people condemn their actions. Perhaps you do as
well...they were all mass murderers. Have you talked with any of them
first before condemning their actions?

Some of the freeband frequencies actually have licensed users to whom
the frequencies are allocated. Here's a question for you: Are you
actually licensed to operate anywhere in the RF spectrum? How would
you like it if the legitimate users of the frequencies in question
here decided to just jump in and use the frequencies you are licensed
on because they felt it to be a viable alternative to getting licenses
for the frequencies allocated to them?

And please, don't give me any of that nonsense about the frequencies
not being used anyway. When you park your car, it's not being
used...how would you like it if I came along and decided to
re-allocate it for my own use, since you aren't using it anyway?

While we're at it, while you're out grocery shopping and your house
isn't being used, I'll just re-allocate your stereo, TV, VCR,
microwave, radio equipment, and any money I find laying around for my
own use as well. After all, you're not using it right now, and it's a
viable alternative to me getting a job and paying taxes and thus being
under Uncle Sam's thumb...so by your own logic, you should have no
complaints if I help myself, right?

Sorry, dude, but you'll have a hard time convincing me you're anything
more than a freeloader who wants to exercise the benefits of living in
a free society without accepting the responsibilities that go with
them. None of us has the Constitutional right to pick and choose which
laws we will obey and which ones we will break...and so just because I
have a license granting me the privilege to drive a car (which is also
not mentioned in the Constitution or any of its Amendments) doesn't
make it okay for me to go screaming through a school zone at a hundred
miles an hour just because I choose not to be under the thumb of the
local legislators who decreed a 15 MPH speed limit there for the sake
of the safety of the kids who attend classes there.

I do agree that the technical proficiency of many freebanders is comparable to even the most competent of hams. However, that in itself will not gain you acceptance by the vast majority of radio hobbyists, any more than the marksmanship skills demonstrated by the Texas Tower Sniper will gain him acceptance from the guys and gals down at the local skeet-shooting club. Having the skills is only half the battle. Now show us that you can apply them properly.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

-----= Posted via Newsfeed.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeed.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== 100,000 Groups! - 19 Servers! - Unlimited Download! =-----

2577. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:35:52 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <b1pkevk2i29p9ibbg35tlrgojqtio6bf9f@4ax.com>
Source record: 68850
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

*** post for FREE via your newsreader at post.newsfeed.com ***

On Wed, 11 Jun 2003 00:15:11 -0400, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>What can you do in the "freeband" that you can't do legally on ten
>meters as a properly licensed ham?

If you mean besides playing music and otherwise interfering with other
stations, running excessive power levels, and trying to impress
everyone within range with your extensive vocabulary of obscenities,
the answer to your question is, "Nothing."

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

-----= Posted via Newsfeed.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeed.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== 100,000 Groups! - 19 Servers! - Unlimited Download! =-----

2578. Re: FCC (was Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:38:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA6EB5.4050108@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68820

Vito wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Seems to me that it is relevant. I hear it all the time. Joe B. wants a
>>rule changed or a new rule not added ...
>
>
> We're on different freq's Mike. You're talking individuals trying to
> influence a commission, I'm talking about major corp's.

Linear thinker, eh? Okay.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2579. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:48:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA70DD.BDCC057E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68821

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030610222436.04207.00000668@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030610175110.23307.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>The demand to BE INVOLVED or shut up is a bogus one, just
> >> another excuse to attempt winning message points.
> >
> >Nobody is telling you to shut up, Len. Even though you have told others to do
> >so.
>
> Sorry, Jimmie, the Colonel and the Bwahahaha have both told me
> to "shut up."

Sorry, that's incorrect, Foghorn.

The Colonel called me a "horse's ass" in public and
> Bwahahaha has called me several kinds of nasty names. You can
> find all that in Google. :-)

Last week I called a lawn mower a lawn mower. I was right on both
occasions.

> >We're simply pointing out that except for your newsgroup postings, and perhaps
> >your lengthy and anti-child reply comments to the FCC three years ago, you're
> >not involved in amateur radio at all.

> >Even though there's been an amateur radio license with no code test available
> >in the USA for more than 13 years, you haven't bothered to get one.
>
> Why is that necessary? It would make no difference to you
> in any event...you would still claim "superiority" from having
> taken and passed a morse code test. :-)

You've long disliked that there are others who have more experience in
something than you. In any endeavor, there are going to be people with
more experience than you, Leonard, old bean. In amateur radio, there
are a number of children with more experience than you. :-)

> I was legally communicating on HF a half century ago and
> passed a commercial test (first class) 47 years ago.

You weren't communicating on HF as a radio amateur and your commercial
test is irrelevant to amateur radio. If you want to be a radio amateur,

you'll have to start at the beginning.

> I don't need any "licenses" to discuss any federal regulations.

No, you don't. You need a license to be a part of amateur radio.
You aren't a part of amateur radio.

> The First Amendment of the US Constitution grants me that
> right. I defended that Constitution as a US military member
> for 8 years, remember? You've never served in the US military,
> remember?

Does the constitution protect you from laughter or derision?

> >Even though you told us almost 3-1/2 years ago you were going for Extra right
> >out of the box, you haven't even attempted any amateur radio license exams.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, I never said WHEN I would. :-)

Do the smiley faces cover your embarrassment over not having walked the
walk after talking the talk?

> You have NO real idea of anything "I attempted." Nada. Zip.

Len has a point, Jim. May I offer more precise wording such as, "you
haven't successfully attempted"?

> >(btw, in the context of the 2000 restructuring, 'right out of the box'
> >obviously meant as soon as the rules changed back on April 15, 2000.)
>
> No, Jimmie, you can't redefine older colloquialisms. "Out of the
> box" refers to taking all test elements at once, just one test
> session instead of coming up through all the classes like good
> little boys and girls of US amateur radio do.

Please direct us to such a definition, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

2580. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:50:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA7160.54B40044@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68822

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE6A32A.86F16ECF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Sure you have, Len. Wanna be Googled and be served up another generous
> >portion of crow?
>
> Colonel, you could copy over the entirety of Google's archive on
> this newsgroup. That would serve no purpose other than making
> you happy to put down another person you don't like...and you DO
> like to put down certain people any which way you can...which
> includes name-calling to the level of using "horse's ass."

Sure it would serve a purpose, *Foghorn. It would show that your
conveniently snipped statement is a false one. That means that you
simply aren't telling the truth.

You were called a **horse's ass because being a horse's ass is your
demonstrated pattern of behavior here. You don't play well with others.

> You feel your amateur extra gives you some kind of "right" to do or
> say anything you want, to act a "superior" any time you need your
> ego boosted. That's been demonstrated time and again by yourself
> in here.

Incorrect, Leonard. The same Constitution you often quote gives me the
right to state my views here. Further, since I am involved and have
been actively involved in amateur radio for forty years, my views
reflect experience. That, if nothing else, sets them apart from yours.

> You really ought to think hard about running for office, like being
> executive president of ARRL for life. That would make you VERY
> important. You could lord it over everyone once a month in QST
> editorial pages and tell everyone how You KNOW How Hams
> Should Be. No problem. :-)

See how little you know? League presidents don't even have regular QST
space. They don't attempt to "lord it over" anyone. What is any of
that to you? You aren't a ham and you aren't a League member.

> Now go back to Living In The Past in Google. Be as vindictive as
> you want to be...you are certainly "superior" in that regard.

Ahh! I think I see the source of your confusion. Google isn't some sort
of time warp. It is only an archive in which can be found almost all of
your posts to this newsgroup. Do you view seeing your current claims

compared to your previous statements as vindictive, Len? The words I'd quote would be accurate accounts of things you've actually stated here. Are you ashamed of them? Why else would you consider seeing them again as "vindictive"?

> It's not going to make a lot of other hams love you, Colonel. That
> IS what you are after, isn't it? :-)

Love me? What a peculiar thing to think, Foghorn*

*Foghorn: One of the nicknames Len receives when he resorts to names like "The Colonel" or "Jimmie". Foghorn Lenhorn is based on the loud know-it-all cartoon rooster from the Warner Brothers cartoons.

**Horse's Ass: The end of the horse farthest removed from the head. It is the portion producing road apples.

Dave K8MN

2581. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:51:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA718A.BCCFB04D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68823

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE6AACC.808DD329@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Sorry, Jimmie, I AM involved in UHF and above. Pity that you
> >> aren't involved. Enjoy old-fashioned working DX on HF with CW.
> >> :-)
> >
> >Lennie means he has satellite TV! Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby.
>
> The Colonel is WRONG. Not a subscriber to any "satellite TV"
> or "satellite radio." Digital cable TV service wired to the house.
>
> You have NO idea of my UHF and above involvement, have NO
> need to know, have NO authority to know.

But, Foghorn, just a few lines ago you commented that Jim isn't involved in "UHF and above" frequencies. Your latest statement is certainly reciprocal. It would mean that you have NO idea of his involvement in "UHF and above" frequencies. It would mean that you have NO need to know and NO authority to know. One thing is for certain: Whatever your involvement, it certainly isn't happening under Part 97. You have nothing to do with that.

> Go to bed, Colonel. Be sure to take off your jackboots first.

What are you--some kind of control freak with a Nazi paraphenalia fetish?

Dave K8MN

2582. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:52:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA71B8.5396B80@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68824

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EE6AA09.5BADA217@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Darn, Len. You are NOT with the FCC and you have NO power to override
> >the Constitution.
>
> Colonel, you are NOT with the FCC and have NO authority over
> anyone.

The movie must have started again. I think this is where I came in.

> >You have nothing to do with amateur radio in any way
> >yet you post to an amateur radio newsgroup in an effort to convince us
> >that you have the answers for amateur radio.
>
> I just state my opinions...when not replying to nastygrams from
> control freaks like yourself demeaning all who have differing
> opinions than yours. :-)

Naw, that's incorrect. You've never just stated your opinions here.
You've spent the bulk of your time doing the things which you accuse
others of doing.

> >You know best what the licensing criteria for radio amateurs should be.
>
> No, I just state my opinions on what parts of US civil radio
> regulations should be deleted...since those that should be
> deleted are way out of date and should have been taken
> out long ago in my opinion.

Others have differing opinions. You've frequently insulted them.

> >On what would this knowledge of yours be based?
>
> A half century's experience in telecommunications, radio
> and electronics technology as design engineer, being able
> to legally operate on a wider range of frequencies than any
> US amateur and using far more modes and modulations
> than are available to any US amateur.

I didn't see anything indicating that you have any experience in amateur
radio whatever during your half century. You don't sound like a very
good judge of what's best for amateur radio.

> >After all, you aren't involved in any way with amateur radio.
>
> Still using that schtick, ey Colonel? :-)

It is still as true today as ever, Foghorn.

> >What are you--some kind of geezer with a control obsession?
>
> No, you are. You need someone to Hit on to satisfy your
> curious personality...especially since long ago when you were
> criticized for poor procedure in US government radio
> communications.

These words seem to be a contradiction to your denial of a control obsession. You weren't any more involved in my government communications job than you are in amateur radio. It hasn't stopped you from trying to be an expert in either area. You're irrelevant to either subject; not involved; an onlooker.

> You just can't take negative criticsm, Colonel.

I needn't take it from someone who hasn't the qualifications for it, O Prince of Pontification, Guru of Gigaherz, Maharishi of Modulation.

> Now go to bed...and don't forget to remove your jackboots first.

See? An obsession with control...and nazi paraphenalia.

Dave K8MN

2583. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:53:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA71F3.23C66829@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68825

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The Ho article didn't mention US amateur radio or any amateur
> radio. Why do you insist there is some sinister intent in the
> words not written? :-)

How typical of Len to waste everyone's time belittling some Ho.

Dave K8MN

2584. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:55:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA7299.520E13B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68826

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The problem is that few in the academic world ARE experienced
> in the field that they teach.

I don't believe you.

> Few instructors of political science have actually run for any
> government-level elective office.

Political science isn't the study of how to run for elective office.

> Few instructors of economics
> have used their "knowledge" to advance their own finances.

Really? How can we gain access to these spiffy facts? Where'd they
come from?

> Few instructors of history have ever set any history. :-)

...to your knowledge ;-)

As fascinating as all this has been, did you know that almost every
instructor of amateur radio licensing courses is a radio amateur?

> Students have to sit politely in classrooms and do their
> assignments obediently in order to secure the grades that will
> allow them to eventually graduate.

Is this part of your problem with authority, Leonard? You didn't want
to sit politely or do your assignments obediently?

> They also are required to
> respect their instructors no matter what...without that they
> get tossed out of class with loss of credits.

Did you have trouble showing respect to your instructors?

> I once took an extension course in digital logic at a large
> junior college here in Los Angeles. The instructor had about
> a tenth of the work experience I had at the time and his "industry
> examples" were at least 20 years old. Some of his class rules
> were quite strict such as never, ever thinking of an Exclusive-OR
> gate as a gate. Ex-ORs had to always be drawn made up out of
> ANDs and ORs and Inverters. He refused to unbend from that
> militant ruling despite being shown a Texas Instrument TTL
> package long on the market containing 4 Exclusive-ORs. All of
> us students had to work according to His rules on that. This
> instructor had a control-freak personality but one had to be nice

> to him or risk loss of credits. No real learning in such classes,
> none that couldn't be had from 20 year old textbooks carrying
> the same information.

Imagine a guy who wouldn't let you run the class.

Dave K8MN

2585. Re: RRAP Contest Challenge?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 00:57:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA7316.3313AFC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68827

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030609230246.10018.00000227@mb-m26.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >From: "Dick Carroll;" dixie
> >
> >>> > It takes a village...
> >>>
> >>> ...and in the (every) village, you'll find a
> >
> >I know that one. You'll find a village idiot.
> >
> >>I just can't resist.....a VIPUL!
> >
> >Thats not funny. By the way, Vipul means someone with vast knowledge. (I may
> >not live up to that, but thats what my name means).
>
> One problem with US amateur radio is its demographics indicating
> an overwhelming majority being white males of Judeo-Christian
> religious beliefs.

What makes that a problem, Leonard? Amateur radio is open to all races
and any of the several sexes. Hams tend to concentrate on their common
ground, not upon what makes them different from each other. But you
wouldn't know about that. You aren't involved.

> Such hams will have great fun putting down
> anyone not of Anglo-Saxon ancestry or "western" ethnics.

Build your own premise and you're sure to come up with your own
conclusion. Vipul isn't running into problems because of his ethnicity.
His difficulties come from faulty thinking.

> No "western" given name? Oh, wow, great opportunity for calling
> such all sorts of depreciatory names, making fun of them for not
> fitting in with "being American." That's getting more typical every
> day in US amateur radio.

I don't know if that's the case in amateur radio. I have acquaintances
the world over with non-western given names and surnames. They don't
get called depreciatory names. None of them are made fun of. Then
again, none of them attempt to argue things such as "amateur radio" and
"ham radio" being two separate things.

Things outside of amateur radio might be different. Let's take your situation as an example. While I've never observed you calling non-westerners depreciatory names, I've see you do quite a number of things with names like "Steve", "Jim", "Dave", "Larry", "Dick" and "Brian" among others. That must be a special reverse of the circumstance you described--maybe because you feel that YOU don't fit in or because you don't feel that we're sitting quietly at our desks, respecting you.

Dave K8MN

2586. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 01:20:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030613212037.24390.00000580@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 68828

In article <bc9occ$k6l$0@pita.alt.net>, "Mark McLisson"
<rasent@comentincradio.org> writes:

>
> What ever happened to Dick Bash? He was without a
>doubt a gentleman and a scholar. Also the finest ham radio
>operator ever to key a microphone.

According to QRZ.COM, he's alive and well and living in Anderson, IN:

KL7IHP Lookups: 196
RICHARD M BASH
33 W. 10th Street - Suite LL4
Anderson IN 46016-1437
USA

BTW, I agree that he's a very nice chap to know. I met him at Dayton many
years ago, and I bought one of his books, even though I had been an Extra
for a couple of years. I find it interesting that to this day he's still an
Advanced,
even though he could pass the final remaining Extra test in his sleep!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2587. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 01:30:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcdtsa$a6q$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 68829

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
> get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?
>
>

Basically what always comes next- they seem to always want to blame code supporters for their woes.

2588. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 01:35:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcduae$8hk$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68830
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bccui9$5po$0@208.207.71.159...
>
>
> Mike Yetsko wrote:
>
> > > Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case
> > mentioned.
> > > In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his "oepned up"
2-meter
> > > walkie talkie to call the San Diego county sheriff's office on their
> > channel
> > > when he had what he considered to be an appropriate emergency.
> > > Not only did the FCC office in San Diego confiscate his radio, they
made
> > > statements to the effect that the mere possession of a radio capable
of
> > doing
> > > that was not legal.
> > > Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.
> >
> > Far as I recall, IF it is the incident you're referring to, it was just
a
> > motorist assistance. There was no immediate danger to property or
> > life involved, just a car off the road.
> >
> > If the story I heard at the time was accurate, the kid deserved to have
> > his radio taken, and probably his license.
>
> Wrong story. This case was when a hiker fell in the mountains with a
> disabling injury, and the ham called on the sheriffs channel after trying
a few
> ham repeaters and getting no answer. The injury evidently turned out to be
not
> so serious, and the sheriff was PO'ed because the ham used his frequency.
The
> story received a lot of publicity at the time. Popular Communications
also had
> a story on it.
> Of course it's difficult to separate the facts from the spin, but the FCC
> SanDiego district Director was quoted as stating that the ham had no
authority
> to possess the radio capable of transmitting on the sheriff's channel.

If that is truly what the FCC director said, then that FCC director clerly didn't have any idea about the law.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2589. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 01:37:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcdueaiuj1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcdfn6$3g3$0@208.207.71.144...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0306121829.6ec647c8@posting.google.com...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<bcaosp$fk$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of
General
> > > > > > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that
frequency, a
> > > > > > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in
> > Canada.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > But the Rule ( Sect 97.401(d) ) says in its totality:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may
transmit
> > > > > > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > > > > > emergency communications. The channel must be shared
with
> > > > > > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service.
The
> > > > > > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > > > > > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere
in
> > > > > > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency"
```

> > applies
> > > > > here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of
> > transmitting on
> > > > > the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why
you
> > had
> > > > > the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in
San
> > Diego
> > > > > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
> > > >
> > > > The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to
> > > > be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
> > > > Part 97.
> > >
> > > Disagree. The rule WRT to Techs is no Techs below 30 mHz except for
> > > coded Techs who can operate down to 28.000. Sect. 97.401(d) does not
> > > include an exception to that rule. Ditto Novices by virtue of their
> > > set of restrictions.
> >
> > Yet we all seem to agree if it is a true emergency, which is the purpose
> > of the rule, then anyone can use it. Anyone should include
> > novices and techs.
>
> So, bottom line: Novices and Tecs have exactly the same authority as
unlicensed
> individuals in this instance.
> It's a simple statement of fact.

I can agree with that statement because the ONLY purpose allowed
for 5.1675 IS an emergency.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2590. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 01:40:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030613214004.22634.00000443@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 68831

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/13/03 8:08 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306130508.389bd296@posting.google.com>

>> In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has nothing
>to
>> do with US policy or regulations.
>
>Such a paradox. You say it does then you say it doesn't.

Such an idiot. Can't read a sentence. Shameshameshame.

>> Japan is a soverign nation.
>
>Except for the international treaties it has signed.

Oh...??? WHAT document resinds a nations soverignty?

>> It will do as it sees fit for it's own purposes.
>
>Are you absolutely certain of this? Is this unique to Japan, or can
>any other soverign nation violate international treaty for domestic
>purposes?

I didn't say it was right, LilLennie...I said they are a soverign nation
and they do wha they want to.

You still have not shown how Japanese radio policy has affected UN policy.

>> Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
>> regulation.
>
>It merely affects the non-adherence to ITU S25 for domestic use, and
>sets a precedence for any other treaty nation.

It sets a precedent for making up one's own rules when the rules they
agreed to don't suit them anymore. See: Japan.

> Japan does not have a representitve on the FCC, nor does a member
>> of the FCC have a say in Japan's Post's Ministry.
>>
>> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ
>
>Wonder whatever happened to all those US callsigns issued for Japan.

No US callsigns are presently assigned to Japan.

There ARE callsigns assigned to US Armed Forces in Japan when operating from US bases, under US control, and in accordance with rules established by the United States Air Force.

They are prohibited from communicating with Japanese Amateur Radio stations. Only US citizens who have obtained a Japanese reciprocal license issued by Japan's Posts Ministry may communcate with Japanese station, operate mobile, etc.

See: Auxiliary Military Radio System.

No, this is not a backwards accronym for MARS.

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2591. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 01:41:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA7DD6.2D7894E6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68833

Bill Sohl wrote:

> If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
> get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?

You know it doesn't always work that way, Bill. They could form a
lobbying group whose aim would be to lower the requirements. Lots of
"someones" refused to meet the requirements of just a few years ago. :-)

Dave K8MN

2592. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 02:44:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA8C33.9010708@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68834

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <bc9occ$k6l$0@pita.alt.net>, "Mark McLisson"
> <rasent@comentincradio.org> writes:
>
>
>> What ever happened to Dick Bash? He was without a
>>doubt a gentleman and a scholar. Also the finest ham radio
>>operator ever to key a microphone.
>
>
> According to QRZ.COM, he's alive and well and living in Anderson, IN:
>
> KL7IHP Lookups: 196
> RICHARD M BASH
> 33 W. 10th Street - Suite LL4
> Anderson IN 46016-1437
> USA
>
> BTW, I agree that he's a very nice chap to know. I met him at Dayton many
> years ago, and I bought one of his books, even though I had been an Extra
> for a couple of years. I find it interesting that to this day he's still an
> Advanced,
> even though he could pass the final remaining Extra test in his sleep!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Interesting, did he let his license lapse and just get it back recently?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2593. OT, but heartwarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 03:24:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EEA95A7.6090601@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68835

http://www.msnbc.com/news/925433.asp?0cv=CB10&cp1=1

http://story.news.yahoo.com/fc?cid=34&tmpl=fc&in=Business&cat=Online_Auctions

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/2943154.stm

When you like Eb*y as much as I do, these stories just kind of warm
your heart.

I just hope everyone who was taken gets their money back and learns.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2594. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 05:53:02 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bced7uqbt0@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 68836

Alun Palmer wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:bc9576$79r$3@208.206.142.72:
>
> >
> >
> > Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> >> Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)
> >
> > All the hopeful comments of the codeless aside, there is no way to
> > predict exactly how that will go until it has already gone. Horsetrading
> > goes on throughout the conference, and all it would take is one country
> > holding a couple of aces to trade who wants s25 kept.
> >
>
> Psychologists have a word for this. Can you spell d-e-n-i-a-l ?

So you can't spell r-e-a-l-i-t-y???

2595. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 12:29:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030614082909.04554.00000508@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68837

In article <Xns939874B97481elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
>news:bc9576$79r$3@208.206.142.72:
>
>>
>>
>> Bert Craig wrote:
>>
>>> Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)
>>
>> All the hopeful comments of the codeless aside, there is no way to
>> predict exactly how that will go until it has already gone. Horsetrading
>> goes on throughout the conference, and all it would take is one country
>> holding a couple of aces to trade who wants s25 kept.
>>
>
>Psychologists have a word for this. Can you spell d-e-n-i-a-l ?
>
Denial by whom, Alun? While we all know that the overwhelming majority of
delegates will vote to simply drop S25.5, there's always a chance something
will stop that particular process. Best not to assume anything until it
actually happens. There ARE some countries still in favor of S25.5, and if they
have some deals to make, things could go in any direction.

For my money, the interesting action will be to see what FCC does if/when S25.5
disappears. I'm guessing that they will simply drop Element 1 without even an
NPRM. I know there will be at least one proposal in FCC Hq. in a matter of
hours after the treaty is ratified, if the new treaty drops S25.5

The issue I really want to see dealt with is the 40 meter mess.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2596. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 12:29:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030614082909.04554.00000509@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 68838

In article <bc9occ$k6l$0@pita.alt.net>, "Mark McLisson"
<rasent@comentincradio.org> writes:

>What ever happened to Dick Bash? He was without a
>doubt a gentleman and a scholar.

Maybe in some ways.

>Also the finest ham radio operator ever to key a microphone.

I disagree. He singlehandedly undermined the examination process. Then FCC
completed the process.

He may be a nice guy but he's no hero of amateur radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2597. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 13:14:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcf794$2gk$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68839

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcdtsa$a6q$0@208.206.142.69...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
> > get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?
>
> Basically what always comes next- they seem to always want to blame code
> supporters for their woes.

You never heardthat from me. As to others that
may have made such statements...ya gotta rise
above it because their opinion doesn't change anything.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2598. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 13:24:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcf7rn$l87$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68840

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EEA7DD6.2D7894E6@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
> > get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?
>
> You know it doesn't always work that way, Bill.

Actually it does.

> They could form a
> lobbying group whose aim would be to lower the requirements. Lots of
> "someones" refused to meet the requirements of just a few years ago. :-)

They did NOT refuse to meet the requirements. Taking a
proactive role and position on changing requirements is
not the same as what Dick's statement addressed.

As to forming a "lobbying group" to change code requirements,
we all know that is already in place. I am a charter member
of that group (NCI) and hold a position on the Bd of Directors.
If anyone finds that "disgusting" that's just too bad.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2599. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 14:41:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306140641.4dc183bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68841
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bcduea$iuj$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bcdfn6$3g3$0@208.207.71.144...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:d22b54c3.0306121829.6ec647c8@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<bcaosp$fk$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of
> General
> > > > > > > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that
> frequency, a
> > > > > > > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in
> Canada.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > But the Rule ( Sect 97.401(d) ) says in its totality:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may
> transmit
> > > > > > > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > > > > > > emergency communications. The channel must be shared
> with
> > > > > > > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service.
> The
> > > > > > > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > > > > > > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere
> in
> > > > > > > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> > > > > > >
```

> > > > > >
> > > > > > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency"
> applies
> > > > > > here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of
> transmitting on
> > > > > > the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why
> you
> had
> > > > > > the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in
> San
> Diego
> > > > > > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to
> > > > > > be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
> > > > > > Part 97.
> > > > >
> > > > > Disagree. The rule WRT to Techs is no Techs below 30 mHz except for
> > > > > coded Techs who can operate down to 28.000. Sect. 97.401(d) does not
> > > > > include an exception to that rule. Ditto Novices by virtue of their
> > > > > set of restrictions.
> > > >
> > > Yet we all seem to agree if it is a true emergency, which is the purpose
> > > of the rule, then anyone can use it. Anyone should include
> > > novices and techs.
> >
> So, bottom line: Novices and Tecs have exactly the same authority as
> unlicensed
> > individuals in this instance.
> > It's a simple statement of fact.
>
> I can agree with that statement because the ONLY purpose allowed
> for 5.1675 IS an emergency.

I doubt that. You know there have to be the usual non-critical
"quickies" on the freq.

>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

w3rv

2600. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 16:46:14 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939A81E176982elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68842

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030614082909.04554.00000508@mb-m20.aol.com:

> In article <Xns939874B97481elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
>>news:bc9576$79r$3@208.206.142.72:
>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Bert Craig wrote:
>>>
>>>> Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)
>>>
>>> All the hopeful comments of the codeless aside, there is no way to
>>> predict exactly how that will go until it has already gone.
>>> Horsetrading goes on throughout the conference, and all it would take
>>> is one country holding a couple of aces to trade who wants s25 kept.
>>>
>>
>>Psychologists have a word for this. Can you spell d-e-n-i-a-l ?
>>
> Denial by whom, Alun? While we all know that the overwhelming majority
> of delegates will vote to simply drop S25.5, there's always a chance
> something will stop that particular process. Best not to assume
> anything until it actually happens.

Up to that point you are correct. There is always a chance that not all
agenda items will be discussed. I think, however, that this has been
skipped over so many times that they are under quite a lot of pressure not
to skip it again. On those previous occasions it didn't get an agenda
number, but this time it is 1.7.1. All in favour of 1.7.1 say aye -Aye.
Now how long did that take?

>There ARE some countries still in
> favor of S25.5, and if they have some deals to make, things could go in
> any direction.
>

The wording pre-agreed allows those countries to keep Morse testing. It is
likely that it will be kept in many former Soviet countries. Your scenario
of this being voted down due to a deal is therefore laughable.

> For my money, the interesting action will be to see what FCC does
> if/when S25.5 disappears. I'm guessing that they will simply drop

> Element 1 without even an NPRM. I know there will be at least one
> proposal in FCC Hq. in a matter of hours after the treaty is ratified,
> if the new treaty drops S25.5

I don't really see how the FCC can do an end run around the usual process, which normally takes about a year. So, I for one am not expecting Element 1 to be dropped until this time next year.

OTOH, in the UK, which is where I am originally from, the RA has already started it's required six week consultation period so that the comment period will close on July 11th, one week after the end of WRC 2003. This is timed to allow official publication of dropping the code test on August 1, 2003, taking immediate effect from that date.

If the FCC has a predetermined plan like that, we don't know what it is.

>
> The issue I really want to see dealt with is the 40 meter mess.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>

Well, I've read all the proposals in CQ. If we are to beleive CQ, then we are likely to get 7100-7200 made worldwide within a year or two (Phase I), and maybe 7200-7300 some years later (Phase II). Phase II seems much less assured than Phase I, and neither seem 100% certain.

2601. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 17:40:17 UTC
From: David Lafferty <dplaff@cox-internet.com>
Message-ID: <vemng0g0aede5b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68843

I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC amateur exams or commercial radio exams.

I always wondered if that means knowledge in radio is more important than knowledge in aviation!

I recall having to use study material with no questions and answers for my ham exams and 1st class commercial phone, then took a ground school class for the private pilot written and all the test questions and answers were in the class material.

But, I may just be easily confused!

73,
David K5DEL

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030614082909.04554.00000509@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <bc9occ$k6l$0@pita.alt.net>, "Mark McLisson"
> <rasent@comentincradio.org> writes:
>
> >What ever happened to Dick Bash? He was without a
> >doubt a gentleman and a scholar.
>
> Maybe in some ways.
>
> >Also the finest ham radio operator ever to key a microphone.
>
> I disagree. He singlehandedly undermined the examination process. Then FCC
> completed the process.
>
> He may be a nice guy but he's no hero of amateur radio.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2602. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 17:51:41 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcfnbdrph0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 68844

David Lafferty wrote:

> I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get
> the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC
> amateur exams or commercial radio exams.
>
> I always wondered if that means knowledge in radio is more important than
> knowledge in aviation!
>

Then you should know that there is NO pilots license ever issued on the basis of any written exam. That comes after practical hands-on training by a skilled and certified CFI. And even then, it comes only after a perspiration-inducing flight examination by a steely eyed professional flight examiner, usually under contract to the FAA. Would you *really* want to fly with a pilot who had no training other than studying the written exam pools?

Definitely apples and oranges.

>
> I recall having to use study material with no questions and answers for my
> ham exams and 1st class commercial phone, then took a ground school class
> for the private pilot written and all the test questions and answers were in
> the class material.
>
> But, I may just be easily confused!

Could be!

2603. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 17:53:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EEB6131.5030803@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68845

Seems some people just like to Bash Dick.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

David Lafferty wrote:
> I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get
> the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC
> amateur exams or commercial radio exams.
>
> I always wondered if that means knowledge in radio is more important than
> knowledge in aviation!
>
> I recall having to use study material with no questions and answers for my
> ham exams and 1st class commercial phone, then took a ground school class
> for the private pilot written and all the test questions and answers were in
> the class material.
>
> But, I may just be easily confused!
>
> 73,
> David K5DEL
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030614082909.04554.00000509@mb-m20.aol.com...
>
>>In article <bc9occ$k6l$0@pita.alt.net>, "Mark McLisson"
>><rasent@comentincradio.org> writes:
>>
>>
>>>What ever happened to Dick Bash? He was without a
>>>doubt a gentleman and a scholar.
>>
>>Maybe in some ways.
>>
>>
>>>Also the finest ham radio operator ever to key a microphone.
>>
>>I disagree. He singlehandedly undermined the examination process. Then FCC
>>completed the process.
>>
>>He may be a nice guy but he's no hero of amateur radio.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

>

2604. Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 18:05:10 UTC
From: tad danley <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEB63C0.AA2FCCE4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68846

My son holds a Tech Plus ticket, and passed the 5 wpm code test about 10 years ago. When he takes the written exam to upgrade to General, what does he need to show in order to get credit for already passing the 5 wpm test?

Thanks and 73,

--
Tad Danley, K3TD

* Anti-spam return address in use *

2605. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 19:12:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <lsKGa.3953$a7.1347370@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68847

"tad danley" <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EEB63C0.AA2FCCE4@earthlink.net...
> My son holds a Tech Plus ticket, and passed the 5 wpm code test about 10
> years ago. When he takes the written exam to upgrade to General, what
> does he need to show in order to get credit for already passing the 5
> wpm test?
>
> Thanks and 73,

A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
both the original and a photocopy.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2606. Re: Ham Educational Source - Semiconductor Physics Course

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-14 22:31:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306141431.3ae28048@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68848

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306131156.6915dbc8@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306130627.7dd67000@posting.google.com>...
> > For those who need to get up to speed on what actually makes our radios tick.
> >
> > http://britneyspears.ac/lasers.htm
> >
> Groovy, baby! But it's not the first time. You oughta see the manuals
> for the Southgate Type 7 and its predecessors...

We all know you ain't quite right James but THIS . . ?

Oh well: Beats the hell outta any physics text McGraw-Hill ever cranked out.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2607. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 00:24:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030614202411.18497.00000718@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 68849

In article <Xns939A81E176982elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20030614082909.04554.00000508@mb-m20.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns939874B97481elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
>>>news:bc9576$79r$3@208.206.142.72:

>>>> Bert Craig wrote:

>>>>> Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)

>>>> All the hopeful comments of the codeless aside, there is no way to
>>>> predict exactly how that will go until it has already gone.
>>>> Horsetrading goes on throughout the conference, and all it would take
>>>> is one country holding a couple of aces to trade who wants s25 kept.

>>>Psychologists have a word for this. Can you spell d-e-n-i-a-l ?

>> Denial by whom, Alun? While we all know that the overwhelming majority
>> of delegates will vote to simply drop S25.5, there's always a chance
>> something will stop that particular process. Best not to assume
>> anything until it actually happens.

>Up to that point you are correct. There is always a chance that not all
>agenda items will be discussed. I think, however, that this has been
>skipped over so many times that they are under quite a lot of pressure not
>to skip it again.

Maybe. To a lot of folks, amateur radio is a small-potatoes legacy service.

>On those previous occasions it didn't get an agenda
>number, but this time it is 1.7.1. All in favour of 1.7.1 say aye -Aye.
>Now how long did that take?

Not long!

But are such agenda items decided by majority vote, or must there be a
consensus? I seem to recall that it's not just who has the majority, but I
could be mistaken about that.

>>There ARE some countries still in
>> favor of S25.5, and if they have some deals to make, things could go in
>> any direction.

>The wording pre-agreed allows those countries to keep Morse testing. It is
>likely that it will be kept in many former Soviet countries.

Sure - but that's not what I'm talking about. I'm referring to keeping S25.5,
not individual countries keeping code testing.

>Your scenario
>of this being voted down due to a deal is therefore laughable.

Then we'll have a good chuckle over a Black & Tan sometime!

The point I was trying to make about a "deal" is that some countries may hold
out as a bargaining tool. "You vote our way on issue X and we'll vote your way
on issue Y". Happens all the time.

>> For my money, the interesting action will be to see what FCC does
>> if/when S25.5 disappears. I'm guessing that they will simply drop
>> Element 1 without even an NPRM. I know there will be at least one
>> proposal in FCC Hq. in a matter of hours after the treaty is ratified,
>> if the new treaty drops S25.5
>
>I don't really see how the FCC can do an end run around the usual process,
>which normally takes about a year.

Here's a scenario for ya - a bit wordy, but worth the read:

Way back in 1998, FCC put Restructuring on the table in a now-well-known NPRM.
One of the issues they asked for comments on was Morse code testing.

Out of the ~2200 comments and reply comments received, the majority not only
wanted code testing to continue, but also wanted code tests of at least two
speeds to continue. Those who wanted no code or 5 wpm only were a minority.
Lots of reasons given on both sides, which we can take as read because we've
both seen them lots of times.

But FCC swept aside the majority opinion and said in its R&O that there was
Morse code testing for any class of ham license served "no regulatory purpose"
other than compliance with S25.5. And since 5 wpm was the minimum test that FCC
thought complied with S25.5, 5 wpm was retained for treaty compliance, and no
other reason.

A few months after the R&O, a Petition for Reconsideration was sent to the FCC
on the issue. FCC denied the petition, saying essentially that their minds were
made up.

Now it's three years later. If/when S25.5 goes away, FCC can simply say
something like "We considered all of the issues and arguments re code testing
way back in 1998-99 and again in 2000. Back then we said S25.5 was the only
reason we kept the 5 wpm test. We still think that way, and without S25.5,
there's no reason to keep Element 1 any more. So we're just going to eliminate
the Element 1 requirement"

IOW: "We hashed this out three-four years ago, and we're just following up on
what was decided back then"

Reasonable?

Although I hope it doesn't play out like that, I see no reason why it couldn't. One quick paragraph from FCC dropping Element 1 for all General and Extra. Easy.

>So, I for one am not expecting Element
>1 to be dropped until this time next year.

Depends on ratification, too.
>
>OTOH, in the UK, which is where I am originally from, the RA has already
>started it's required six week consultation period so that the comment
>period will close on July 11th, one week after the end of WRC 2003. This
>is timed to allow official publication of dropping the code test on August
>1, 2003, taking immediate effect from that date.

RSGB and RA work very closely, from what I hear. Almost too closely for some folks. Ever hear of the UKRS?
>
>If the FCC has a predetermined plan like that, we don't know what it is.
>
I don't think it's predetermined, just possible. FCC might do the NPRM thing - I'm just saying they might avoid a lot of delay and paperwork. Heck, with an NPRM, both sides may launch massive comment campaigns, making more work for FCC, and possibly causing them to once again deny the majority opinion.

>> The issue I really want to see dealt with is the 40 meter mess.

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>Well, I've read all the proposals in CQ. If we are to beleive CQ, then we
>are likely to get 7100-7200 made worldwide within a year or two (Phase I),
>and maybe 7200-7300 some years later (Phase II). Phase II seems much less
>assured than Phase I, and neither seem 100% certain.

Again, nothing's certain till the ink is dry. SWBC is a big deal to some folks. From what I read, those are the current hot proposals, and the old 6900-7200 proposal has all but disappeared.

Wouldn't it be GREAT to have 200 or even all 300 kHz worldwide exclusive amateur? 40 is a great band for both domestic and dx, and is usable almost around the clock and around the sunspot cycle. Antenna size is reasonable and simple rigs can work well on the band. Only problem is that there isn't enough of it - yet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2608. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 01:20:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcghkvdmi0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 68702

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Seems some people just like to Bash Dick.....

I represent that statement!

2609. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 01:27:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EEBCBCC.6050002@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68703

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>Seems some people just like to Bash Dick.....
>
>
> I represent that statement!

hehe.. This thread is gonna spin outta control here!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2610. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 01:48:16 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68704

On Sat, 14 Jun 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "tad danley" <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EEB63C0.AA2FCCE4@earthlink.net...
> > My son holds a Tech Plus ticket, and passed the 5 wpm code test about 10
> > years ago. When he takes the written exam to upgrade to General, what
> > does he need to show in order to get credit for already passing the 5
> > wpm test?
> >
> > Thanks and 73,
>
> A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
> both the original and a photocopy.

Agreed. However, since he got it before 1994 (presumedly in 1993, since that is 10 years ago), it may simply say "Technician." In that case, he will need to bring his code element CSCE (and a copy of the CSCE) as well.

Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.

2611. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 01:56:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030614215623.07737.00001333@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68705

>Subject: Re: Dick Bash
>From: "David Lafferty" dplaff@cox-internet.com
>Date: 6/14/03 12:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <vemng0g0aede5b@corp.supernews.com>

>I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get
>the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC
>amateur exams or commercial radio exams.

Huh...?!?!

The Q&A for plot exams sure wasn't public domain when I took my Private
written in 1974.

>I always wondered if that means knowledge in radio is more important than
>knowledge in aviation!

I think if we reviewed the timeline we'd find that the FCC led the way in
mediocrity and foolheartiness.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2612. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 01:57:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030614215712.23406.00000183@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68706

In article <vemng0g0aede5b@corp.supernews.com>, "David Lafferty"
<dplaff@cox-internet.com> writes:

>I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get
>the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC
>amateur exams or commercial radio exams.

As pointed out by others, the written part of FAA exams was but one part of the
requirements. Note also that a pilot's license alone doesn't qualify someone to
design/build/maintain/repair their own airplanes....
>
>I always wondered if that means knowledge in radio is more important than
>knowledge in aviation!
>
Different things entirely. Raises a question, though - can a pilot's license be
renewed indefinitely without any sort of retesting or recertification?

>I recall having to use study material with no questions and answers for my
>ham exams and 1st class commercial phone, then took a ground school class
>for the private pilot written and all the test questions and answers were in
>the class material.

Was there someone who did to the FAA what Mr. Bash did to the FCC?

As I have heard the story, what Bash did was to ask hams coming out of FCC exam
sessions what the questions and answers were, and pay for the information. From
the recollections of many, he was able to recreate the exam Q&A fairly
faithfully.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2613. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 02:04:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030614220437.07881.00001302@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68707

>Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 6/14/03 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.

Huh?

Current FCC policy says the CSCE is good for one year for TESTING credit purposes. It is good "forever" for the purpose of granting the Novice HF privileges to a Technician.

How's that for Uncle Sam logic?

73

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2614. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 02:50:47 UTC
From: David Lafferty <dplaff@cox-internet.com>
Message-ID: <vennro625t0f8c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68709

Gee Dick, I must be confused again, dang it!

Didn't see any comment in my post that claimed the written test was all that was required for a pilots license. I was talking about the WRITTEN exams years ago between the FAA exams and the FCC exams and the open question pools..

I guess maybe I was writing between the lines with my secret computer ink. I hate when I do that...
I've turned that option off in this post, so there shouldn't be any hiddened messages.

David K5DEL

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:bcfnbdrph0@208.206.142.69...
>
>
> David Lafferty wrote:
>
> > I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get
> > the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC
> > amateur exams or commercial radio exams.
> >
> > I always wondered if that means knowledge in radio is more important than
> > knowledge in aviation!
> >
>
> Then you should know that there is NO pilots license ever issued on the basis
> of any written exam. That comes after practical hands-on training by a
> skilled and certified CFI. And even then, it comes only after a
> perspiration-inducing flight examination by a steely eyed professional flight
> examiner, usually under contract to the FAA. Would you *really* want to fly with
> a pilot who had no training other than studying the written exam pools?
>
> Definitely apples and oranges.
>
>
> >
> > I recall having to use study material with no questions and answers for

my
> > ham exams and 1st class commercial phone, then took a ground school
class
> > for the private pilot written and all the test questions and answers
were in
> > the class material.
> >
> > But, I may just be easily confused!
>
> Could be!
>
>

2615. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 02:52:08 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68708

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030614202411.18497.00000718@mb-m05.aol.com:

> In article <Xns939A81E176982elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20030614082909.04554.00000508@mb-m20.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <Xns939874B97481elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
>>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
>>>>news:bc9576$79r$3@208.206.142.72:
>
>>>>> Bert Craig wrote:
>
>>>>>> Keepin' my fingers crossed for both 40m & the S25. ;-)
>
>>>>> All the hopeful comments of the codeless aside, there is no way to
>>>>> predict exactly how that will go until it has already gone.
>>>>> Horsetrading goes on throughout the conference, and all it would
>>>>> take is one country holding a couple of aces to trade who wants s25
>>>>> kept.
>
>>>>Psychologists have a word for this. Can you spell d-e-n-i-a-l ?
>
>>> Denial by whom, Alun? While we all know that the overwhelming
>>> majority of delegates will vote to simply drop S25.5, there's always
>>> a chance something will stop that particular process. Best not to
>>> assume anything until it actually happens.
>
>>Up to that point you are correct. There is always a chance that not all
>>agenda items will be discussed. I think, however, that this has been
>>skipped over so many times that they are under quite a lot of pressure
>>not to skip it again.
>
> Maybe. To a lot of folks, amateur radio is a small-potatoes legacy
> service.
>
>>On those previous occasions it didn't get an agenda
>>number, but this time it is 1.7.1. All in favour of 1.7.1 say aye -Aye.
>>Now how long did that take?
>

> Not long!
>
> But are such agenda items decided by majority vote, or must there be a
> consensus? I seem to recall that it's not just who has the majority,
> but I could be mistaken about that.
>
>>>There ARE some countries still in
>>> favor of S25.5, and if they have some deals to make, things could go
>>> in any direction.
>
>>The wording pre-agreed allows those countries to keep Morse testing. It
>>is likely that it will be kept in many former Soviet countries.
>
> Sure - but that's not what I'm talking about. I'm referring to keeping
> S25.5, not individual countries keeping code testing.
>
>>Your scenario
>>of this being voted down due to a deal is therefore laughable.
>
> Then we'll have a good chuckle over a Black & Tan sometime!
>
> The point I was trying to make about a "deal" is that some countries
> may hold out as a bargaining tool. "You vote our way on issue X and
> we'll vote your way on issue Y". Happens all the time.
>
>>> For my money, the interesting action will be to see what FCC does
>>> if/when S25.5 disappears. I'm guessing that they will simply drop
>>> Element 1 without even an NPRM. I know there will be at least one
>>> proposal in FCC Hq. in a matter of hours after the treaty is
>>> ratified, if the new treaty drops S25.5
>>
>>I don't really see how the FCC can do an end run around the usual
>>process, which normally takes about a year.
>
> Here's a scenario for ya - a bit wordy, but worth the read:
>
> Way back in 1998, FCC put Restructuring on the table in a
> now-well-known NPRM. One of the issues they asked for comments on was
> Morse code testing.
>
> Out of the ~2200 comments and reply comments received, the majority not
> only wanted code testing to continue, but also wanted code tests of at
> least two speeds to continue. Those who wanted no code or 5 wpm only
> were a minority. Lots of reasons given on both sides, which we can take
> as read because we've both seen them lots of times.
>
> But FCC swept aside the majority opinion and said in its R&O that there
> was Morse code testing for any class of ham license served "no
> regulatory purpose" other than compliance with S25.5. And since 5 wpm
> was the minimum test that FCC thought complied with S25.5, 5 wpm was

> retained for treaty compliance, and no other reason.
>
> A few months after the R&O, a Petition for Reconsideration was sent to
> the FCC on the issue. FCC denied the petition, saying essentially that
> their minds were made up.
>
> Now it's three years later. If/when S25.5 goes away, FCC can simply say
> something like "We considered all of the issues and arguments re code
> testing way back in 1998-99 and again in 2000. Back then we said S25.5
> was the only reason we kept the 5 wpm test. We still think that way,
> and without S25.5, there's no reason to keep Element 1 any more. So
> we're just going to eliminate the Element 1 requirement"
>
> IOW: "We hashed this out three-four years ago, and we're just following
> up on what was decided back then"
>
> Reasonable?
>
> Although I hope it doesn't play out like that, I see no reason why it
> couldn't. One quick paragraph from FCC dropping Element 1 for all
> General and Extra. Easy.
>
>>So, I for one am not expecting Element 1 to be dropped until this time
>>next year.
>
> Depends on ratification, too.
>>
>>OTOH, in the UK, which is where I am originally from, the RA has
>>already started it's required six week consultation period so that the
>>comment period will close on July 11th, one week after the end of WRC
>>2003. This is timed to allow official publication of dropping the code
>>test on August 1, 2003, taking immediate effect from that date.
>
> RSGB and RA work very closely, from what I hear. Almost too closely for
> some folks. Ever hear of the UKRS?

Yes. It seems to have died, though. I agree that the RA and the RSGB are
too close. It's a pity someone couldn't keep a rival soceity going.

>>
>>If the FCC has a predetermined plan like that, we don't know what it
>>is.
>>
> I don't think it's predetermined, just possible. FCC might do the NPRM
> thing - I'm just saying they might avoid a lot of delay and paperwork.
> Heck, with an NPRM, both sides may launch massive comment campaigns,
> making more work for FCC, and possibly causing them to once again deny
> the majority opinion.
>
>>> The issue I really want to see dealt with is the 40 meter mess.
>

>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>>Well, I've read all the proposals in CQ. If we are to beleive CQ, then
>>we are likely to get 7100-7200 made worldwide within a year or two
>>(Phase I), and maybe 7200-7300 some years later (Phase II). Phase II
>>seems much less assured than Phase I, and neither seem 100% certain.
>
> Again, nothing's certain till the ink is dry. SWBC is a big deal to
> some folks. From what I read, those are the current hot proposals, and
> the old 6900-7200 proposal has all but disappeared.
>

Yes. That one seems to be dead.

> Wouldn't it be GREAT to have 200 or even all 300 kHz worldwide
> exclusive amateur? 40 is a great band for both domestic and dx, and is
> usable almost around the clock and around the sunspot cycle. Antenna
> size is reasonable and simple rigs can work well on the band. Only
> problem is that there isn't enough of it - yet.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use phone, but I think you probably guessed that already.

2616. NPR program on amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 03:08:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEBE3B7.19B9A345@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68710

This url was sent to me by Eric W3DQ in Washington. It is an NPR
program based on the book "Hello World: A Life in Ham Radio".

http://realserver.bu.edu:8080/ramgen/w/b/wbur/connection/audio/2003/06/con_0612b.rm

Dave K8MN

2617. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 03:24:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEBE76F.F325444C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68711

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EEA7DD6.2D7894E6@earthlink.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
> > > get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?
> >
> > You know it doesn't always work that way, Bill.
>
> Actually it does.
>
> > They could form a
> > lobbying group whose aim would be to lower the requirements. Lots of
> > "someones" refused to meet the requirements of just a few years ago. :-)
>
> They did NOT refuse to meet the requirements. Taking a
> proactive role and position on changing requirements is
> not the same as what Dick's statement addressed.

Yes, many DID refuse to meet the requirements for various license classes until the standards were changed. Taking a proactive (how I hate that useless word) role on changing requirements for a self-serving end is the route a large number took.

> As to forming a "lobbying group" to change code requirements,
> we all know that is already in place.

You'll have no doubt noticed the "smiley face" which I included. Yes, we all know.

> I am a charter member
> of that group (NCI) and hold a position on the Bd of Directors.
> If anyone finds that "disgusting" that's just too bad.

I've been aware of your view.

Dave K8MN

2618. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 05:15:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306142115.59f758c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68712

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030614215712.23406.00000183@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <vemng0g0aede5b@corp.supernews.com>, "David Lafferty"
> <dplaff@cox-internet.com> writes:
>
> >I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get
> >the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC
> >amateur exams or commercial radio exams.
>
> As pointed out by others, the written part of FAA exams was but one part of the
> requirements. Note also that a pilot's license alone doesn't qualify someone to
> design/build/maintain/repair their own airplanes....
> >
> >I always wondered if that means knowledge in radio is more important than
> >knowledge in aviation!
> >
> Different things entirely. Raises a question, though - can a pilot's license be
> renewed indefinitely without any sort of retesting or recertification?

Yes. As long as ya continue to pass the medicals. There are three
classes of medicals with varying times between exams, etc., gets
complicated, nothing like it in ham radio.

> >I recall having to use study material with no questions and answers for my
> >ham exams and 1st class commercial phone, then took a ground school class
> >for the private pilot written and all the test questions and answers were in
> >the class material.
>
> Was there someone who did to the FAA what Mr. Bash did to the FCC?
>
> As I have heard the story, what Bash did was to ask hams coming out of FCC exam
> sessions what the questions and answers were, and pay for the information. From
> the recollections of many, he was able to recreate the exam Q&A fairly
> faithfully.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2619. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 12:49:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306150449.31adcd3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68719

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
>
> > Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer access
> > the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> > (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
>
> OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
> ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
> service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
> your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you _effectively_
> UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was about,
> this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far as
> the internet is concerned.)
> The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they were
> talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes. An
> old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
> "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."
> Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
> power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason,
> you're off-line.

When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?

> ---

w3rv

2620. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 13:35:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bchsmn$v8a$0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 68720

N2EY wrote:

> . Raises a question, though - can a pilot's license be
> renewed indefinitely without any sort of retesting or recertification?

Private pilots must undergo a "bienniel flight review" with a certified flight instructor and have their log signed off that they have done this to be legal. This was instituted for safety reasons. The flight instructor reviews the pilots flying to try to determine if he has developed any unsafe habits and to reinforce his proper flight skills.

Dick

2621. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 13:45:44 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bchta8id0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 68721

Robert wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bcbgvv$is1$0@208.206.142.95...
> >
> >
> > Vito wrote:
> >
> > > when WARC wanted to
> > > drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied long
> > > and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might get
> > > licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.
> >
> > We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is
> running a VE
> > team for the first eight years of VE testing and during that time some
> large
> > majority of examinees came from the ranks of CBers.
> >
> > What distinguished them was that almost all had decided to become ham
> radio
> > operators, and study to meet the requirements for their license. Just like
> we did
> > before there was such a thing as CB.
> >
> > The sole part of what you say that is factual
>
> Well, you're rebuttal isn't even logical. How does the fact that
> some people learned code prove that the idea that there was a
> pro-code-testing 'movement' is urban legend? Boiled down to its logical
> components, your statement is:
>
> "Some number of CB'ers learned Morse Code,"
>
> Therefore,
>
> "There is no pro-code-testing group of hams."

Some how- I can't imagine how- you managed to distill that from my post.

NO where did I even imply there is no pro-code testing group of hams. I DID state that those hams had no control over whether or not code testing exists. But SURELY you already knew that. Vito strongly implied that procode hams are responsible for the existance of code testing becuse we didn't want any CBers to become licensed. History PROVES that to be incorrect.

Do you really believe that I would have been a VE for years if that was true, when a large portion of applicants were CBers, who did become licensed under my team? That's what you're saying.

2622. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 13:47:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bchtdrid1@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 68722

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> >
> > > Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer access
> > > the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> > > (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
> >
> > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
> > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
> > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
> > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you _effectively_
> > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was about,
> > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far as
> > the internet is concerned.)
> > The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they were
> > talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes. An
> > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
> > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."
> > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
> > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason,
> > you're off-line.
>
> When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?

I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....

2623. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 14:36:58 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bci0a8dhr1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68750

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bchta8$id$0@208.206.142.93...
>
>
> Robert wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bcbgvv$is1$0@208.206.142.95...
> > >
> > >
> > > Vito wrote:
> > >
> > > > when WARC wanted to
> > > > drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied
long
> > > > and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might
get
> > > > licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.
> > >
> > > We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is
> > running a VE
> > > team for the first eight years of VE testing and during that time some
> > large
> > > majority of examinees came from the ranks of CBers.
> > >
> > > What distinguished them was that almost all had decided to become ham
> > radio
> > > operators, and study to meet the requirements for their license. Just
like
> > we did
> > > before there was such a thing as CB.
> > >
> > > The sole part of what you say that is factual
> >
> > Well, you're rebuttal isn't even logical. How does the fact that
> > some people learned code prove that the idea that there was a
> > pro-code-testing 'movement' is urban legend? Boiled down to its logical
> > components, your statement is:
> >
> > "Some number of CB'ers learned Morse Code,"
> >
> > Therefore,
> >
> > "There is no pro-code-testing group of hams."
```

>
> Some how- I can't imagine how- you managed to distill that from my post.

Because that was about all there was to it.

> NO where did I even imply there is no pro-code testing group of hams. I
DID
> state that those hams had no control over whether or not code testing
exists.

If they didn't, how could NCI have any sway in the matter today?

> But SURELY you already knew that. Vito strongly implied that procode hams
>are responsible for the existance of code testing

Persistence, I think. At the beginning, it was arguably necessary.

> becuse we didn't want any CBers to
> become licensed. History PROVES that to be incorrect.

You're saying that the amateur community and the ARRL had ZERO
influence in the matter?

> Do you really believe that I would have been a VE for years if that was
true,
> when a large portion of applicants were CBers, who did become licensed
under >my team? That's what you're saying.

Hardly. The CBers you're talking about were willing to jump through
the hoop.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2624. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 14:39:18 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bci0kt$dp1$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68749

```
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306150449.31adcd3c@posting.google.com...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> >
> > > Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer
access
> > > the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> > > (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
> >
> > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not
just
> > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without
phone
> > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn
up
> > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
_effectively_
> > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
about,
> > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
as
> > the internet is concerned.)
> > The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they
were
> > talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes.
An
> > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
'net:
> > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around
it."
> > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does
to
> > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
reason,
> > you're off-line.
>
> When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
```

Nice dodge of the question, not that I was talking to you. Jim's
implied that the internet was down due to 9/11, but he only specifies that
he couldn't connect through his regular ISP. This simply does not prove that
the infrastructure in question was actually down, only one part of it.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2625. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 14:42:23 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bci0ku$dp1$2@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68751

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bchtdrid1@208.206.142.93...
>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > > news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> > >
> > > > Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer
access
> > > > the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> > > > (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
> > >
> > > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not
just
> > > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without
phone
> > > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn
up
> > > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal
"impossible".)
> > > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
effectively
> > > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
about,
> > > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as
far as
> > > the internet is concerned.)
> > > The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what
they were
> > > talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net
goes. An
> > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
'net:
> > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around
it."
> > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does
to
> > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever

reason,
> > > you're off-line.
> >
> > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
>
> I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....

I think you're incapable of directly answering a question put forth
by anybody that disagrees with you regarding Morse Code, and you've got NO
grasp of logic.
Jim stated that he couldn't access his usual ATT dial-up account.
This doesn't prove that he couldn't access the internet, does it?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2626. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:02:39 UTC
From: tad danley <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEC991C.174DD136@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68723

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
> both the original and a photocopy.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Thanks Dee. I'm not sure what his present ticket says but will find out. I
am concerned that after moving a few times he may not have the original CSCE.
One thing I DO know for sure is that the FCC ULS database shows his license
class as Technician Plus. Is that considered sufficient documentation?

73,

--
Tad Danley, K3TD

* Anti-spam return address in use *

2627. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:10:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615121031.00447.00000768@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68724

>Subject: Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/12/03 3:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bcanrliaf1@nd.eastky.net>
>
>
>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
>> Go easy on the blowhard. He's got real military experience, without
>> having actually served.

>Uh-oh....;)

As opposed to Brian who actually served but has no military experience.

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2628. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:14:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615121429.00447.00000769@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68725

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/13/03 1:21 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bcbqim$vo3$1@nd.eastky.net>

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bcbgvv$is1$0@208.206.142.95...

>> We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is
>running a VE
>> team for the first eight years of VE testing and during that time some
>large
>> majority of examinees came from the ranks of CBers.
>>
>> What distinguished them was that almost all had decided to become ham
>radio
>> operators, and study to meet the requirements for their license. Just like
>we did
>> before there was such a thing as CB.
>>
>> The sole part of what you say that is factual
>
> Well, you're rebuttal isn't even logical. How does the fact that
>some people learned code prove that the idea that there was a
>pro-code-testing 'movement' is urban legend? Boiled down to its logical
>components, your statement is:
>
>"Some number of CB'ers learned Morse Code,"

Dick's comments said that a significant number of CBers decided to become
licensed Amateurs and then met the existing requirements to do so.

He did not mentuion Code. Just "the requirements".

One need not mention "Code" in todays context in order meet "requirements"
either.

>Therefore,
>
>"There is no pro-code-testing group of hams."

How did you glean that from Dick's comments?

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2629. Re: Ham Educational Source - Semiconductor Physics Course

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:23:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615122324.27503.00000517@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68726

In article <d22b54c3.0306141431.3ae28048@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0306131156.6915dbc8@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0306130627.7dd67000@posting.google.com>...
>> > For those who need to get up to speed on what actually makes our radios
>tick.
>> >
>> > http://britneyspears.ac/lasers.htm
>> >
I didn't write it, I just pointed it out.

>> Groovy, baby! But it's not the first time. You oughta see the manuals
>> for the Southgate Type 7 and its predecessors...
>
>We all know you ain't quite right James but THIS . . ?

The text is kinda dry but the diagrams make up for it.
>
>Oh well: Beats the hell outta any physics text McGraw-Hill ever cranked out.

If only I'd had that book back in EE school...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2630. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:23:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615122325.27503.00000518@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68727

In article <Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>>>OTOH, in the UK, which is where I am originally from, the RA has
>>>already started it's required six week consultation period so that the
>>>comment period will close on July 11th, one week after the end of WRC
>>>2003. This is timed to allow official publication of dropping the code
>>>test on August 1, 2003, taking immediate effect from that date.
>>
>> RSGB and RA work very closely, from what I hear. Almost too closely for
>> some folks. Ever hear of the UKRS?
>
>Yes. It seems to have died, though. I agree that the RA and the RSGB are
>too close. It's a pity someone couldn't keep a rival soceity going.

From what I read, the UKRS was blacklisted from the start by the RA. As in 'We
don't even want to hear what you have to say'

>>>If the FCC has a predetermined plan like that, we don't know what it
>>>is.

>> I don't think it's predetermined, just possible. FCC might do the NPRM
>> thing - I'm just saying they might avoid a lot of delay and paperwork.
>> Heck, with an NPRM, both sides may launch massive comment campaigns,
>> making more work for FCC, and possibly causing them to once again deny
>> the majority opinion.
>>
>>>> The issue I really want to see dealt with is the 40 meter mess.
>>
>>>Well, I've read all the proposals in CQ. If we are to beleive CQ, then
>>>we are likely to get 7100-7200 made worldwide within a year or two
>>>(Phase I), and maybe 7200-7300 some years later (Phase II). Phase II
>>>seems much less assured than Phase I, and neither seem 100% certain.
>>
>> Again, nothing's certain till the ink is dry. SWBC is a big deal to
>> some folks. From what I read, those are the current hot proposals, and
>> the old 6900-7200 proposal has all but disappeared.

>Yes. That one seems to be dead.

Guess the folks below 7000 made a better argument...
>
>> Wouldn't it be GREAT to have 200 or even all 300 kHz worldwide
>> exclusive amateur? 40 is a great band for both domestic and dx, and is
>> usable almost around the clock and around the sunspot cycle. Antenna
>> size is reasonable and simple rigs can work well on the band. Only

>> problem is that there isn't enough of it - yet.

>Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
>call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most
>of the DX never listen where I can transmit.

Split operation for DX has been common for decades. No big deal. The 40 meter
situation is worse because:

1) the DX can't work you on-freq using 'phone even if he/she wants to.
2) the DX has to try to hear you through multi-KW SWBC

>Yes, I only use phone, but I
>think you probably guessed that already.

I remember this discussion from before.

Getting the SWBC out of 7100-7200 or even all the way up to 7300 will solve a
lot of problems.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2631. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:36:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <9g1Ha.4146$a7.1490250@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68728

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
>
> > Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer
access
> > the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> > (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
>
> OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
> ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
> service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
> your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
effectively
> UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
about,
> this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
as
> the internet is concerned.)
> The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they
were
> talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes.
An
> old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
> "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around
it."
> Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
> power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
reason,
> you're off-line.

The entire phone system in that area was jammed up. You have to go over
local lines to get to the long distance lines. Phone traffic often took
more than an hour to get into and out of the area for an extended period of
time. The emergency workers could not have operated effectively on this
basis, thus the advantages of wireless.

Keep in mind that all commercial services, including the internet, are
designed for handling normal traffic volumes with a SMALL margin for peak
traffic. Even with no problems of any kind, there have been occasions when

that peak volume exceeded the capacity and people could not get through when they wanted to (you have probably experienced this when trying to call family at certain times of the day on major holidays). When you combine damage to the system with a major increase in traffic, commercial systems simply are not the right method to handle emergency traffic. They can't handle it efficiently and that includes the internet. Emergency preparedness agencies in this country know that and in most areas actively solicit the involvement of amateur radio operators.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2632. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:37:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Dh1Ha.4147$a7.1490400@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68729

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Sat, 14 Jun 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "tad danley" <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EEB63C0.AA2FCCE4@earthlink.net...
> > > My son holds a Tech Plus ticket, and passed the 5 wpm code test about
10
> > > years ago. When he takes the written exam to upgrade to General, what
> > > does he need to show in order to get credit for already passing the 5
> > > wpm test?
> > >
> > > Thanks and 73,
> >
> > A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
> > both the original and a photocopy.
>
> Agreed. However, since he got it before 1994 (presumedly in 1993, since
that
> is 10 years ago), it may simply say "Technician." In that case, he will
need
> to bring his code element CSCE (and a copy of the CSCE) as well.
>
> Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.

I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.

Dee D. Flint

2633. It's another fun Sunday on 14.313

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 16:43:13 UTC
From: Unca Meat <hotmen4cow@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eeca212@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 68730
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It's another Sunday on 14.313 and guess who
is on there playing Gospel and C&W music
again....????

Yup......It's "him" again. (complete with his new
mode of operation...."Hi-Fi" SSB)

Don't y'all wish this goofball would go back to holding up
his (bad grammar filled) hand written "hell and brimstone"
posterboard signs on the streetcorners in the
downtown business district, just like he used to do
in days past...?

Why is it in Ham Radio do we always *seem* to attract
all the screwballs and ex-mental patients? Can someone
explain this...?

2634. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 17:41:19 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcib3uhju1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68752

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030615121429.00447.00000769@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....
> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
> >Date: 6/13/03 1:21 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bcbqim$vo3$1@nd.eastky.net>
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:bcbgvv$is1$0@208.206.142.95...
>
> >> We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is
> >running a VE
> >> team for the first eight years of VE testing and during that time some
> >large
> >> majority of examinees came from the ranks of CBers.
> >>
> >> What distinguished them was that almost all had decided to become ham
> >radio
> >> operators, and study to meet the requirements for their license. Just
like
> >we did
> >> before there was such a thing as CB.
> >>
> >> The sole part of what you say that is factual
> >
> > Well, you're rebuttal isn't even logical. How does the fact that
> >some people learned code prove that the idea that there was a
> >pro-code-testing 'movement' is urban legend? Boiled down to its logical
> >components, your statement is:
> >
> >"Some number of CB'ers learned Morse Code,"
>
> Dick's comments said that a significant number of CBers decided to
become
> licensed Amateurs and then met the existing requirements to do so.

> He did not mentuion Code. Just "the requirements".

The existing requirements, at the time.

> One need not mention "Code" in todays context in order meet
"requirements"
> either.

Well, I thought the VE program pre-dated the no-code tech license,
and that Dick was against the no-code tech ticket concept.

I stand corrected.

> >Therefore,
> >
> >"There is no pro-code-testing group of hams."
>
> How did you glean that from Dick's comments?
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2635. Re: The "Pirate" Boom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 17:42:24 UTC
From: dmills@spamblock.demon.co.uk
Message-ID: <06bicb.3c1.ln@spamblock.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 68903
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In alt.radio.pirate Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:

<Snip>

> time, they'll likely put something into the rules (I believe they outlawed a
> passive reflector type device - essentially an antenna which would
> re-radiate police radar frequencies much more effectively than an untuned
> body - which had a diode which had an audio signal fed to it. This
> modulated signal would be recovered by the radar set and see the modulation
> much more strongly than the Doppler effect so you could set the speed the
> cop would see).

I have seen a nice variation on this theme, a set of hub caps with corner
cube reflectors mounted appropriately... Apparent speed changes rapidly
hopefully preventing the detector getting a good lock.

Regards, Dan.
--
** The email address *IS* valid, do NOT remove the spamblock
And on the evening of the first day the lord said.....
.... LX 1, GO!; and there was light.

2636. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 18:23:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615142303.20198.00000267@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68731

In article <bc7dlv$9bc$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
>Date: Wed, 11 Jun 2003 10:17:43 -0400

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030611092938.16033.00000397@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> >Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>> >Date: 6/9/03 3:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <bc2qtr$g4f$1@nd.eastky.net>

> but the FACTS are that the Federal Communications
>> Commission, a panel of politically appointed civilians, makes/enforces the
>> radio regulations by which we all must adhere.
>
> Yes, but that's not the point, is it? If the opinions of members of
>the ARS and/or the public at large were irrelevant, there wouldn't be a time
>period during which one submits those opinions on regulatory matters.

Sorry, Robert, that's faulty logic. The existence of a comment system does not prove public comment is seriously considered by The Commission. They are free to ignore public comment and act however they think best. It's NOT a democratic process.

Three examples:

In the recent restructuring, the majority of comments were not only pro-code-testing, but pro-code-testing with at least two code test speeds. FCC went with the minority opinion and enacted minimum code testing.

Also in the recent restructuring, the NPRM proposed 4 license classes and new standards for the written tests. But the R&O enacted three license classes and reduced written testing dramatically. Why?

In the NPRM for the new 5 MHz allocation, the vast majority of comments were for a band 150 kHz wide, allowing a wide variety of modes. FCC unanimously endorsed the proposal - but then, AFTER the comment and reply comment periods had ended, NTIA sent a letter to FCC opposing the idea. (This was long after Sept 11, 2001 btw) FCC had to backpedal furiously from its position.
>
>> That there are opinions that do not reflect that is obvious. Your
>>quotes
>> from Google are valid OPINIONS, no doubt, but carry no force of law.
>
> I seriously doubt the logic of a lot of 'em.

There's an equal array of anti-code-test quotes available from Google.
>
>> >Well, enough of that.
>>
>> Yep...enough of that. Unless you can show me a point of law which
>refutes
>> it.
>
> Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
>public _opinion_?
>
Sure - but they don't have to act on it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2637. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 18:23:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615142307.20198.00000268@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68732

In article <20030614220437.07881.00001302@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 15 Jun 2003 02:04:37 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Date: 6/14/03 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
>>Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
>
> Huh?

> Current FCC policy says the CSCE is good for one year for TESTING credit
>purposes.

You're both somewhat right and somewhat wrong.

CSCEs are good for 365 days (not one year, which has burned a few folks each leap year). After that they are not good for any element credit, code or written.

However, certain expired documents ARE good for element credit:

Quoting Part 97:

ï¿½97.505 Element credit.

(a) The administering VEs must give credit as specified below to an examinee holding any of the following license grants or license documents:

(1) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal) FCC-granted Advanced Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and 3.

(2) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal) FCC-granted General Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and 3.

(3) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal) FCC-granted Technician Plus Class operator (including a Technician Class operator license granted before February 14, 1991) license grant: Elements 1 and 2.

(4) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal) FCC-granted Technician Class operator license grant: Element 2.

(5) An unexpired (or expired) FCC-granted Novice Class operator license grant: Element 1.

(6) A CSCE: Each element the CSCE indicates the examinee passed within the previous 365 days.

(7) An unexpired (or expired less than 5 years) FCC-issued commercial radiotelegraph operator license or permit: Element 1.

(8) An expired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license document granted before March 21, 1987: Element 3.

(9) An expired or unexpired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license document granted before February 14, 1991: Element 1.

(b) No examination credit, except as herein provided, shall be allowed on the basis of holding or having held any other license grant or document.

(End of Part 97 quote)

Note that an old expired Tech can be good for Element 3, and an old expired Novice or Tech can be good for Element 1. But a CSCE more than 365 days old gives no credit. Only a license can carry element credit beyond 365 days.

>It is good "forever" for the purpose of granting the Novice HF
>privileges to a Technician.

Yup.

> How's that for Uncle Sam logic?

Makes no sense at all.

It gets worse - consider these scenarios:

Expired Novice or Tech-with-code licenses are good for Element 1, but other expired-beyond-the-grace-period licenses are not. So someone who held a Novice 50 years ago and let it expire gets Element 1 credit, but someone who held an Extra and let it expire 732 days ago gets no credit.

In similar fashion, an expired Tech from before March 21, 1987 is worth Element 3, but not Element 2! Also, no other expired-beyond-the-grace-period license is worth written element credit.

Huh?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2638. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 20:14:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EECD3C9.3080601@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68733

Robert wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
>
>
>>Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer access
>>the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
>>(temporary) number provided by AT&T.
>
>
> OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
> ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
> service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
> your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)

If there is no service where YOU are, there is no service. When a
catastrophe happens, the fact that the systems work in other places is
100 percent irrelevant in the area in which the emergency is going on.

> Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you _effectively_
> UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was about,
> this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far as
> the internet is concerned.)

> The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they were
> talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes. An
> old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
> "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."

DIfferent argument. If someone took out any particular ISP, no one
would notice? I'll bet you a cup of coffee that the users of that ISP
would notice.

> Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
> power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason,
> you're off-line.

Do you carry two cell phones?

You seem to be looking at this from an incorrect perspective, Robert.
The area in which communications is needed becomes precisely the area in
which it doesn't exist. The person trying to call for help with his cell
phone sin't going to get through if his signal isn't getting out because
the tower was blown down by a hurricane or tornado, or if th ewhole area

is without power. If the phone lines are down (or even just blocked because everyone's relatives are calling to see if their loved ones are okay, you won't connect to your ISP. If the cable goes down, I can't connect to mine.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2639. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 20:15:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EECD400.4090007@adelphia.net>
Source record: 68734

Brian Kelly wrote:
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
>
>>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>>news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
>>
>>
>>>Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer access
>>>the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
>>>(temporary) number provided by AT&T.
>>
>> OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
>>ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
>>service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
>>your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
>>Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
>>itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
>>subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you _effectively_
>>UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was about,
>>this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far as
>>the internet is concerned.)
>> The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they were
>>talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes. An
>>old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
>>"The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."
>> Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
>>power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason,
>>you're off-line.
>
>
> When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?

Maybe he uses a woodburning ISP?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2640. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:24:28 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcio69mqk1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68754

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EECD3C9.3080601@adelphia.net...
> Robert wrote:
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> >
> >
> >>Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer
access
> >>the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> >>(temporary) number provided by AT&T.
> >
> >
> > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not
just
> > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without
phone
> > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn
up
> > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
>
>
> If there is no service where YOU are, there is no service.

Hogwash. All he's said was that the ATT ISP was down, NOT his phone
system.

>When a
> catastrophe happens, the fact that the systems work in other places is
> 100 percent irrelevant in the area in which the emergency is going on.

Man, reading comprehension is definitely in short supply around this
place.

>
> > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
effectively
> > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
about,
> > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
as
> > the internet is concerned.)
>

> > The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they
were
> > talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes.
An
> > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
'net:
> > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around
it."
>
> DIfferent argument.

Again, re-read what's been said. An ATT server is NOT his phone
system. In fact, the way he worded things, it sounded like his phone system
was working, it just couldn't get through to THAT server.

>If someone took out any particular ISP, no one
> would notice? I'll bet you a cup of coffee that the users of that ISP
> would notice.

Yes, they probably would. Too bad that's irrelevant to the point.

> > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does
to
> > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
reason,
> > you're off-line.
>
> Do you carry two cell phones?
>
> You seem to be looking at this from an incorrect perspective, Robert.
> The area in which communications is needed becomes precisely the area in
> which it doesn't exist.

No, I'm simply looking at the survivability of the system, starting
with Mr. Hampton's point.

> The person trying to call for help with his cell
> phone sin't going to get through if his signal isn't getting out because
> the tower was blown down by a hurricane or tornado, or if th ewhole area
> is without power. If the phone lines are down (or even just blocked
> because everyone's relatives are calling to see if their loved ones are
> okay, you won't connect to your ISP. If the cable goes down, I can't
> connect to mine.

If you'd bother to actually _read_ what I've said, instead of having
some sort of knee-jerk reaction as if I'm supporting the original incredibly
stupid troll, the entire question revolves around, in this specific
instance, if Jim's phone was working or not. He was external to the disaster
area and has implied that it was impossible to connect to the internet -
I've simply asked if he tried any other options - if he didn't, then his
anecdote is useless.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2641. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:25:15 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152119220.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68735

On Sun, 15 Jun 2003, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 6/14/03 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
> >Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
>
> Huh?
>
> Current FCC policy says the CSCE is good for one year for TESTING credit
> purposes. It is good "forever" for the purpose of granting the Novice HF
> privileges to a Technician.
>
> How's that for Uncle Sam logic?

...But the FCC didn't issue any "Technician Plus" licenses between February 1991 and June 1994 - so proof of this license class will ONLY be on a CSCE. Very few people applied for a corrected license. Those who got code CSCE's after June 1994 should have a license that says (or said) "Technician Plus" on it, but some VE teams may not have gotten the word in a timely manner.

Now, as for "logic", note that only an expired Novice or Technician license can give credit for code, while expired (beyond the grace period) General, Advanced, or Extra licenses will not - yet they oviously have a code element embedded in them. There was LITTLE to no logic in the FCC's ruling.

2642. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:26:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126030.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68736

On Sun, 15 Jun 2003, tad danley wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
> > both the original and a photocopy.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Thanks Dee. I'm not sure what his present ticket says but will find out. I
> am concerned that after moving a few times he may not have the original CSCE.
> One thing I DO know for sure is that the FCC ULS database shows his license
> class as Technician Plus. Is that considered sufficient documentation?

If he has the license that says such, he doesn't need the CSCE.

2643. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:27:59 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68737

```
On Sun, 15 Jun 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Sat, 14 Jun 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > "tad danley" <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3EEB63C0.AA2FCCE4@earthlink.net...
> > > > My son holds a Tech Plus ticket, and passed the 5 wpm code test about
> 10
> > > > years ago. When he takes the written exam to upgrade to General, what
> > > > does he need to show in order to get credit for already passing the 5
> > > > wpm test?
> > > >
> > > > Thanks and 73,
> > >
> > > A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
> > > both the original and a photocopy.
> >
> > Agreed. However, since he got it before 1994 (presumedly in 1993, since
> that
> > is 10 years ago), it may simply say "Technician." In that case, he will
> need
> > to bring his code element CSCE (and a copy of the CSCE) as well.
> >
> > Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
>
> I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.

Perhaps you bought your license?

The FCC didn't make the distinction between Technicians with code and without
until June 1994 - at least as far as their licensing database goes.
```

2644. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:42:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcip86$os1$0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 68738

tad danley wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
> > both the original and a photocopy.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Thanks Dee. I'm not sure what his present ticket says but will find out. I
> am concerned that after moving a few times he may not have the original CSCE.
> One thing I DO know for sure is that the FCC ULS database shows his license
> class as Technician Plus. Is that considered sufficient documentation?
>

It should be. Print it from the FCC database and take it along. All Tech Plus licensees passed a code test.

Dick

2645. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:46:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615174644.25815.00000740@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68740

In article <bcb4eg$n6m$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>So far around here, it looks like the score is:
>
>Pro-testers insulting, belittling and otherwise avoiding the issue of
>testing: All of 'em.

Robert,

There's a lot of that going on on the anti-test side, too.

Perhaps you can point out to me where I've insulted someone without
provocation.
>
>Pro-testers providing rational supporting argument: Zero
>
How about this:

The tests for an amateur radio license should be based on what hams actually do with radio. For example, the writtens contain lots of questions on FM repeaters because there are lots of amateur radio FM repeaters. The writtens contain zero questions on FM stereo multiplex and doppler radar because very few, if any, hams do FM stereo multiplex or doppler radar.

On the HF/MF amateur bands, manual Morse/CW is used widely and extensively by hams. It's the second-most popular mode on those bands, and there are times when it is the most popular mode on them. Manual Morse/CW is such a big part of HF/MF amateur radio that it's only reasonable and rational that there should be a test for that skill, since skills cannot be tested with written test methods alone.

Now some folks may say they have no intention of using Morse/CW, so why require them to learn it at any level of skill, even the most basic? If we follow that reasoning, however, most of what's in the written tests has to be eliminated as well. For example, why someone who only wants to operate modern manufactured equipment have to learn so much theory? Why learn the band edges, mode designators, or formulas when you can look them up?

What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on opinions, nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used against the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2646. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:46:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030615174645.25815.00000741@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 68739

In article <bchsmn$v8a$0@208.206.142.93>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> . Raises a question, though - can a pilot's license be
>> renewed indefinitely without any sort of retesting or recertification?
>
> Private pilots must undergo a "bienniel flight review" with a certified
>flight
>instructor and have their log signed off that they have done this to be
>legal.
> This was instituted for safety reasons. The flight instructor reviews the
>pilots
>flying to try to determine if he has developed any unsafe habits and to
>reinforce
>his proper flight skills.
>
TNX, Dick. I take it the above is in addition to the medicals.

Imagine if hams had to do that on a biennial basis...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2647. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 21:52:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcipqapvb0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 68741

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20030614220437.07881.00001302@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >Date: 15 Jun 2003 02:04:37 GMT
> >
> >>Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
> >>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >>Date: 6/14/03 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
> >
> >>Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> >
> > Huh?
>
> > Current FCC policy says the CSCE is good for one year for TESTING credit
> >purposes.
>
> You're both somewhat right and somewhat wrong.
>
> CSCEs are good for 365 days (not one year, which has burned a few folks each
> leap year). After that they are not good for any element credit, code or
> written.
>
> However, certain expired documents ARE good for element credit:
>
> Quoting Part 97:
>
> ï¿½97.505 Element credit.
>
> (a) The administering VEs must give credit as specified below to an examinee
> holding any of the following license grants or license documents:
>
> (1) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
> FCC-granted Advanced Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and 3.
>
> (2) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
> FCC-granted General Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and 3.
>
> (3) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
> FCC-granted Technician Plus Class operator (including a Technician Class

> operator license granted before February 14, 1991) license grant: Elements 1
> and 2.
>
> (4) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
> FCC-granted Technician Class operator license grant: Element 2.
>
> (5) An unexpired (or expired) FCC-granted Novice Class operator license grant:
> Element 1.
>
> (6) A CSCE: Each element the CSCE indicates the examinee passed within the
> previous 365 days.
>
> (7) An unexpired (or expired less than 5 years) FCC-issued commercial
> radiotelegraph operator license or permit: Element 1.
>
> (8) An expired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license document granted
> before March 21, 1987: Element 3.
>
> (9) An expired or unexpired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license
> document granted before February 14, 1991: Element 1.
>
> (b) No examination credit, except as herein provided, shall be allowed on the
> basis of holding or having held any other license grant or document.
>
> (End of Part 97 quote)
>
> Note that an old expired Tech can be good for Element 3, and an old expired
> Novice or Tech can be good for Element 1. But a CSCE more than 365 days old
> gives no credit. Only a license can carry element credit beyond 365 days.
>
> >It is good "forever" for the purpose of granting the Novice HF
> >privileges to a Technician.
>
> Yup.
>
> > How's that for Uncle Sam logic?
>
> Makes no sense at all.
>
> It gets worse - consider these scenarios:
>
> Expired Novice or Tech-with-code licenses are good for Element 1, but other
> expired-beyond-the-grace-period licenses are not. So someone who held a Novice
> 50 years ago and let it expire gets Element 1 credit, but someone who held an
> Extra and let it expire 732 days ago gets no credit.
>
> In similar fashion, an expired Tech from before March 21, 1987 is worth Element
> 3, but not Element 2! Also, no other expired-beyond-the-grace-period license is
> worth written element credit.
>

> Huh?
>

Ya gotta wonder what zoo the writer of all that excaped from.

2648. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-15 22:33:23 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcis8gobs1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68753

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030615174644.25815.00000740@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bcb4eg$n6m$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
writes:
>
> >So far around here, it looks like the score is:
> >
> >Pro-testers insulting, belittling and otherwise avoiding the issue of
> >testing: All of 'em.
>
> Robert,
>
> There's a lot of that going on on the anti-test side, too.
>
> Perhaps you can point out to me where I've insulted someone without
> provocation.

I'll re-phrase: Most of 'em.

> >Pro-testers providing rational supporting argument: Zero
> >
> How about this:
>
> The tests for an amateur radio license should be based on what hams
actually do
> with radio.
> For example, the writtens contain lots of questions on FM repeaters
> because there are lots of amateur radio FM repeaters. The writtens
contain
> zero questions on FM stereo multiplex and doppler radar because very few,
if
> any, hams do FM stereo multiplex or doppler radar.

Personally, I found the test to be imbalanced; I'm not idealogically
wedded to any ideas about changing it, though.

> On the HF/MF amateur bands, manual Morse/CW is used widely and extensively
by
> hams. It's the second-most popular mode on those bands, and there are
times
> when it is the most popular mode on them. Manual Morse/CW is such a big
part of
> HF/MF amateur radio that it's only reasonable and rational that there
should be
> a test for that skill, since skills cannot be tested with written test

methods
> alone.

What a ham _needs_ to be (imo) is a good operator/technician - his operations, in whatever mode or band, should be conducted lawfully, skillfully and with his equipment operating within the specified norms. That's what the testing should 'select' for, again, imo.

> Now some folks may say they have no intention of using Morse/CW, so why require
> them to learn it at any level of skill, even the most basic? If we follow that
> reasoning, however, most of what's in the written tests has to be eliminated as
> well. For example, why someone who only wants to operate modern
>manufactured equipment have to learn so much theory?

Your delving into what some would call part of the very definition of amateur radio, aren't you? Anyway....theory applies across the board, to all radios, all bands, all antennas and feedlines and what-have-you. All hams, sort of by definition, operate radios. They should all have some basic understanding of what radios do and how they do it, so they can operate properly, within given parameters. That some few people (or nearly all of 'em) only plan on operating "modern" equipment is irrelevant, possibly even a red herring; we're _all_ operating radios of various types, and they all obey the same laws of physics.

>Why learn the band edges, mode
> designators, or formulas when you can look them up?

I'll agree with that, actually. A good operator will either wind up knowing 'em through repetition, or look things up to be _sure_. Testing for it seems pointless as it doesn't demonstrate anything but ability to memorize. As to formulas, I have the perfect solution - provide the formulas, plus some. Print 'em on the back of the circuit diagram sheet, and use questions that'll show knowledge of actually knowing how to put 'em to use. Throw in some formulas that are just plain _wrong_, like scrambling up Ohm's law. If somebody understands _theory_, they can figure out what's bogus and what isn't.

> What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on opinions,
> nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used against
> the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?

The argument doesn't apply because, as I said, we're _all_ using radios, and the theory applies across the board.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2649. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 00:30:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EED0F8A.7080606@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 68745

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> According to QRZ.COM, he's alive and well and living in Anderson, IN:
>
> KL7IHP Lookups: 196
> RICHARD M BASH
> 33 W. 10th Street - Suite LL4
> Anderson IN 46016-1437
> USA
>
> BTW, I agree that he's a very nice chap to know. I met him at Dayton many
> years ago, and I bought one of his books, even though I had been an Extra
> for a couple of years. I find it interesting that to this day he's still an
> Advanced,
> even though he could pass the final remaining Extra test in his sleep!

Not everyone has to have an extra ticket to feel like they are
somebody.

2650. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 00:32:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EED1012.9030303@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 68746

Dick Carroll; wrote:

>
>
> Then you should know that there is NO pilots license ever issued on the basis
> of any written exam. That comes after practical hands-on training by a
> skilled and certified CFI. And even then, it comes only after a
> perspiration-inducing flight examination by a steely eyed professional flight
> examiner.

I know that feeling.

2651. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 02:08:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <RE9Ha.4195$a7.1558515@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68742

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152119220.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 15 Jun 2003, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> > >Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
> > >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> > >Date: 6/14/03 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
> >
> > >Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> >
> > Huh?
> >
> > Current FCC policy says the CSCE is good for one year for TESTING
credit
> > purposes. It is good "forever" for the purpose of granting the Novice
HF
> > privileges to a Technician.
> >
> > How's that for Uncle Sam logic?
>
> ...But the FCC didn't issue any "Technician Plus" licenses between
February
> 1991 and June 1994 - so proof of this license class will ONLY be on a
CSCE.
> Very few people applied for a corrected license. Those who got code
CSCE's
> after June 1994 should have a license that says (or said) "Technician
Plus" on
> it, but some VE teams may not have gotten the word in a timely manner.
>

Incorrect. I received my Tech Plus license in 1992 and it said Tech Plus.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2652. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 02:14:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <YJ9Ha.4208$a7.1559232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68743

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 15 Jun 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > On Sat, 14 Jun 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > > "tad danley" <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3EEB63C0.AA2FCCE4@earthlink.net...
> > > > > My son holds a Tech Plus ticket, and passed the 5 wpm code test
about
> > 10
> > > > > years ago. When he takes the written exam to upgrade to General,
what
> > > > > does he need to show in order to get credit for already passing
the 5
> > > > > wpm test?
> > > > >
> > > > > Thanks and 73,
> > > >
> > > > A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely.
Take
> > > > both the original and a photocopy.
> > >
> > > Agreed. However, since he got it before 1994 (presumedly in 1993,
since
> > that
> > > is 10 years ago), it may simply say "Technician." In that case, he
will
> > need
> > > to bring his code element CSCE (and a copy of the CSCE) as well.
> > >
> > > Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> >
> > I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.
>
> Perhaps you bought your license?

You are way off base here.

>
> The FCC didn't make the distinction between Technicians with code and
without
> until June 1994 - at least as far as their licensing database goes.

I don't know what the database said but I do know what my license said.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2653. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 02:21:24 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <EQ9Ha.163315$d51.236297@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 68744

>
> Yes it is an attitude problem. I have nothing against Morse as a hobby
> mode, in fact I hope to use it alot when I retire - maybe even get good

Hobby mode ????? Boy I never heard that before ..Veto you should register that with a TM ... What about phone ... non- hobby mode ??? partial hobby mode ??? I need to grab a few Iron City Beers to ponder this one.

> at it. OTOH I deeply resent people using unrealistic barriers to keep

Here we go again with the ...They (whoever that is or are) keeping us out. Unrealistic ....If it were so then why do I have thousands of CW contacts over the years ...whith thousands of other ops oh well I guess more beer is needed to get a grasp on this one ....

> others from sharing what is, after all, public property. Requiring Morse
> before allowin

I guess I can go to the local park and dig up an acre or two and plant my beans ....of course it is public property so no problem right ??????

g people to talk on recreational (amateur) bands is the
> same as requiring a flint-and-steel campfire before renting a hotel room
> in a national forest.

Aha another variation on the standard transmission argument ...come on fellows you can get better than this ....

Vito hope to work you on CW one of these days

God Bless .....KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon PA

A strict adherent to the fact that CW does not always get through but neither does my E-mail at times.

2654. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 03:30:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EED39EE.60905@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68747

>
>
>Now, as for "logic", note that only an expired Novice or Technician license can
>give credit for code, while expired (beyond the grace period) General,
>Advanced, or Extra licenses will not - yet they oviously have a code element
>embedded in them. There was LITTLE to no logic in the FCC's ruling.
>
>
But those licenses (general, advanced & extra) required code faster than
5WPM. To some
brearucrat, faster code speed is not the same as 5WPM, and the new rules
spelled out
"5 WPM". He may have thought that 13 or 20 was easier than 5? The guy
was probably
someone who usually did rules for broadcast radio or TV.....

2655. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 03:43:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EED3CDA.8090201@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68748

N2EY wrote:

>I disagree. He singlehandedly undermined the examination process. Then FCC
>completed the process.
>
>
Does it really require more knowledge and skill to operate on 14.160
than on 14.305?
Power levels are the same, equipment and antennas are the same. Only
reason for the
distinction on frequency is that your (suppressed) carrier frequency is
easily measured
at a remote location. It's not like VFR vs IFR in general aviation....
Ham radio didn't suffer any degradation of safety because of Bash. Bash was
the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's high school
algebra
tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or the frat house's
library of
previous year's tests at some college.

2656. Re: *** !!! FREE MARTHA !!! *** |--------- ivoknyda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 05:14:39 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bckt9k$k23ea$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68775

Here is the text of the message below I had sent as I found it in my "sent items" folder, as I delete all newgroup messages in each newsgroup after reading/responding. If you wish further, feel free to look it up on your own as well.

****
****

Seems like I remember someone offering a similar wish as to intention to ALL no-coders (regardless of the specific individual) in this newsgroup. Do I smell hypocrisy??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >Hopefully she will be swabbing stainless steel toilets
> >in some medium-security prision someplace.
> >She is nothing but another Leona Hemsley.
> >Hopefully someday, she dies broke in an alcohol-induced stupor.
>
> How charming! Why would you wish that kind of fate on anyone?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

****
****

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20030610212656.09580.00000706@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <bc2f6u$eimek$21@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry,
> >
> >1. Re-read the line where it says "similar wish as to intention." It does
> >not state that this person wished for IDENTICAL action to the no-coders.
> >Again, similar does not equal exact.
> >
> >2. If the line stated "Seems like I remember Larry Roll
> >offering....." instead of the word "someone" I would be more than
> >happy to offer an apology. How do you know I was or was not referring to

> >you? Guilty conscience??? How do you know I wasn't referring to another
> >person here????
> >
>
> Ryan:
>
> OK, fine. Provide the quote which identifies this "someone."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

That is not my responsibility..... that is yours if you have a issue with it.

Again, re-read the original message. "seems like i remember" does not indicate anything more that an attempt to refresh the memory. It was never stated "I know "so-n-so said so as a fact."

Ryan

2657. Re: Speaking Of Foxhunting... 2x

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 05:39:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bckt9n$k23ea$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68776

Noticed on Comedy Central (that is a comedy related channel on cable tv for the hams here, no its not public tv or NPR) the "Insomniac with Dave Attel" show featured a foxhunting crew somewhere near Albequrqe (sp.?) New Mexico.

Thought it was kind of interesting to see it on that channel!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030612155509.07705.00000694@mb-m18.aol.com...
> Day before yesterday (10 June) we had a line of thunderstorms roll
through
> here in the late afternoon. On my way to work I heard a
"thump-thump-thump" on
> the local EMS channel of 155.340. This is also known as the HEAR
frequency for
> "Hospital Ambulance Emergency Radio" channel.
>
> Late Tuesday night it was apparent that it wasn't going away. It was
> irregular and without modulation and was recycling at a 1-2
pulse-per-second
> rate. When I got off shift at 0700 Wednesday morning, it was still there.
I
> got some initial bearings using my FT-2600 and a hand held yagi, but due
to the
> valley we are in, it was difficult to avoid the ghosting. I finally got a
> decent steer from a prominent local "scenic view" site below Sewanee, TN.
But
> having been up all night overtook me and I headed for the barn.
>
> At the 0200Z ARES net that evening, NCS gave me the net for a while,
and
> stations from around the area were asked to check 155.340 and report thier
> findings. After 15 minutes on the net we'd narrowed this down from a 125
> square-mile area to a 30 mile area just west of Shelbyville, TN.
>
> I hit the road around 1400Z and started north from Winchester towards
> Tullahoma, TN and took bearings from the airport. Sure enough, northwest
was
> the plan. I stopped at the Motlow Fire Tower and took a bering from the
tower
> which confirmed my findings from the airport. I continued west until the

> signal started to drop and then would find the next northbound highway.
> Eventually I made my way to Lewisburg, TN.
>
> The signal to this point had never been more than half scale on the
> s-meter, even with the RF squelch off and the AF squelch wide open.
Within
> minutes it was full scale with the RF squelch at "FULL ON" and nothing but
a
> paper clip in the SO-239. Sure enough, I wound up at the door of Marshall
> County Medical Center. I had thought earlier that it proably was a
hospital,
> but it could have just as easily been an EMS station or a VFD department
so I
> tried to not let myself be swayed by the blue "H" signs, although every
time a
> turn was dictated, there was a sign!
>
> I ID'd myself to the ER staff, first as a fellow nurse then explained
why
> I was there. Sure enough, they said they'd not been able to use the radio
for
> two days and had "griped" it to thier maint department, but they were not
aware
> it was latched in transmit! The maint department man and I walked up the
hill
> to the shed at the base of the tower, and as he opened the door I could
hear
> the "click-click-click" of a ratcheting relay. He pulled the plug and the
> thumping in my HT went silent!
>
> In retrospect, I would have got this done a lot faster had I had a
good
> step-attenuator at my disposal. Also, the "Lil-Elper" DF unit we use in
CAP
> was not capable of using alternate RF sources, so that was of no use. I
think
> I'll look into the "Vectronics" unit.
>
> Just thought I'd share. It was a really beautiful day to be driving
in
> Middle Tennessee.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2658. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 05:44:17 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bckt9p$k23ea$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68777

> > Six could start to be utilized more on a local basis if hams started to
use
> > it more. I have found that my case, mobile operation, that using SSB I
have
> > had local range use of 30-70 miles radius of my location. FM on six
gets
> > anywhere from around 10-30 miles local use (simplex) This is my
personal
> > experience. It seems like we still could use that band a little more
than
> > just during band openings. I see ham's usage of six meters akin to only
> > caring for your kids when they are good, and totally disowning them when
> > they are bad!
>
> But why am I going to buy a 6 meter rig to talk local. I think one of
> the reasons we have 6 meters in the first place is that it is such an
> unrelaible band. That may be the fun of it for some hams, but for
> business use, they would have to use it for local use, then put up with
> occasional major intereference from everyone else on that frequency.

Why not use it? What the hell could it hurt? I have personally gotten at
least 50 or more miles on SSB on six meters. Sounds like a case of the old
line "Hi, I am a ham radio operator, I have tons of friends around the
world.....but none in my backyard."

>
>
> >
> >
> > As far as 220, 902 and 1.2Ghz allocations, if there were more gear
> > available, at a reasonable price from our bigger manufacturers (Kenwood,
> > Icom, Yaesu, Alinco etc.) may be we would hear more on these bands. I
would
> > also like to see them make more all-mode gear for those bands, (or at
least
> > SSB) for some of the different digital modes. PSK would be cool to use
on
> > 6m, 2m, and 70cm as an alternative to packet. In fact I can see some
merit
> > in using PSK over packet in those bands for public service/emergency
comms!
> >
> >
> > If we as a whole don't start using the bands.... we are gonna lose them.
> > And I probably will be the first to say, "I told ya so!"

>
>
> Sure enough. Problem is, the really high band's utility for most
> amateur type work are pretty limited. I enjoy the articles about how so
> and so conjured up some rig to talk to his buddy across town, and the
> gargantuan efforts to set distance record between a few hams, but that's
> about the extent of the people there. It is a fertile ground for short
> distance comms, how many do we need? If we were on the air in droves
> there, I would take up a "my cold dead fingers" approach. But we're not,
> and I'm not going to become an experimenter at those freq's just to camp
> out there.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

The bands above 2.4 gig I don't see alot of use for, but I am sure there are
others that would differ in opinion. Christ, we don't utilize the
frequencies we do have between 50Mhz and 2.4Ghz enough.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>

2659. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 10:45:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306160245.6bbf44cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68755

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bchtdrid1@208.206.142.93>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
> > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."
> > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
> > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason,
> > > you're off-line.
> >
> > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
>
> I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....

Was prolly not here before desktop computers happened. Sheltered
existence. Needs to spend a long weekend in the deep woods without a
keyboard, matches or a UPS.

2660. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 11:32:07 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bck9sr$an6$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 68757

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306160245.6bbf44cc@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bchtdrid1@208.206.142.93>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>
> > > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
'net:
> > > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes
around it."
> > > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it
does to
> > > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
reason,
> > > > you're off-line.
> > >
> > > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> > > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
> >
> > I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....
>
> Was prolly not here before desktop computers happened.

Long before, half-wit.

> Sheltered
> existence. Needs to spend a long weekend in the deep woods without a
> keyboard, matches or a UPS.

I'd like to see you spend a week in the desert with a satellite
radio and a case of c-rations, might jolt some sense into that thick skull
of yours so you'd understand the concept that "ISP down" doesn't equal
"phone lines down".

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/11/2003

2661. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 11:45:19 UTC
From: Roland Stiner <nk2u@1stconnect.com>
Message-ID: <zZhHa.145$B5.22@fe01.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 68756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

> This should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.

Where in the constitution does it give Freebanders the right to break the
law?

2662. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 12:22:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030616082259.14458.00000304@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68758

In article <bcis8gobs1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

> I'll re-phrase: Most of 'em.

Thanks.

>> >Pro-testers providing rational supporting argument: Zero

>> How about this:

>> The tests for an amateur radio license should be based on what hams
>> actually do with radio.

>> For example, the writtens contain lots of questions on FM repeaters
>> because there are lots of amateur radio FM repeaters. The writtens
>> contain
>> zero questions on FM stereo multiplex and doppler radar because very few,
>> if any, hams do FM stereo multiplex or doppler radar.
>
> Personally, I found the test to be imbalanced; I'm not idealogically
>wedded to any ideas about changing it, though.

Interesting! I find the test unbalanced, too - tests many things at a very
shallow level. Juast my opinion, of course.

How do is the test imbalanced in your opinion?
>
>> On the HF/MF amateur bands, manual Morse/CW is used widely and extensively
>> by hams. It's the second-most popular mode on those bands, and there are
>> times
>> when it is the most popular mode on them. Manual Morse/CW is such a big
>> part of
>> HF/MF amateur radio that it's only reasonable and rational that there
>> should be
>> a test for that skill, since skills cannot be tested with written test
>> methods alone.
>
> What a ham _needs_ to be (imo) is a good operator/technician - his
>operations, in whatever mode or band, should be conducted lawfully,
>skillfully and with his equipment operating within the specified norms.
>That's what the testing should 'select' for, again, imo.

OK, fine - then it makes sense for there to ba a test of basic operating skill.
And Morse/CW skill is a basic operating skill in amateur radio.
>
>> Now some folks may say they have no intention of using Morse/CW, so why
>> require

>> them to learn it at any level of skill, even the most basic? If we follow
>> that
>> reasoning, however, most of what's in the written tests has to be
>> eliminated as
>> well. For example, why someone who only wants to operate modern
>> manufactured equipment have to learn so much theory?
>
> Your delving into what some would call part of the very definition of
>amateur radio, aren't you?

Perhaps - but there are plenty of folks who would say Morse/CW skill is
part of the very definition of amateur radio, too.

It's one thing to say "hams should be knowledgeable about radio theory"
and quite a different thing to say "hams should have to pass Test X in
radio theory to get the license".

>Anyway....theory applies across the board, to all
>radios, all bands, all antennas and feedlines and what-have-you.

But not all of the theory. To operate HF CW, I don't really need to
know very much about VHF propagation, FM repeaters, satellites,
and a whole lot of other stuff that's on the test. But those things are
a big part of passing the written test.

>All hams,
>sort of by definition, operate radios. They should all have some basic
>understanding of what radios do and how they do it, so they can operate
>properly, within given parameters.

Agreed - but they don't all operate the same radios. How much theory is needed
to operate an HT?

>That some few people (or nearly all of
>'em) only plan on operating "modern" equipment is irrelevant, possibly even
>a red herring; we're _all_ operating radios of various types, and they all
>obey the same laws of physics.

Sorry, that "laws of physics" line is a red herring. Practical radio is more
about technology and engineering than about physics and science.

>>Why learn the band edges, mode
>> designators, or formulas when you can look them up?
>
> I'll agree with that, actually. A good operator will either wind up
>knowing 'em through repetition, or look things up to be _sure_. Testing for
>it seems pointless as it doesn't demonstrate anything but ability to
>memorize.

So there goes a big chunk of the written test. In fact, most of the regs are
memorization....

>As to formulas, I have the perfect solution - provide the
>formulas, plus some. Print 'em on the back of the circuit diagram sheet, and

>use questions that'll show knowledge of actually knowing how to put 'em to
>use.

Such as? Remember, the structure of the test is multiple choice.

And there's still the question - why MUST those things be on the test? Why
can't
hams simply look up, say, the theory of dipole antennas, rather than having to
answer
any questions on them?

>Throw in some formulas that are just plain _wrong_, like scrambling up
>Ohm's law.

On the formula sheet?

>If somebody understands _theory_, they can figure out what's
>bogus and what isn't.

Perhaps - but why test for those formulas at all? Our licenses are for
operating, not solving problems in theory.
>
>> What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on
>>opinions,
>> nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used
>> against
>> the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
>
> The argument doesn't apply because, as I said, we're _all_ using
>radios, and the theory applies across the board.
>
Only the most basic theory applies across the board. And there's no requirement
to use any particular technology, just as there's no requirement to use any
particular mode.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2663. More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 12:31:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030616083115.04279.00001165@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68759

The Associated Press ran a nice pro-Amateur Radio item entitled "Amateur radio helps in disasters" in the Sunday papers. Locally it was on B2 of the Chattanooga Times Free Press.

The first rant to fizzle is the assertion that Amateur radio doesn't get any "general media" time. Seems to me the Associated Press is sufficiently mainstream in anyone's book.

The next one is in paragraph three of the story. Seems I am not the only one who considers Amateur Radio to be more that "just" a hobby..."Actually, it's a public service" says the AP item. "Some" person(s) in this forum (unlicensed, and obviously poorly informed...) has insisted that no one outside of Amateur Radio is aware of it's emergency preparedness role. Seems that assumption is incorrect.

The item goes on to discuss Skywarn and Amateur Radio's move into the digital age. More rants fizzle in the hands of disinterested third parties....

It adds a personal touch, mentioning briefly the "family tradition" of W5UGD and how KA2CLX and her hubby became Hams together.

All in all....Good PR for Amatuer Radio from a respected source.

It just keeps getting better and better.

"I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."

73

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2664. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 12:44:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcke37fsu0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 68760

Robert Casey wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
> >I disagree. He singlehandedly undermined the examination process. Then FCC
> >completed the process.
> >
> >
> Does it really require more knowledge and skill to operate on 14.160
> than on 14.305?
> Power levels are the same, equipment and antennas are the same. Only
> reason for the
> distinction on frequency is that your (suppressed) carrier frequency is
> easily measured
> at a remote location. It's not like VFR vs IFR in general aviation....
> Ham radio didn't suffer any degradation of safety because of Bash. Bash was
> the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's high school
> algebra
> tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or the frat house's
> library of
> previous year's tests at some college.

So require all hams to take the Extra class test? No beginner classes?
Instead it has gone the other way...Extra class licenses are made easy-
the clear result of such activity as Bash engaged in..

2665. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 12:45:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcke5dfsu1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 68761

Robert wrote:

> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306150449.31adcd3c@posting.google.com...
> > "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > > news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> > >
> > > > Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer
> access
> > > > the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> > > > (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
> > >
> > > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not
> just
> > > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without
> phone
> > > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn
> up
> > > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> > > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
> _effectively_
> > > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
> about,
> > > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
> as
> > > the internet is concerned.)
> > > The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they
> were
> > > talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes.
> An
> > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
> 'net:
> > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around
> it."
> > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does
> to
> > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
> reason,
> > > you're off-line.
> >

> > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
>
> Nice dodge of the question, not that I was talking to you. Jim's
> implied that the internet was down due to 9/11, but he only specifies that
> he couldn't connect through his regular ISP. This simply does not prove that
> the infrastructure in question was actually down, only one part of it.

That's what you evidently can't understannd-the part that is always down in an emergency is the part most needed for relief of that emergency.

2666. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 12:52:09 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bckehpgnb0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 68762

Robert wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bchta8id0@208.206.142.93...
> >
> >
> > Robert wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bcbgvv$is1$0@208.206.142.95...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Vito wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > when WARC wanted to
> > > > > drop Morse a couple decades ago the FCC-led US delegation lobbied
> long
> > > > > and hard to keep it. Why? Because "we" were afraid (gasp) CBrs might
> get
> > > > > licensed so "we" demamded the code requirement stay in the treaties.
> > > >
> > > > We DID???? That sure escapes my memory! In fact what I remember is
> > > running a VE
> > > > team for the first eight years of VE testing and during that time some
> > > large
> > > > majority of examinees came from the ranks of CBers.
> > > >
> > > > What distinguished them was that almost all had decided to become ham
> > > radio
> > > > operators, and study to meet the requirements for their license. Just
> like
> > > we did
> > > > before there was such a thing as CB.
> > > >
> > > > The sole part of what you say that is factual
> > >
> > > Well, you're rebuttal isn't even logical. How does the fact that
> > > some people learned code prove that the idea that there was a
> > > pro-code-testing 'movement' is urban legend? Boiled down to its logical
> > > components, your statement is:
> > >
> > > "Some number of CB'ers learned Morse Code,"
> > >
> > > Therefore,

> > >
> > > "There is no pro-code-testing group of hams."
> >
> > Some how- I can't imagine how- you managed to distill that from my post.
>
> Because that was about all there was to it.
>
> > NO where did I even imply there is no pro-code testing group of hams. I
> DID
> > state that those hams had no control over whether or not code testing
> exists.
>
> If they didn't, how could NCI have any sway in the matter today?
>
> > But SURELY you already knew that. Vito strongly implied that procode hams
> >are responsible for the existance of code testing
>
> Persistence, I think. At the beginning, it was arguably necessary.
>
> > becuse we didn't want any CBers to
> > become licensed. History PROVES that to be incorrect.
>
> You're saying that the amateur community and the ARRL had ZERO
> influence in the matter?
>
> > Do you really believe that I would have been a VE for years if that was
> true,
> > when a large portion of applicants were CBers, who did become licensed
> under >my team? That's what you're saying.
>
> Hardly. The CBers you're talking about were willing to jump through
> the hoop.
>

Ah, so it wassn't "meeting the requirements" by learning a basic communications skill widely used in ham radio, it was just "jumping through hoops". I see. You're just another kid avoiding everything you can avoid.

Bye!

2667. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 12:53:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bckejvgnb1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 68763

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bchtdrid1@208.206.142.93>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net:
> > > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."
> > > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to
> > > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason,
> > > > you're off-line.
> > >
> > > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> > > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
> >
> > I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....
>
> Was prolly not here before desktop computers happened. Sheltered
> existence. Needs to spend a long weekend in the deep woods without a
> keyboard, matches or a UPS.

Prolly never survive.

2668. Re: Callsign changes on WRC agenda

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 12:54:33 UTC
From: Martin <mabmrtn.delete.this@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <verfgbo7j1q0b3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68764

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns939797E6A11FFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
> news:20030611005337.02197.00000578@mb-m12.aol.com:
>
> > In article <ae406dc2.0306101823.c377fb0@posting.google.com>,
> > elektros@yahoo.com (elektros) writes:
> >
> >>I took a look at the official WRC 2003 website. I was looking for info
> >>on s.25, but all I found on that was that it's definitely on the
> >>agenda. What I also found on the agenda was a proposal to change ham
> >>callsigns to avoid running out of them. I couldn't find any more
> >>details.
> >>
> >>Alun, N3KIP
...
>
> So, Len, if you know how to navigate the site, what is the proposed change
> to callsigns?

Basically, they are proposing to legalize longer callsigns - I think that
the current rules only allow for four characters following the country
prefix e.g. one digit plus three letters max. They are not proposing
compulsory callsign reissue - just allowing for longer callsigns to be
issued if the national authority feel it is necessary.

Martin (G8FXC & M3ABL)

2669. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 13:36:19 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bckh9b$dk4$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69011

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> That's what you evidently can't understannd-

I understand far more than you suspect, oh arrogant one.

>the part that is always down in an
> emergency is the part most needed for relief of that emergency.

Explains why your mouth is always going at full-throttle.

Try reading it all over again, but for _comprehension_. One person's
anecdote about a specific ISP doesn't mean diddly, not without further
clarification on what he actually attempted to _do_.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2670. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 14:12:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EEDD04A.2030806@psu.edu>
Source record: 68766

Robert wrote:
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306150449.31adcd3c@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
>
> news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
>
>>>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>>>news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer
>>>
> access
>
>>>>the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
>>>>(temporary) number provided by AT&T.
>>>
>>> OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not
>>
> just
>
>>>ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without
>>
> phone
>
>>>service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn
>>
> up
>
>>>your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
>>>Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
>>>itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
>>>subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
>>
> _effectively_
>
>>>UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
>>
> about,
>
>>>this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
>>

> as
>
>>>the internet is concerned.)
>>> The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they
>>
> were
>
>>>talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes.
>>
> An
>
>>>old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
>>
> 'net:
>
>>>"The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around
>>
> it."
>
>>> Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does
>>
> to
>
>>>power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
>>
> reason,
>
>>>you're off-line.
>>
>>When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
>>tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
>
>
> Nice dodge of the question, not that I was talking to you. Jim's
> implied that the internet was down due to 9/11, but he only specifies that
> he couldn't connect through his regular ISP. This simply does not prove that
> the infrastructure in question was actually down, only one part of it.

A long long time ago in this thread, some anonymous person (just like
you "Robert") noted that:

Quote from Tarapia Tapioco:

>>>Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
>>>CW coders.
>>>For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
>>>solution is Internet, not CW.

>>>Anyway CW will be dead soon, D-DAY minus
>>>48 hours for WRC-2003 !

End quote from Tarapia Tapioco.

That one ISP going down does not affect the web is not in question. The web was designed specifically to not be vulnerable to individual nodes being up or down. Maybe *you* are arguing that, but the rest of us are responding to the initial posters assertion that the Internet is the way to go for emergency comms.

Go back and read the thread from that angle, and maybe it will make a bit more sense to you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2671. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 14:37:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EEDD632.6010409@psu.edu>
Source record: 68767

```
Robert wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EECD3C9.3080601@adelphia.net...
>
>> Robert wrote:
>>
>>> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>>> news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no
>>>> longer
>>>
> access
>
>>>> the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a
>>>> new (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
>>>
>>>
>>> OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not
>>
> just
>
>>> ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you
>>> without
>>
> phone
>
>>> service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might
>>> burn
>>
> up
>
>>> your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal
>>> "impossible".)
>>
>>
>> If there is no service where YOU are, there is no service.
>
>
> Hogwash. All he's said was that the ATT ISP was down, NOT his phone
> system.
```

Doesn't matter. The point is that some people are claimin that

>
>> When a catastrophe happens, the fact that the systems work in other
>> places is 100 percent irrelevant in the area in which the emergency
>> is going on.
>
>
> Man, reading comprehension is definitely in short supply around this
> place.
>

Maybe you aren't having the same discussion the rest of us are, "Robert"

>
>>> Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the
>>> 'net itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse*
>>> groups, and one subject I remember being debated is, what would
>>> happen if you_effectively_ UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly,
>>> which was what the discussion was about, this effectively nukes
>>> that system, it's effectively non-existent as far as the internet
>>> is concerned.)

>>> The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they
>>> were talking about),is that there would be no effect as far as
>>> the net goes. An old expression may apply, regarding why censorship
>>> won't work on the 'net:
>
>>> "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes
>>> around it."
>
>> DIfferent argument.
>
>
> Again, re-read what's been said. An ATT server is NOT his phone
> system. In fact, the way he worded things, it sounded like his phone
> system was working, it just couldn't get through to THAT server.

Quote from Tarapia Tapioco:

> Nobody lives on the Sun except some silly
> CW coders.
> For serious rescue transmissions on Earth, THE
> solution is Internet, not CW.
>
> Anyway CW will be dead soon, D-DAY minus
> 48 hours for WRC-2003 !

End Quote

And in the context of what that anonymous poster noted, if he couldne't
get through, and if he was in one of the nodes where there was a need
for comms, then there would'nt be any comms if that were the only method
available.

>
>> If someone took out any particular ISP, no one would notice? I'll
>> bet you a cup of coffee that the users of that ISP would notice.
>
>
> Yes, they probably would. Too bad that's irrelevant to the point.
>
>
>
>>> Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does
>>
> to
>
>>> power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for
>>> whatever
>>
> reason,
>
>>> you're off-line.
>>
>> Do you carry two cell phones?
>>
>> You seem to be looking at this from an incorrect perspective,
>> Robert. The area in which communications is needed becomes
>> precisely the area in which it doesn't exist.
>
>
> No, I'm simply looking at the survivability of the system, starting
> with Mr. Hampton's point.

He said he could no longer access the internet from AT&T. I believe
him. After a week, he apparently got on with another number. If he was
involved in emergency work and using the internet for it, it wouldn't
have worked.

>
>> The person trying to call for help with his cell phone sin't going
>> to get through if his signal isn't getting out because the tower
>> was blown down by a hurricane or tornado, or if th ewhole area is
>> without power. If the phone lines are down (or even just blocked
>> because everyone's relatives are calling to see if their loved ones
>> are okay, you won't connect to your ISP. If the cable goes down, I
>> can't connect to mine.
>
>
> If you'd bother to actually _read_ what I've said, instead of having
> some sort of knee-jerk reaction as if I'm supporting the original
> incredibly stupid troll, the entire question revolves around, in this
> specific instance, if Jim's phone was working or not. He was external
> to the disaster area and has implied that it was impossible to
> connect to the internet - I've simply asked if he tried any other

> options - if he didn't, then his anecdote is useless.

Sure, from that perspective no one node going out will bring the whole network down, cell system or internet. They aren't designed that way. No argument there. No point in arguing it either - its as close to a given as you can get.

But he didn't imply that no one could get on the net. He specifically wrote that HE could not get on via AT&T until a week later.

Phil Kane however noted in a previous post that "for serious emergencies, say bye-bye to the Internet". This is a very broad statement, but within the context, he was correct. This is because in the area in which the emergency is, there is very likely not going to be any available internet or cell phone coverage, due to the support structure going away. And those places are where the communications are going to be needed.

Why do you post anonymously?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2672. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 14:43:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EEDD787.3050705@psu.edu>
Source record: 68769

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Robert wrote:

<some snippage>
>>
>> Nice dodge of the question, not that I was talking to you. Jim's
>>implied that the internet was down due to 9/11, but he only specifies that
>>he couldn't connect through his regular ISP. This simply does not prove that
>>the infrastructure in question was actually down, only one part of it.
>
>
> That's what you evidently can't understannd-the part that is always down in an
> emergency is the part most needed for relief of that emergency.
>

I think Robert is having his own argument on a different topic here,
Dick. His argument is correct, but it's a different argument nonetheless.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2673. Upgrade from pre-1987 Technician to General class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 14:48:25 UTC
From: Graybeard <law32@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZMkHa.50657$lo.4783085@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 68768

I feel like I am beating a dead horse, after reading several posts, but I still have a problem and need help. I obtained my Technician license in 1984 while working at Motorola in South Florida. Moved several times while there and no longer have original license documentation.

I recently retired and moved to the West Orlando area in Florida, and changed the address on my license. I would now like to upgrade to General Class, which I never obtained in South FL since most of my friends were on the 2-meter repeaters there.

From the information that I have read, the FCC does not maintain old data base info; only the current license data. I obtained info from web site QRZ.com which lists my original 1984 license date from the March 1993 QRZ Ham Radio Callsign Database. I printed the info from the web site.

I also read that I must apply at a VE session showing evidence of having held a Technician license prior to 1987 to obtain a General Class upgrade. Will the copy of the QRZ.com info be acceptable to the VE? Is that all I require?

Also, can anyone tell me how to find a VE in the Orlando area, since I recently moved here and have been inactive.

73
WA4TFK

--
Graybeard

2674. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 14:55:04 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcklpg$f6p$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69006

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> > Personally, I found the test to be imbalanced; I'm not
idealogically
> >wedded to any ideas about changing it, though.
>
> Interesting! I find the test unbalanced, too - tests many things at a very
> shallow level. Juast my opinion, of course.
>
> How do is the test imbalanced in your opinion?

Pretty much what we go into below - too much stuff (like bands) that
a 'newbie' really should look up before he keys his radio anyway. What I
think of as regulatory 'trivia', etc.

> >
> >> On the HF/MF amateur bands, manual Morse/CW is used widely and
extensively
> >> by hams. It's the second-most popular mode on those bands, and there
are
> >> times
> >> when it is the most popular mode on them. Manual Morse/CW is such a big
> >> part of
> >> HF/MF amateur radio that it's only reasonable and rational that there
> >> should be
> >> a test for that skill, since skills cannot be tested with written test
> >> methods alone.
> >
> > What a ham _needs_ to be (imo) is a good operator/technician -
his
> >operations, in whatever mode or band, should be conducted lawfully,
> >skillfully and with his equipment operating within the specified norms.
> >That's what the testing should 'select' for, again, imo.
>
> OK, fine - then it makes sense for there to ba a test of basic operating
skill.
> And Morse/CW skill is a basic operating skill in amateur radio.

But there's no practical test of any _other_ operating skill. How
many Techs (or anybody else, for that matter) know the entire phonetic
alphabet? Too many people grew up on a diet of 1-Adam 12, etc. and have been
overexposed to the excreble result of the telecom union and "Frank, Adam,
Baker, heck, lets just make it up as we go' phonetic alphabet. As a
genuinely fundamental 'skill', an entry-level test ought to at least require
the examinee write out the phonetic alphabet. This isn't going to cost more

than a scrap of paper and a moment of the VE's time. Some _general_
knowledge of Q and Z signals (well, just Q I guess), net procedures, that
sort of thing.

> >> Now some folks may say they have no intention of using Morse/CW, so why
> >> require
> >> them to learn it at any level of skill, even the most basic? If we
follow
> >> that
> >> reasoning, however, most of what's in the written tests has to be
> >> eliminated as
> >> well. For example, why someone who only wants to operate modern
> >> manufactured equipment have to learn so much theory?
> >
> > Your delving into what some would call part of the very definition
of
> >amateur radio, aren't you?
>
> Perhaps - but there are plenty of folks who would say Morse/CW skill is
> part of the very definition of amateur radio, too.

Yes, in the past.

> It's one thing to say "hams should be knowledgeable about radio theory"
> and quite a different thing to say "hams should have to pass Test X in
> radio theory to get the license".

> >Anyway....theory applies across the board, to all
> >radios, all bands, all antennas and feedlines and what-have-you.
>
> But not all of the theory. To operate HF CW, I don't really need to
> know very much about VHF propagation,

You don't need to know anything about propagation to operate any
radio in any mode, but that knowledge will make your operation more
effective.

> FM repeaters, satellites,
> and a whole lot of other stuff that's on the test. But those things are
> a big part of passing the written test.

There's that imbalance again. Chicken and egg - the first radio I
bought was a 2-meter, and it's hard to argue that I didn't go that route
because of a certain amount of emphasis. And now, my existence as a user
of 2-meter increases the number of users - which in the long haul (generally
speaking) could lead to even more emphasis on the test, because gee whiz
we're getting all these people on 2-meter, gotta be sure they know what
they're doing.....hhmmm.

> >All hams,
> >sort of by definition, operate radios. They should all have some basic
> >understanding of what radios do and how they do it, so they can operate
> >properly, within given parameters.

>
> Agreed - but they don't all operate the same radios. How much theory is
needed
> to operate an HT?

None, but that's true of any radio. The argument here is, really, do
you want just operators, or _skilled_ operators? Learning and knowing theory
promotes operator _skill_, while CW/Morse simply does not, if it did, it'd
be required for that reason alone for professionals. That it's being phased
out across the board is sufficient proof that it's irrelevant to having good
operators; a lot of that other 'stuff', on the other hand, isn't.

> >That some few people (or nearly all of
> >'em) only plan on operating "modern" equipment is irrelevant, possibly
even
> >a red herring; we're _all_ operating radios of various types, and they
all
> >obey the same laws of physics.
>
> Sorry, that "laws of physics" line is a red herring. Practical radio is
more
> about technology and engineering than about physics and science.

I'm not sure what you mean by 'practical' radio. Are you arguing
(for whatever reason) that theory should be dropped in favor of
tech/engineering type questions?

> >>Why learn the band edges, mode
> >> designators, or formulas when you can look them up?
> >
> > I'll agree with that, actually. A good operator will either wind
up
> >knowing 'em through repetition, or look things up to be _sure_. Testing
for
> >it seems pointless as it doesn't demonstrate anything but ability to
> >memorize.
>
> So there goes a big chunk of the written test. In fact, most of the regs
are
> memorization....

Yep. I'd say the only regs that ought to be tested should do with
safety and emergencies. Anything else can be looked up and will be learned
through use.

> >As to formulas, I have the perfect solution - provide the
> >formulas, plus some. Print 'em on the back of the circuit diagram sheet,
and
> >use questions that'll show knowledge of actually knowing how to put 'em
to
> >use.
>

> Such as? Remember, the structure of the test is multiple choice.

Testing techniques isn't my strong point, but I've seen it done.
Having the answers available is a bigger stumbling block.

> And there's still the question - why MUST those things be on the test? Why
> can't
> hams simply look up, say, the theory of dipole antennas, rather than
having to
> answer any questions on them?

You're arguing from the erroneous position that knowledge of morse
code is as fundamental as knowledge of radio wave propagation without having
actually _proven_ that it is, and in the face of a lot of real-world
evidence that it's not.
If we accept that the idea is true, then to properly test for
practical knowledge, then facility in all modes needs to be demonstrated.
This is patently a ridiculous notion.

>
> >Throw in some formulas that are just plain _wrong_, like scrambling up
> >Ohm's law.
>
> On the formula sheet?

Yep.

> >If somebody understands _theory_, they can figure out what's
> >bogus and what isn't.
>
> Perhaps - but why test for those formulas at all? Our licenses are for
> operating, not solving problems in theory.

The testing is supposed to be creating a 'pool of skilled operators
and technicians', if I remember correctly. A skilled operator/technician
understands theory, and if a person understands theory, they can easily
solve problems in it, hence testing for it would be a valid requirement.

> >> What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on
> >>opinions,
> >> nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used
> >> against
> >> the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
> >
> > The argument doesn't apply because, as I said, we're _all_ using
> >radios, and the theory applies across the board.
> >
> Only the most basic theory applies across the board.

I disagree with where you went with that.

>And there's no requirement
> to use any particular technology, just as there's no requirement to use

any
> particular mode.

Actually, there is. To use that HF technology, I have to use Morse
Code at least once.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2675. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 14:59:10 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcklvkfdi1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69010

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Ah, so it wassn't "meeting the requirements" by learning a basic
communications
> skill widely used in ham radio, it was just "jumping through hoops". I
see.
> You're just another kid avoiding everything you can avoid.

Dick, I qualified in submarines, spent nearly 10 years in the Navy,
and worked with a little communications outfit at MacDill AFB you've never
heard of. I've done things and been places that would leave you confused
about whether to shit or go blind, and then you'd fart and close one eye.

> Bye!

Good riddance, loser.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2676. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:02:10 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bckmduffa1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69007

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> A long long time ago in this thread, some anonymous person (just like
> you "Robert") noted that:

"Robert" is no more or less 'anonymous' than "Mike Coslo". It's my
name, my e-mail isn't even munged.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2677. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:06:48 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bckmdvffa2@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69012

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> That one ISP going down does not affect the web is not in question. The
> web was designed specifically to not be vulnerable to individual nodes
> being up or down. Maybe *you* are arguing that, but the rest of us are
> responding to the initial posters assertion that the Internet is the
> way to go for emergency comms.

Can I help it if you're responding to a retard?

> Go back and read the thread from that angle, and maybe it will make a
> bit more sense to you.

It _all_ makes sense to me. What the supposedly sensible posters
apparently don't get is that the information regarding what happened with
ATT during 9/11 is wholly insufficient to reach the conclusion that's been
reached.
I suggest YOU go back and re-read what I originally asked of Mr.
Hampton. And if you're going to get into a thread started by an idiot troll,
don't assume that ensuing serious discussion (as I _initally_ assumed; my
bad) supports the original idiotic contention.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2678. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:09:14 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bckmif$fm3$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69009

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Why do you post anonymously?

For somebody who seems to know a little bit about the net, you don't
know anything about anonymous posting. Do you know how to look at headers,
check e-mail, look up my NNTP posting host? Give it a try, "Mike".

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2679. Word from Geneva...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:23:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bckne3$44e$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 68770

The International Telecommunication Union's (ITU) World
Radiocommunication
Conference 2003 got under way June 9 in Geneva, Switzerland. More than

2600 delegates and other participants are expected to attend the
four-week
conference, chaired by Dr Veena Rawat of Canada.

"Several items on the conference agenda are of great importance to
radio
amateurs, so the International Amateur Radio Union has fielded its
largest
team of observers at an ITU conference in more than a decade," noted
IARU
Secretary (and ARRL CEO) David Sumner, K1ZZ,

And now, a NOTE TO ALL THE HOPEFUL.....

Sumner said that, while there's been plenty of informal discussion about

the issues, no final decisions have been made yet. "It is important to

remember that nothing is final until the second reading of a document
in
the Plenary, which--in the case of controversial issues--will not take

place until the final week of the conference, June 30-July 4," he
said.--IARU news release

Whew! At least you can hope they don't run out of time before it
happens....

2680. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:28:46 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcknne$4ue$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 68771

Vito wrote:

Morse efficiency more legendary than factual. But more

> important it has nothing to do with *requiring* it to *not* use it. The
> Amateur Service is primarily recreational - something we do for fun, not
> to earn money, et cetera - and code is fun. That's a far better reason
> to *keep* it than BSing ourselves about its efficiency.

I will have to freely agree that it sure can't be efficient when attempted by persons who have not learned it to any skill level. Other than than, you can deny it as you wish, but that remains

> But it is NOT a
> valid reason to keep the *requirement*.

YOUR OPINION. Nothing more.

2681. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:36:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcko62$614$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 68772

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > Robert wrote:
>
> <some snippage>
> >>
> >> Nice dodge of the question, not that I was talking to you. Jim's
> >>implied that the internet was down due to 9/11, but he only specifies that
> >>he couldn't connect through his regular ISP. This simply does not prove that
> >>the infrastructure in question was actually down, only one part of it.
> >
> >
> > That's what you evidently can't understannd-the part that is always down in an
> > emergency is the part most needed for relief of that emergency.
> >
>
> I think Robert is having his own argument on a different topic here,
> Dick. His argument is correct, but it's a different argument nonetheless.
>
>

Yeah, he seems to think the Internet is a single entity instead of a large number of internetconnected networks. "Infrastructure" would mean any significant portion of it, not the whole.

2682. Re: Upgrade from pre-1987 Technician to General class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:38:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bckoag$614$1@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 68773

Graybeard wrote:

>
> I also read that I must apply at a VE session showing evidence of having
> held a Technician license prior to 1987 to obtain a General Class upgrade.
> Will the copy of the QRZ.com info be acceptable to the VE? Is that all I
> require?

It should be, as I understand present rules. But you can get all your questions answered by going to website www.arrl.org and asking them. They can tell you how to get in touch with a VVE team in your area.

Dick

2683. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:56:15 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bckpakgje1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69008

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcko62$614$0@208.207.71.152...
>
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > >
> > > Robert wrote:
> >
> > <some snippage>
> > >>
> > >> Nice dodge of the question, not that I was talking to you.
Jim's
> > >>implied that the internet was down due to 9/11, but he only specifies
that
> > >>he couldn't connect through his regular ISP. This simply does not
prove that
> > >>the infrastructure in question was actually down, only one part of it.
> > >
> > >
> > > That's what you evidently can't understannd-the part that is always
down in an
> > > emergency is the part most needed for relief of that emergency.
> > >
> >
> > I think Robert is having his own argument on a different topic
here,
> > Dick. His argument is correct, but it's a different argument
nonetheless.
> >
> >
>
> Yeah, he seems to think the Internet is a single entity instead of a large
number of
> internetconnected networks. "Infrastructure" would mean any significant
portion >of it, not the whole.

Still can't read, eh Dick? What part of "His argument is correct"
didja miss? Need reading glasses or something?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2684. Re: Upgrade from pre-1987 Technician to General class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 15:58:56 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <5PlHa.57699$Pc5.26386@fed1read01>
Source record: 68774

Contact you local VE about these questions, VE's for Florida are listed at
URL:
http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/examsearch.phtml?State=FL

For Orlando, FL
02-Jul-2003
Sponsor: ORLANDO ARCTime: 5:30 PM (Walk-ins allowed)
Contact: HAROLD T PROSSER
(407)365-2444
Email: KK1B@ARRL.NET
VEC: ARRL/VEC
Location: BEARDALL SENIOR CITZEN CENTER
75 E GORE ST
BETWEEN DELANEY & ORANGE AVE
ORLANDO, FL 32806

You can call or e-mail

Also you might try W5YI at URL: http://www.w5yi.org/
For a modest fee -- they will do all the paperwork and I understand they
have many callbooks to look up old icall nfo for verfication

AFOR -- Anon For Obvious Reasons

"Graybeard" <law32@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ZMkHa.50657$Io.4783085@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> I feel like I am beating a dead horse, after reading several posts, but I
> still have a problem and need help. I obtained my Technician license in
> 1984 while working at Motorola in South Florida. Moved several times
while
> there and no longer have original license documentation.
>
> I recently retired and moved to the West Orlando area in Florida, and
> changed the address on my license. I would now like to upgrade to General
> Class, which I never obtained in South FL since most of my friends were on
> the 2-meter repeaters there.
>
> From the information that I have read, the FCC does not maintain old data
> base info; only the current license data. I obtained info from web site
> QRZ.com which lists my original 1984 license date from the March 1993 QRZ
> Ham Radio Callsign Database. I printed the info from the web site.
>
> I also read that I must apply at a VE session showing evidence of having
> held a Technician license prior to 1987 to obtain a General Class upgrade.
> Will the copy of the QRZ.com info be acceptable to the VE? Is that all I
> require?

>
> Also, can anyone tell me how to find a VE in the Orlando area, since I
> recently moved here and have been inactive.
>
> 73
> WA4TFK
>
>
> --
> Graybeard
>
>

2685. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 16:39:34 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEDF2C6.204C3230@crosslink.net>
Source record: 68765

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Vito wrote:
>
> > OTOH I deeply resent people using unrealistic barriers to keep
> > others from sharing what is, after all, public property.
>
> Seems like you blame all longtime licensed hams (all of whom are Morse qualified,
> thus suspect) for the actions of the FCC. Sorry, FCC doesn't pay much attention to
> anything I have to say, ...

Not "all", just a selfish but vocal few who had nothing to do except
defend their priviledges from others. Code requirements have diminished
as they died off. IMHO FCC does pay much attention to what ARRL says
hams want - part of their "police yourself" policy. Example: bandplans.

>
> But your next paragraph is even more troubling..
>
> > Requiring Morse
> > before allowing people to talk on recreational (amateur) bands is the
> > same as requiring a flint-and-steel campfire before renting a hotel room
> > in a national forest.
> >
>
> Under your rant/scenario no such thing is even implied.

Yes, because Morse efficiency more legendary than factual. But more
important it has nothing to do with *requiring* it to *not* use it. The
Amateur Service is primarily recreational - something we do for fun, not
to earn money, et cetera - and code is fun. That's a far better reason
to *keep* it than BSing ourselves about its efficiency. But it is NOT a
valid reason to keep the *requirement*.

73, K3DWW

2686. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 17:07:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306160907.4bce007d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68778

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3EED3CDA.8090201@ix.netcom.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >I disagree. He singlehandedly undermined the examination process. Then FCC
> >completed the process.

> Does it really require more knowledge and skill to operate on 14.160
> than on 14.305?

Yes and no.

In terms of purely technical information, no.

But if 14.160 is where the DX hangs out, operating split at the rate
of 200 QSOs/hr, and 14.305 is casual ragchewer territory, then it does
take some more skill.

> Power levels are the same, equipment and antennas are the same. Only
> reason for the
> distinction on frequency is that your (suppressed) carrier frequency is
> easily measured
> at a remote location.

Your argument is against the concept of incentive licensing. Did Bash
only produce books for the Advanced and Extra class licenses? (I
really don't know - I have never seen a "Bash book").

> It's not like VFR vs IFR in general aviation....

Not totally, but there IS a difference. In my experience, 7005 is a
different game than 7050.

And if there's no difference, why not be satisfied with 14.305?

> Ham radio didn't suffer any degradation of safety because of Bash.

I disagree!

Before his books, a prospective ham had only a general idea of what
was on the exam. FCC put out "study guides" in essay format that were
available from the Govt. printing office and reprinted in the ARRL
License Manuals, but they were not the actual verbatim tests. The
prospective ham had to do at least some mental processing to interpret
the actual test questions from the study guide language. And, as
recommended in the study guide and LM, most prospective hams read
other radio books.

With the actual Q&A in hand, that sort of processing was no longer
necessary.

Note that back in those days the Q&A pools were much smaller. In fact,
I have read that there were only 2 or 3 versions of each written test,
and that the reason FCC required a 30 day wait before retesting was to
prevent recognition of the fact that there were so few versions.

> Bash was
> the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's high school
> algebra
> tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or the frat house's
> library of
> previous year's tests at some college.

I disagree again! It's more like someone looking at a copy of the
teachers's intended high school algebra test when studying for the
same algebra test.

In the schools I attended, such things were violations of the honor
code and could get you kicked out, even though the tests were changed
every year.

There's also the fact that algebra and college-level tests, open or
closed book, are rarely multiple-choice tests where all you need do is
get enough right answers without showing any work.

I think there are several reasons Bash got away with what he did:

1) It would have been embarrassing to the FCC to actuallyadmit that
they only had a few different tests for each level of license.

2) Bash did not act alone - he had lots of help from those who gave
him the information. Prosecuting all of those people would have been
difficult.

3) Bash never had access to the actual test materials. There were
warnings about those taking tests divulging their contents, but the
rules were vague about someone asking testees about the test. It could
be argued that Bash did not violate any rules or laws, but that those
who gave him info were the real criminals.

4) (This may be the biggest one): FCC was considering getting out of
the testing business anyway, so there was no point in prosecuting
someone for what would no longer be a violation.

All of this is kind of academic now, because FCC isn't about to go
back to private, secret tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2687. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 17:28:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgkrt32.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68779

On Wed, 11 Jun 2003 10:17:43 -0400, Robert wrote:

> Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
>public _opinion_?

First question: No.

Second Question: The Commission is required to receive and consider whomever's opinion during the comment and reply comment periods but is not required to go with "popular opinion" or any other opinion in the record. as long as sufficient justification for what they decide is articulated in their decisions. A true CYA operation, of which the staff are experts.

Anyone who disagrees with a Commission decision is free to take it to appeal, first to the Commission for reconsideration, and then to the Federal appellate courts. In the latter case, though, the appellant would have to show that (a) that s/he is or will be harmed by the Commission's decision and (b) the Commission violated rules of procedure in reaching that decision. The Federal courts are very loath to reverse on issues which they feel fall within agency expertise except when it involves a high profile political or national policy issue, and believe me, nothing in amateur radio rises to that level.

Been there, tried that, "it ain't easy"....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2688. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 17:28:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgksp94.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68780

On 12 Jun 2003 02:12:23 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>Apparent the FCC must have agreed or they simple did not care enough
>>to complain.
>
>Not the FCC's job to deal with other countries' violations of the treaty.

Actually any signatory Administration can file a complaint with the
ITU if another signatory Administration is in violation, but the
role of the ITU would be as a mediator to resolve the problem.
Unless the complaining Administration can show that the other
Administration's action is causing some harm to it, the complaint
would go nowhere.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2689. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 17:28:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgks7h3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68781

On 12 Jun 2003 01:55:58 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>I'm not sure if GMDSS is now the only distress system, or if a watch
>must still be kept at quarter to and quarter past the hour on 2182 kHz
>USB. Does anyone know if that is gone too?

The Rules still require that all ships required to be equipped with
a MF (2 MHz band) radiotelephone station must maintain a watch on
2182 kHz and observe the "silent period".

As part of the GMDSS system, all ships over 300 gross tons making
voyages in the open sea were required to maintain a continuous watch
on 2182 kHz by speaker or auto-alarm receiver and a continuous watch
by speaker on VHF Channel 16 (156.80 MHz) until February 1, 1999.

After that date, the requirement shifted to a maintaining a
continuous watch on 2187.5 kHz and VHF Channel 70 (156.525 MHz)
using a muted receiver capable of receiving DSC (Digital Selective
Calling) signals.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2690. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 17:55:38 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcl0bgjjs1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69013

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgkrt32.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 11 Jun 2003 10:17:43 -0400, Robert wrote:
>
> > Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
> >public _opinion_?
>
> First question: No.

No requirement to hold public hearings? At all?

> Second Question: The Commission is required to receive and consider
> whomever's opinion

Yes, that's what I said.

>during the comment and reply comment periods but
> is not required to go with "popular opinion"

Well, that's not what I said. I said what you said: "Consider".
Hell, you quoted me: "(...) and consider public _opinion_?"

And then YOU say: "The Commission is required to receive and
consider whomever's opinion"

Looks like hams are taking argument to new heights of absurdity.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2691. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 18:27:46 UTC
From: Akhbar Balink <Akhbar@BalinkCamelDrivers.org>
Message-ID: <bcl26t$pu3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68782

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgks7h3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 12 Jun 2003 01:55:58 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> >I'm not sure if GMDSS is now the only distress system, or if a watch
> >must still be kept at quarter to and quarter past the hour on 2182 kHz
> >USB. Does anyone know if that is gone too?
>
> The Rules still require that all ships required to be equipped with
> a MF (2 MHz band) radiotelephone station must maintain a watch on
> 2182 kHz and observe the "silent period".
>
> As part of the GMDSS system, all ships over 300 gross tons making
> voyages in the open sea were required to maintain a continuous watch
> on 2182 kHz by speaker or auto-alarm receiver and a continuous watch
> by speaker on VHF Channel 16 (156.80 MHz) until February 1, 1999.
>
> After that date, the requirement shifted to a maintaining a
> continuous watch on 2187.5 kHz and VHF Channel 70 (156.525 MHz)
> using a muted receiver capable of receiving DSC (Digital Selective
> Calling) signals.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Who gives a camel shit?

73 de Akhbar Balink

2692. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 18:28:43 UTC
From: Akhbar Balink <Akhbar@BalinkCamelDrivers.org>
Message-ID: <bcl28e$q13$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68783

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgksp94.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 12 Jun 2003 02:12:23 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >>Apparent the FCC must have agreed or they simple did not care enough
> >>to complain.
> >
> >Not the FCC's job to deal with other countries' violations of the treaty.
>
> Actually any signatory Administration can file a complaint with the
> ITU if another signatory Administration is in violation, but the
> role of the ITU would be as a mediator to resolve the problem.
> Unless the complaining Administration can show that the other
> Administration's action is causing some harm to it, the complaint
> would go nowhere.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Who gives a camel shit?

73 de Akhbar Balink

2693. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 18:35:53 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939C947A69A85elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68784

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgks7h3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com:

> On 12 Jun 2003 01:55:58 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>I'm not sure if GMDSS is now the only distress system, or if a watch
>>must still be kept at quarter to and quarter past the hour on 2182 kHz
>>USB. Does anyone know if that is gone too?
>
> The Rules still require that all ships required to be equipped with
> a MF (2 MHz band) radiotelephone station must maintain a watch on
> 2182 kHz and observe the "silent period".
>
> As part of the GMDSS system, all ships over 300 gross tons making
> voyages in the open sea were required to maintain a continuous watch
> on 2182 kHz by speaker or auto-alarm receiver and a continuous watch
> by speaker on VHF Channel 16 (156.80 MHz) until February 1, 1999.
>
> After that date, the requirement shifted to a maintaining a
> continuous watch on 2187.5 kHz and VHF Channel 70 (156.525 MHz)
> using a muted receiver capable of receiving DSC (Digital Selective
> Calling) signals.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

That's interesting. So the HF phone distress frequency still exists but is
no longer 2182 kHz, having moved to 2187.5, and listening at specific
times is now superceded by DSC. But are the actual transmissions still
USB? Presumably they are, or everyone would have to invest in new radios?

It also seems that the VHF channels have been changed. Presumably they
still use FM?

2694. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 18:39:38 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939C951D1F72Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68785

"Akhbar Balink" <Akhbar@BalinkCamelDrivers.org> wrote in
news:bcl26t$pu3$0@pita.alt.net:

>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgks7h3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On 12 Jun 2003 01:55:58 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>> >I'm not sure if GMDSS is now the only distress system, or if a watch
>> >must still be kept at quarter to and quarter past the hour on 2182 kHz
>> >USB. Does anyone know if that is gone too?
>>
>> The Rules still require that all ships required to be equipped with
>> a MF (2 MHz band) radiotelephone station must maintain a watch on
>> 2182 kHz and observe the "silent period".
>>
>> As part of the GMDSS system, all ships over 300 gross tons making
>> voyages in the open sea were required to maintain a continuous watch
>> on 2182 kHz by speaker or auto-alarm receiver and a continuous watch
>> by speaker on VHF Channel 16 (156.80 MHz) until February 1, 1999.
>>
>> After that date, the requirement shifted to a maintaining a
>> continuous watch on 2187.5 kHz and VHF Channel 70 (156.525 MHz)
>> using a muted receiver capable of receiving DSC (Digital Selective
>> Calling) signals.
>>
>> --
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>>
>
> Who gives a camel shit?
>
> 73 de Akhbar Balink
>
>
>

You might if you had an HF rig on a small vessel. You might be using it on
the ham bands and then go to call Mayday on 2182, when the Coast Guard are
listening on 2187.5! And then no-one would come to your aid, as you sank
gently beneath the waves...

2695. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 18:42:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161042.14ece7c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68786

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bccvqp$7so$0@208.207.71.159>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0306130508.389bd296@posting.google.com...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<20030612160838.07705.00000697@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > >Date: 6/12/03 2:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306121132.1cef0d08@posting.google.com>
>
> > > > >> What Japan did and how it did it have nothing to do with US
> policy or
> > > > >> regulations.
> > > > >
> > > > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> > > >
> > > > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
> nothing to
> > > > do with US policy or regulations.
> > > >
> > > > >With respect to UN/ITU treaties? It sure does.
> > > > >
> > > > >See: Japan.
> > > >
> > > > In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has
> nothing to
> > > > do with US policy or regulations.
> > >
> > > Such a paradox. You say it does then you say it doesn't.
> > >
> > > > Japan is a soverign nation.
> > >
> > > Except for the international treaties it has signed.
> >
> > Signing a treaty doesn't change the fact that Japan is a
> > soverign nation.
> >
> > > > It will do as it sees fit for it's own purposes.
> > >
> > > Are you absolutely certain of this? Is this unique to Japan, or can
> > > any other soverign nation violate international treaty for domestic
> > > purposes?
```

> >
> > The fact that Japan has had a code-free domestic
> > license is well known. The rest of the countries that are part of the
> > ITU treaty apparently don't see Japan's position as being
> > in violation of the treaty... or, even if some do, they have long
> > since defaulted to approval by simply doing nothing.
> >
> > > > Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
> > > > regulation.
> > >
> > > > It merely affects the non-adherence to ITU S25 for domestic use, and
> > > > sets a precedence for any other treaty nation.
> >
> > True, yet there hasn't been any wholesale non-adhearance.
> > Again, perhaps other countires administrations see no harm
> > nor violation in Japan's position.
>
> You codehaters are really something else!

Who hates code?

> Japan chose, for reasons and with justifications detailed by N2EY, to
> institute a domestic HF codeless license.

On the amateur bands, which Jim and Steve say can't be.

No other countries have protested
> on the same basis-there are no negative effects noted on them. No other
> country has to "consider" Japan's decision in any way. No other country is
> invoved. If Japan wants to do that, no one else is involved.

They are, none-theless, in violation.

> So our FCC does not decide to do the same. One could glean from all these
> plaintive posts that FCC is somehow thus considered derelict.
> . What nonsense! The dereliction is on the part of those who refuse to
> meet the existing qualifications because they happen to "feel" they aren't
> "proper". It's disgusting!

Dick, you're not writing code, so please try to keep the punctuation
within the proper structure.

Anyway, No One has said anything about derelection except you. Why do
you bring it up, then claim I did or Bill did? Some people would call
that lying.

So go ahead and be disgusted that you started a lie. I certainly am.

Meanwhile, all I said was the the FCC could have gone that way. Jim
and Steve say they couldn't have because of the treaty.

I think you all need a nice warm sitz bath.

2696. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 18:44:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161044.5db0ee79@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68787

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcdtsa$a6q$0@208.206.142.69>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >
> > If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
> > get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?
> >
> >
>
>
> Basically what always comes next- they seem to always want to blame code
> supporters for their woes.

Dick imagines that people are making complaints. But no complaints
have been made. Now he imagines that code is being blamed.

Poor Dick.

2697. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 18:47:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161047.603d693d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68788

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bcf7rn$l87$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EEA7DD6.2D7894E6@earthlink.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > If someone refuses to meet current requirements they don't
> > > get licensed Dick. What's disgusting about that?
> >
> > You know it doesn't always work that way, Bill.
>
> Actually it does.
>
> > They could form a
> > lobbying group whose aim would be to lower the requirements. Lots of
> > "someones" refused to meet the requirements of just a few years ago. :-)
>
> They did NOT refuse to meet the requirements. Taking a
> proactive role and position on changing requirements is
> not the same as what Dick's statement addressed.
>
> As to forming a "lobbying group" to change code requirements,
> we all know that is already in place. I am a charter member
> of that group (NCI) and hold a position on the Bd of Directors.
> If anyone finds that "disgusting" that's just too bad.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Then there was the eyes rolled back "Code Forever" lobbying group.

The FCC made the No Code Technician license a reality anyway.

Later the ARRL said they had supported the NCT license. They forgot
to mention that they only supported it as it passed.

2698. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 19:02:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161102.1d9de06@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68789

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030613214004.22634.00000443@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/13/03 8:08 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306130508.389bd296@posting.google.com>
>
> >> In respect to UN/ITU treaties, it does. However it STILL has nothing
> to
> >> do with US policy or regulations.
> >
> >Such a paradox. You say it does then you say it doesn't.
>
> Such an idiot. Can't read a sentence. Shameshameshame.

Poor Steve, he cannot structure a sentence properly.

> >> Japan is a soverign nation.
> >
> >Except for the international treaties it has signed.
>
> Oh...??? WHAT document resinds a nations soverignty?

Of course not, silly. But it does obligate them to adhere to it. So
when you say that the FCC cannot change the code requirement because
of S25, doesn't that mean we have signed over one tiny slice of our
soverignty so that we and other nations can live in harmony?

> >> It will do as it sees fit for it's own purposes.
> >
> >Are you absolutely certain of this? Is this unique to Japan, or can
> >any other soverign nation violate international treaty for domestic
> >purposes?
>
> I didn't say it was right, LilLennie...I said they are a soverign nation
> and they do wha they want to.
>
> You still have not shown how Japanese radio policy has affected UN policy.

It should be obvious, Steve, but just for you I'll point it out.

It has weakened the treaty.

> >> Nothing it does in regards to Amateur Radio affects US policy or
> >> regulation.
> >

> >It merely affects the non-adherence to ITU S25 for domestic use, and
> >sets a precedence for any other treaty nation.
>
> It sets a precedent for making up one's own rules when the rules they
> agreed to don't suit them anymore. See: Japan.

Yes, Steve. I've been saying See: Japan. Now you get it.

> > Japan does not have a representitve on the FCC, nor does a member
> >> of the FCC have a say in Japan's Post's Ministry.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ
> >
> >Wonder whatever happened to all those US callsigns issued for Japan.
>
> No US callsigns are presently assigned to Japan.

So Japan is once again a soverign nation?

> There ARE callsigns assigned to US Armed Forces in Japan when operating
> from US bases, under US control, and in accordance with rules established by
> the United States Air Force.

What other country does this?

> They are prohibited from communicating with Japanese Amateur Radio
> stations. Only US citizens who have obtained a Japanese reciprocal license
> issued by Japan's Posts Ministry may communcate with Japanese station, operate
> mobile, etc.

Cool.

> See: Auxiliary Military Radio System.
>
> No, this is not a backwards accronym for MARS.
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

When did you get your old call back?

2699. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 19:04:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161104.6da2e87d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68790

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bccv77$6v2$0@208.207.71.159>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message n
>
> >
> > > > For domestic use, as the ARRL requested, S25 need not apply.
> > >
> > > Where in the treaty does it say that?
> >
>
> >
> > See: Japan. In the absense ITU treaty violation with respect to S25,
> > use of HF by non-code tested amateurs for domestic use is an
> > acceptable practice.
> >
>
> And now we see how you came to believe that you actually had permission.
>
> The old "If it works there it has to automatically work here, too" routine.
>
> Whatta dweeb!

Poor DICK. Keeps stretching but the logic is still out of his reach.

> > > How can anyone guarantee that the 5 MHz signals will not leave the
> > > USA?
> >
> > See: Japan. How do they contain their signals to Japan?
> >
> > > > See: Japan.
> > >
> > > Has Japan allowed its hams on 5 MHz?
> >
> > Ask them.
> >
> > > The requirement has to do with the license, not domestic use. It also
> > > specifically requires a General or higher license for hams to use 60
> > > meters.
> >
> > It didn't have to be that way. It could have been anything we wanted
> > it to be.
> >
> > > Japanese amateurs are not limited to domestic use only.
> >

> > Then why would the PCTA blast me for working JA's?
> >
> > Oh, I forgot about the double-standard.
> >
> > > Here's how the Japanese sytem works (reposted many times).
> >
> > Reposted many times? Then how did the PCTA that blasted me for
> > working JA's miss this?
> >
> > Oh, I forgot about the double-standard. Sorry, I've been away for a
> > while.
> >
> > > This is Japan's argument, not mine:
> > >
> > > Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test.
> > > These are
> > > "4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify
> > > not
> > > having a code test for them:
> > >
> > > 1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and
> > > to
> > > promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.
> > >
> > > 2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful
> > > interference need
> > > to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all
> > > countries,
> > > and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.
> > >
> > > 3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that
> > > are
> > > worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is
> > > prevented.
> > >
> > > 4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on
> > > HF (10
> > > watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful
> > > interference
> > > to amateurs of other countries is avoided.
> > >
> > > Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its
> > > measures re
> > > 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not agree
> > > with Japan's
> > > reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan
> > > on it in
> > > at least the past 35 years.
> >
> > Hmmm. No challenges? Not even one?

> >
> > Then it must be accepted as a valid variance to the treaty.
> >
> > And if no one has challenged it in over 35 years, is S25 even a valid
> > requirement?
> >
> > > Note that the other three classes of Japanese amateur radio license DO
> > > require
> > > a code test.
> >
> > Note that the US has licenses that require a code test, but no license
> > that allows non-code tested amateurs on HF at any power level, even
> > though we could.
> >
> > > Note also that Japanese 4th classers only have privs on freqs that are
> > > worldwide exclusive amateur. (See 3), above). That leaves out 60
> > > meters.
> >
> > Then Japan must not be allowing their 4th classers any privs on 5 MHz.
> >
> > > If/when the code test is eliminated, a General class or higher license
> > > will
> > > still be required to access 60 meters unless the rules change.
> >
> > Typical of the FCC to box themselves in to all kinds of administrative
> > changes to Part 97 when S25 goes away.
> >
> > > Would you be satisfied with a US equivalent of the Japanese 4th class
> > > license? QRP power and no access to shared allocations?
> >
> > I think such a license would be useful to any number of people.
> >
> > Don't you?

Don't you?

2700. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 19:08:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161108.17a2dd81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68791

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030615121031.00447.00000768@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart
> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
> >Date: 6/12/03 3:29 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bcanrliaf1@nd.eastky.net>
> >
> >
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
> >
> >> Go easy on the blowhard. He's got real military experience, without
> >> having actually served.
>
> >Uh-oh....;)
>
> As opposed to Brian who actually served but has no military experience.
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

As opposed to Steve who bought hisself a box full of medals.

2701. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 19:10:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161110.769a357@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68792
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message news:<vejqvnbdn6ioad@corp.supernews.com>...
> > OH NO !!! Tell me it ain't so !!! Does that mean my modified ya'all come
> > back CB jobber that does 12 watts output PEP on TEN METERS is illegal ????
> > I gotta destroy the evidence quick.
> >
>
> Actually, common sense prevails.
>
> Once you modify the equipment, it no longer has it's 'type acceptance'
> or whatever it's called these days and is no longer legal for CB use.
> Even ON valid CB frequencies at valid CB parameters. It is just a
> pie of parts that you now can use as HAM equipment, if you so choose.
>
> There is nothing wrong using it on 10M as long as the use of it adheres
> to valid amateur restrictions.
>
> Mike

Mike, true as far as that goes. But a lot of these guys cannot decide
if they are Hams or CBers. Therein lies the problem with such radios.

2702. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 19:25:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306161125.118a9019@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68793
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcbhse$is1$3@208.206.142.95>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bc94fs$6s9$0@208.206.142.72...
> > >
> > >
> > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > >
> > > > On 11 Jun 2003 04:36:37 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >You're still confused, Mike. If an amateur radio license of General
> > > > >class or higher is required for *hams* to access that frequency, a
> > > > >code requirement currently does apply, within the USA. YMMV in Canada.
> > > >
> > > > But the Rule (Sect 97.401(d)) says in its totality:
> > > >
> > > > (d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit
> > > > emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> > > > emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> > > > stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> > > > transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
> > > >
> > > > That's the only mention of that frequency/channel in the Rules
> > > > Governing the Amateur Service. There is no mention elsewhere in
> > > > Part 97 of class of operator license authorized to do that.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Ah, so. The old global rule about "anything goes in an emergency" applies
> > > here, I see. So all you need is a radio station capable of transmitting on
> > > the frequency ---- and an emergency! And be ready to explain why you had
> > > the radio station so long before the emergency, like the kid in San Diego
> > > who transmitted on the Sheriff's channel.
> >
> > The point is that a ham, including novices and techs, appears to
> > be able to use 5.1675 in the abcense of any other statements in
> > Part 97.
>
> I dont' think so, Bill. More like *anyhone* can use 5.1675 without regard to
> whether or not they're licensed at all. Of course that isn't true of the five
> new 60 meter channels.

Wrong. In an actual emergency, you use what works. Does 60M not work? Let me go review the ARRL's pioneering work during the experimental era of the last few years...

I'm back. It works, or at least the ARRL said it did.

2703. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 19:30:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EEE1AD5.3090504@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68794

>
>
>>>
>>>
>
>
>
>>Does it really require more knowledge and skill to operate on 14.160
>>than on 14.305?
>>
>>
>
>Yes and no.
>
>In terms of purely technical information, no.
>
>But if 14.160 is where the DX hangs out, operating split at the rate
>of 200 QSOs/hr, and 14.305 is casual ragchewer territory, then it does
>take some more skill.
>
>
True, but if someone screws it up, it still doesn't create a public
safety hazard, like if
someone doesn't fly an aircraft correctly (could crash killing people in
the craft and
on the ground). And most hams will learn the correct methods quickly
enough on
the air anyway. When I say "screws it up" I don't mean some idiot
playing music
or cursing or such. I'm talking about newbie type errors that someone
gets the
DX contest procedures wrong. Most newbies will learn after a few contacts.

>
>
>
>>Power levels are the same, equipment and antennas are the same. Only
>>reason for the
>>distinction on frequency is that your (suppressed) carrier frequency is
>>easily measured
>>at a remote location.
>>
>>
>

>Your argument is against the concept of incentive licensing. Did Bash
>only produce books for the Advanced and Extra class licenses? (I
>really don't know - I have never seen a "Bash book").
>
Not sure where I stand on incentive licensing. An arguement for it is
that you can get
better educated and skilled hams by dangling various carrots. But an
arguement against
would be why should the FCC care? Are they in the business of handing
out gold stars?
Someone wishing to do SSTV just reads up about it, gets the equipment
and sets it
up, and can be called successful if he manages several QSOs in that
mode. Having to
take an FCC mandated test is just another essentially unnecessary chore
in the way.
The ham should already know to not cause interference to other QSOs or
services
anyway.

>
>
>
>>It's not like VFR vs IFR in general aviation....
>>
>>
>
>Not totally, but there IS a difference. In my experience, 7005 is a
>different game than 7050.
>
>
>
But there's no public safety hazard in a ham learning on the air, unlike
a pilot
trying to learn IFR on his own....

>
>
>
>>Ham radio didn't suffer any degradation of safety because of Bash.
>>
>>
>
>I disagree!
>
>Before his books, a prospective ham had only a general idea of what
>was on the exam. FCC put out "study guides" in essay format that were
>available from the Govt. printing office and reprinted in the ARRL
>License Manuals, but they were not the actual verbatim tests. The
>prospective ham had to do at least some mental processing to interpret
>the actual test questions from the study guide language. And, as

>recommended in the study guide and LM, most prospective hams read
>other radio books.
>
>With the actual Q&A in hand, that sort of processing was no longer
>necessary.
>
>Note that back in those days the Q&A pools were much smaller. In fact,
>I have read that there were only 2 or 3 versions of each written test,
>and that the reason FCC required a 30 day wait before retesting was to
>prevent recognition of the fact that there were so few versions.
>
>
>
>>Bash was
>>the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's high school
>>algebra
>>tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or the frat house's
>>library of
>>previous year's tests at some college.
>>
>>
>
>I disagree again! It's more like someone looking at a copy of the
>teachers's intended high school algebra test when studying for the
>same algebra test.
>
>In the schools I attended, such things were violations of the honor
>code and could get you kicked out, even though the tests were changed
>every year.
>
My schools didn't have a problem with this, as old exams once seen by
students became
"public domain" knowledge for all intents and purporses. Teachers and
profs either
recognized this fact, or didn't really care. We did have honor codes,
but that was
directed to actual cheating during an exam or copying homework. Looking
at last
year's tests was not a violation of the codes we had. Many college
profs didn't
care about undergraduate classes; to them it was wasted time that they
would want
to put towards writing research grant proposals or publishing papers.
My brother is an adjunct prof at the local community college. He
actually creates
a few versions of the same test and randomly distributes the versions to
the students
when the test is to be taken. Word gets around that one can't just look
at the
next student's test and copy, as that answer won't match his question.

My brother
just changes the numbers in the questions, and changes the sequence of the
questions on the different versions.

There's also the fact that what a cheater copies may be a wrong answer
anyway.
Most tests treat a blank answer the same as a wrong answer, so you're
better off
picking a random choice in a multiple choice test than leaving it blank
(you might
get lucky and hit the correct choice). So I used to fill out all the
say "C's" on the
unfinished portion of an SAT test when time was just about up. I
probably hit
a few correct ones that way.

>
>There's also the fact that algebra and college-level tests, open or
>closed book, are rarely multiple-choice tests where all you need do is
>get enough right answers without showing any work.
>
So you couldn't just memorize "A, C, B, B, A, etc". Had heard that
broadcasting schools
would just teach "the answer to question 5 is C". But looking at an old
test tells you what
the teacher is looking for, and thus what to study. My brother actually
told his students
to, for example, not spend time memorizing the associtive or commutive
laws by name, but
just know that "if A=B and B=C, then A = C".

>
>I think there are several reasons Bash got away with what he did:
>
>1) It would have been embarrassing to the FCC to actually admit that
>they only had a few different tests for each level of license.
>
>2) Bash did not act alone - he had lots of help from those who gave
>him the information. Prosecuting all of those people would have been
>difficult.
>
>3) Bash never had access to the actual test materials. There were
>warnings about those taking tests divulging their contents, but the
>rules were vague about someone asking testees about the test. It could
>be argued that Bash did not violate any rules or laws, but that those
>who gave him info were the real criminals.
>
>4) (This may be the biggest one): FCC was considering getting out of
>the testing business anyway, so there was no point in prosecuting
>someone for what would no longer be a violation.
>

>
>
Essentially the FCC didn't really care. Even the FAA had open question
pools. But
you didn't get a pilot's license just passing a written test.

2704. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 20:08:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306161958470.1191@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68795

On Mon, 16 Jun 2003, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152119220.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Sun, 15 Jun 2003, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> > > >Subject: Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question
> > > >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> > > >Date: 6/14/03 8:48 PM Central Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306150146350.807@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
> > >
> > > >Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> > >
> > > Huh?
> > >
> > > Current FCC policy says the CSCE is good for one year for TESTING
> credit
> > > purposes. It is good "forever" for the purpose of granting the Novice
> HF
> > > privileges to a Technician.
> > >
> > > How's that for Uncle Sam logic?
> >
> > ...But the FCC didn't issue any "Technician Plus" licenses between
> February
> > 1991 and June 1994 - so proof of this license class will ONLY be on a
> CSCE.
> > Very few people applied for a corrected license. Those who got code
> CSCE's
> > after June 1994 should have a license that says (or said) "Technician
> Plus" on
> > it, but some VE teams may not have gotten the word in a timely manner.
> >
>
> Incorrect. I received my Tech Plus license in 1992 and it said Tech Plus.

That is not consistent with the FCC policy at the time. They didn't even have "P"'s in their database to distinguish the license class until June 1994, by which time, you had already upgraded to extra (as of January 1993).

FCC Form 610, March 1992 edition, didn't even have a box for the "Technician Plus" or "Technician with HF" printed on it. The November 1993 edition is the first version of the form to have a "Technician with HF" license class printed on it as an examination result possibility. What you are saying wasn't possible based on the version of the 610 in use at the time.

2705. Re: Upgrade from pre-1987 Technician to General class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 20:10:26 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306162010290.1191@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68796

On Mon, 16 Jun 2003, Graybeard wrote:
> I feel like I am beating a dead horse, after reading several posts, but I
> still have a problem and need help. I obtained my Technician license in
> 1984 while working at Motorola in South Florida. Moved several times while
> there and no longer have original license documentation.
>
> I recently retired and moved to the West Orlando area in Florida, and
> changed the address on my license. I would now like to upgrade to General
> Class, which I never obtained in South FL since most of my friends were on
> the 2-meter repeaters there.
>
> From the information that I have read, the FCC does not maintain old data
> base info; only the current license data. I obtained info from web site
> QRZ.com which lists my original 1984 license date from the March 1993 QRZ
> Ham Radio Callsign Database. I printed the info from the web site.
>
> I also read that I must apply at a VE session showing evidence of having
> held a Technician license prior to 1987 to obtain a General Class upgrade.
> Will the copy of the QRZ.com info be acceptable to the VE? Is that all I
> require?

Yes.

> Also, can anyone tell me how to find a VE in the Orlando area, since I
> recently moved here and have been inactive.

http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/examsearch.phtml

2706. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 20:54:37 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bclas7nmq1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69015

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> My schools didn't have a problem with this, as old exams once seen by
> students became
> "public domain" knowledge for all intents and purporses. Teachers and
> profs either
> recognized this fact, or didn't really care.

Hehehe. I had a biology professor who copyrighted everything -
tests, handouts, lectures. He didn't allow tape-recording a lecture, even.
Actually, he wasn't as odd a duck as it sounds, overall, but a bit nutty on
that subject...

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2707. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 21:16:25 UTC
From: M'Balz Es-Hari <boubi.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <40704N785@web2news.com>
Source record: 68797
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> "Roland Stiner" <nk2u@1stconnect.com> wrote:
>>> This should
>>> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution
>>> as legal hams
>>> do.
>>
>> Where in the constitution does it give Freebanders the
>> right to break the
>> law?
>>
> Hi Roland, you're responding to a troll who's trying to bait
> this group using an anonymized remailer.
>
> Best to ignore the coward.

speaking of cowards, Moparholic is a freebander.

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

2708. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 21:52:45 UTC
From: Akhbar Balink <Akhbar@BalinkCamelDrivers.org>
Message-ID: <bcle74$gm2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 68798

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgkrt32.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 11 Jun 2003 10:17:43 -0400, Robert wrote:
>
> > Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
> >public _opinion_?
>
> First question: No.
>
> Second Question: The Commission is required to receive and consider
> whomever's opinion during the comment and reply comment periods but
> is not required to go with "popular opinion" or any other opinion in
> the record. as long as sufficient justification for what they decide
> is articulated in their decisions. A true CYA operation, of which
> the staff are experts.
>
> Anyone who disagrees with a Commission decision is free to take it
> to appeal, first to the Commission for reconsideration, and then to
> the Federal appellate courts. In the latter case, though, the
> appellant would have to show that (a) that s/he is or will be harmed
> by the Commission's decision and (b) the Commission violated rules
> of procedure in reaching that decision. The Federal courts are very
> loath to reverse on issues which they feel fall within agency expertise
> except when it involves a high profile political or national policy
> issue, and believe me, nothing in amateur radio rises to that level.
>
> Been there, tried that, "it ain't easy"....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Who gives a camel shit?

73 de Akhbar Balinsk

2709. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 22:14:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <SirHa.4544$a7.1685619@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68799

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bci0kt$dp1$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306150449.31adcd3c@posting.google.com...
> > "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:<bcaoih$io8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > > news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> > >
> > > > Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer
> access
> > > > the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> > > > (temporary) number provided by AT&T.
> > >
> > > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not
> just
> > > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without
> phone
> > > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn
> up
> > > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal
"impossible".)
> > > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
> _effectively_
> > > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
> about,
> > > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as
far
> as
> > > the internet is concerned.)
> > > The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what
they
> were
> > > talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net
goes.
> An
> > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
> 'net:
> > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around
> it."
> > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does

> to
> > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
> reason,
> > > you're off-line.
> >
> > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
>
> Nice dodge of the question, not that I was talking to you. Jim's
> implied that the internet was down due to 9/11, but he only specifies that
> he couldn't connect through his regular ISP. This simply does not prove
that
> the infrastructure in question was actually down, only one part of it.
>

Even if he chose to access another service, calls took over an hour to get
through. That makes it an inadequate tool for emergency usage.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2710. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 22:20:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <qorHa.4546$a7.1686386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68800

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bck9sr$an6$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> I'd like to see you spend a week in the desert with a satellite
> radio and a case of c-rations, might jolt some sense into that thick skull
> of yours so you'd understand the concept that "ISP down" doesn't equal
> "phone lines down".
>

To repeat, in the case of the 9/11 disaster, to which the individual was referring when he stated his ISP was down, it is documented that some phone lines were out completely, some cell towers were out completely, and the rest of the system was overloaded to the extent that phone calls took an hour or more to get through if they got through at all. Thus using the internet, regardless of the status of the ISP, is not a viable choice.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2711. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 23:11:09 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcliq7qtb1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69014

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:qorHa.4546$a7.1686386@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bck9sr$an6$1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > I'd like to see you spend a week in the desert with a satellite
> > radio and a case of c-rations, might jolt some sense into that thick
skull
> > of yours so you'd understand the concept that "ISP down" doesn't equal
> > "phone lines down".
> >
>
> To repeat, in the case of the 9/11 disaster, to which the individual was
> referring when he stated his ISP was down, it is documented that some
phone
> lines were out completely,

Some is not all.

>some cell towers were out completely,

Some is still not all.

>and the
> rest of the system was overloaded to the extent that phone calls took an
> hour or more to get through if they got through at all.

Depends on where you were, no?

> Thus using the
> internet, regardless of the status of the ISP, is not a viable choice.

Another pronouncement from on high? Since nobody's going to bother to
re-read what started this (and in no way could have been construed to
deserve the incredibly asinine level of insults being hurled by some
apparent 2-year old "hams"), here it is again, not that I expect any of you
pricks to actually _read_ it even when it's being spoon-fed to you:

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:qG4Ga.1325$Cj1.725@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...

> Exactly right, Phil. Immediately following 9-11, I could no longer access
> the internet via AT&T. It was a week before I was back up on a new
> (temporary) number provided by AT&T.

OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you _effectively_ UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was about, this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far as the internet is concerned.)
The bottom line (reached by people who seemed to know what they were talking about), is that there would be no effect as far as the net goes. An old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the 'net: "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes around it."
Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it does to power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever reason, you're off-line.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2712. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-16 23:24:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030616192426.12195.00001059@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68851

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/16/03 1:42 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306161042.14ece7c6@posting.google.com>

>> Japan chose, for reasons and with justifications detailed by N2EY, to
>> institute a domestic HF codeless license.
>
>On the amateur bands, which Jim and Steve say can't be.

A lie.

Please cite the quote wherein I said "...(it) ca't be"...

>> No other countries have protested
>> on the same basis-there are no negative effects noted on them. No other
>> country has to "consider" Japan's decision in any way. No other country is
>> invoved. If Japan wants to do that, no one else is involved.
>
>They are, none-theless, in violation.

That is true.

>Dick, you're not writing code, so please try to keep the punctuation
>within the proper structure.

Plucked right out of Lennie's behind, I see.

>Meanwhile, all I said was the the FCC could have gone that way. Jim
>and Steve say they couldn't have because of the treaty.

I have said I want my country to observe the treaties it signs the same as
it would expect me to observe the laws to which I am bound.

How can we expect other nations to respect us if we pick and choose the
laws we care to "adhere" to, even the small ones...?!?!

>I think you all need a nice warm sitz bath.

I think you need to follow your own advice, Lennie...I mean
Brain...er...BRIAN...

Steve, K4CAP

2713. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 00:38:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EEE62F3.7070204@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68852

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>"tad danley" <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:3EEB63C0.AA2FCCE4@earthlink.net...
>
>
>>My son holds a Tech Plus ticket, and passed the 5 wpm code test about 10
>>years ago. When he takes the written exam to upgrade to General, what
>>does he need to show in order to get credit for already passing the 5
>>wpm test?
>>
>>Thanks and 73,
>>
>>
>
>A copy of his license that actually says TECH PLUS will do nicely. Take
>both the original and a photocopy.
>
>
>
When he does take the general written, he might as well go for the
extra. It cost nothing
extra! at the same VE session.

2714. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 00:54:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcloru$89u$0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 68853

Akhbar Balink wrote:

>
> Who gives a camel shit?

Why, you do, Sahib. Else why would you have bothered to respond, as opposed to just toggling the "next" key?

2715. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 01:03:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bclpcf$a3s$0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 68854

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bck9sr$an6$1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > I'd like to see you spend a week in the desert with a satellite
> > radio and a case of c-rations, might jolt some sense into that thick skull
> > of yours so you'd understand the concept that "ISP down" doesn't equal
> > "phone lines down".
> >
>
> To repeat, in the case of the 9/11 disaster, to which the individual was
> referring when he stated his ISP was down, it is documented that some phone
> lines were out completely, some cell towers were out completely, and the
> rest of the system was overloaded to the extent that phone calls took an
> hour or more to get through if they got through at all. Thus using the
> internet, regardless of the status of the ISP, is not a viable choice.

Not only all that, "Robert" doesn't seem to be able to properly mix his
metaphors. C-rations went out with Vietnam and satellite radio sets were not in
use at the time, that was still the era of the T-368/R390A HF stuff.
MRE's would have been the proper cuisine to take along to a desert posting along
with your satellite radio.
Methinks he's a phony.

2716. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 01:04:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bclpff$a3s$1@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 68855

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/16/03 1:42 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306161042.14ece7c6@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Japan chose, for reasons and with justifications detailed by N2EY, to
> >> institute a domestic HF codeless license.
> >
> >On the amateur bands, which Jim and Steve say can't be.
>
> A lie.
>
> Please cite the quote wherein I said "...(it) ca't be"...
>
> >> No other countries have protested
> >> on the same basis-there are no negative effects noted on them. No other
> >> country has to "consider" Japan's decision in any way. No other country is
> >> invoved. If Japan wants to do that, no one else is involved.
> >
> >They are, none-theless, in violation.
>
> That is true.
>
> >Dick, you're not writing code, so please try to keep the punctuation
> >within the proper structure.
>
> Plucked right out of Lennie's behind, I see.
>

That would explain the heavy tan on the end of his nose.

2717. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 01:23:22 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vesrhid65kb72f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68856

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgkrt32.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 11 Jun 2003 10:17:43 -0400, Robert wrote:
>
> > Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
> >public _opinion_?
>
> First question: No.
>
> Second Question: The Commission is required to receive and consider
> whomever's opinion during the comment and reply comment periods but
> is not required to go with "popular opinion" or any other opinion in
> the record. as long as sufficient justification for what they decide
> is articulated in their decisions. A true CYA operation, of which
> the staff are experts.

The FCC is a quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial body, and, like the
federal legislative and judical bodies they are not required to
follow popoular opinion. However, the legislative folks like to get
re-elected, they are expert in at measuring the direction and force of
the prevailing winds.

> Anyone who disagrees with a Commission decision is free to take it
> to appeal, first to the Commission for reconsideration, and then to
> the Federal appellate courts. In the latter case, though, the
> appellant would have to show that (a) that s/he is or will be harmed
> by the Commission's decision and (b) the Commission violated rules
> of procedure in reaching that decision. The Federal courts are very
> loath to reverse on issues which they feel fall within agency expertise
> except when it involves a high profile political or national policy
> issue, and believe me, nothing in amateur radio rises to that level.

Merely following the procedure does not prevent court from overturning
an FCC decision. In review an FCC decision the court shall consider
5 USC 706, which provides:

To the extent necessary to decision and when presented, the reviewing
court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional
and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of
the terms of an agency action. The reviewing court shall -
(1) compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and
(2) hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions
found to be -
(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in
accordance with law;

(B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;
(C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or
short of statutory right;
(D) without observance of procedure required by law;
(E) unsupported by substantial evidence in a case subject to sections
556 and 557
of this title or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency
hearing provided by statute; or
(F) unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject
to
trial de novo by the reviewing court. In making the foregoing
determinations,
the court shall review the whole record or those parts of it
cited by a party,
and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error.

The burden of proof is on the plaintiff.

> Been there, tried that, "it ain't easy"....

and "it ain't cheap" ....; but it is possible.

> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Larry KC8EPO

2718. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 01:39:07 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bclrfe$u9o$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69016

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Not only all that, "Robert" doesn't seem to be able to properly mix his
> metaphors. C-rations went out with Vietnam

Bzzzt. Wrong.

>and satellite radio sets were not in
> use at the time, that was still the era of the T-368/R390A HF stuff.
> MRE's would have been the proper cuisine to take along to a desert posting
>along with your satellite radio.
> Methinks he's a phony.

Bwahahahaha!!!!! I'll pass this one along to the CSM. It's the wannabe
losers who start spouting "phony" at the drop of the hat, along with being
completely clueless.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2719. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 01:51:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030616215142.14837.00000737@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68857

In article <d22b54c3.0306142115.59f758c3@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Different things entirely. Raises a question, though - can a pilot's
>>license be
>> renewed indefinitely without any sort of retesting or recertification?
>
>Yes. As long as ya continue to pass the medicals. There are three
>classes of medicals with varying times between exams, etc., gets
>complicated, nothing like it in ham radio.

We-all, now I'm cornfuzed. You say it's just the medicals, while somebody else (W0EX?) sez ya need a biennial checkout and the medicals. I suppose it depends on what yer flyin' too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2720. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 01:51:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030616215143.14837.00000738@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68858

In article <f45722ac.0306161047.603d693d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Then there was the eyes rolled back "Code Forever" lobbying group.

Who was that?
>
>The FCC made the No Code Technician license a reality anyway.
>
>Later the ARRL said they had supported the NCT license.

Where?

>They forgot to mention that they only supported it as it passed.
>
No, you've got it all mixed up.

What happened is that about 1989 the FCC brought up the idea of a no-code VHF-only license for at least the third time (they had previoulsy proposed such things in 1975 and 1983). ARRL asked members what they thought - specifically, what they thought about a limited-privileges VHF/UHF only nocodetest license. Opinion was just about 50-50. So the ARRL leadership decided to support the idea of a sort of VHF Novice, and made a proposal to the FCC.

This was back when there were petitions to reallocate 220 to other services, which FCC could do under ITU treaty. The ARRL proposal would have put most of the new nocodetest hams on 220 (no 2 meter privileges for them in the ARRL proposal). The idea was to kill two birds with one stone: create a nocodetest ham license and fill up 220 with activity.

But FCC saw through that idea, and rather than adding a new license class they just dumped the code test and the HF privs from the Technician.

Trouble was, that meant there were Techs-with-HF and Techs-without-HF, so some time later FCC had to create the Tech Plus class.

2721. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 02:26:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bclu97$j1g$0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 68859

lk wrote:

> Been there, tried that, "it ain't easy"....

>
> and "it ain't cheap" ....; but it is possible.
>

Many things are theoretically possible that turn out to be virtually impossible
to acheive in practice, for a variety of reasons.

2722. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 02:34:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bclunckgi0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 68860

N2EY wrote:

> In article <d22b54c3.0306142115.59f758c3@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Different things entirely. Raises a question, though - can a pilot's
> >>license be
> >> renewed indefinitely without any sort of retesting or recertification?
> >
> >Yes. As long as ya continue to pass the medicals. There are three
> >classes of medicals with varying times between exams, etc., gets
> >complicated, nothing like it in ham radio.
>
> We-all, now I'm cornfuzed. You say it's just the medicals, while somebody else
> (W0EX?) sez ya need a biennial checkout and the medicals. I suppose it depends
> on what yer flyin' too.
>

Unless something changed since I've been involved, the bienniel flight review is
still in place. I haven't been involved in flying for several years but I can't
imagine that rule would be dropped given the reasons for it in the first place.
Too many private pilots were getting too lax and picking up too many unsafe habits
that caused abrupt termination of their flights.
That doesn't mean some pilots don't ignore it without getting caught.

2723. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 02:36:21 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bclur5kgi1@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 68861

N2EY wrote:

> In article <f45722ac.0306161047.603d693d@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Then there was the eyes rolled back "Code Forever" lobbying group.
>
> Who was that?
> >
> >The FCC made the No Code Technician license a reality anyway.
> >
> >Later the ARRL said they had supported the NCT license.
>
> Where?
>
> >They forgot to mention that they only supported it as it passed.
> >
> No, you've got it all mixed up.

They don't call him "Blender" Burke without reason.

2724. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 03:18:26 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bcm1c8$korrj$1@ID-166180.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 68862

Ain't it amaz'n how some folks just keep paddling upstream -- good reference, Steve. As for those of us at the plans analyst level of Emergency Management, the word is ALREADY out. And you can rest assured that the ARS and its capabilities will remain a vital part of those plans.

Arnie -
KT4ST

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030616083115.04279.00001165@mb-m04.aol.com...
> The Associated Press ran a nice pro-Amateur Radio item entitled "Amateur
> radio helps in disasters" in the Sunday papers. Locally it was on B2 of the
> Chattanooga Times Free Press.
>
> The first rant to fizzle is the assertion that Amateur radio doesn't get
> any "general media" time. Seems to me the Associated Press is sufficiently
> mainstream in anyone's book.
>
> The next one is in paragraph three of the story. Seems I am not the only
> one who considers Amateur Radio to be more that "just" a hobby..."Actually,
> it's a public service" says the AP item. "Some" person(s) in this forum
> (unlicensed, and obviously poorly informed...) has insisted that no one outside
> of Amateur Radio is aware of it's emergency preparedness role. Seems that
> assumption is incorrect.
>
> The item goes on to discuss Skywarn and Amateur Radio's move into the
> digital age. More rants fizzle in the hands of disinterested third parties....
>
> It adds a personal touch, mentioning briefly the "family tradition" of
> W5UGD and how KA2CLX and her hubby became Hams together.
>
> All in all....Good PR for Amatuer Radio from a respected source.
>
> It just keeps getting better and better.
>
> "I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2725. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 03:20:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306161920.1f8ef11d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68863

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bck9sr$an6$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306160245.6bbf44cc@posting.google.com...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bchtdrid1@208.206.142.93>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > > > > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on the
> 'net:
> > > > > > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes
> around it."
> > > > > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it
> does to
> > > > > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for whatever
> reason,
> > > > > > you're off-line.
> > > > >
> > > > > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
> > > > > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
> > > >
> > > I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....
> > >
> > Was prolly not here before desktop computers happened.
> >
> Long before, half-wit.
> >
> > Sheltered
> > existence. Needs to spend a long weekend in the deep woods without a
> > keyboard, matches or a UPS.
> >
> I'd like to see you spend a week in the desert with a satellite
> radio and a case of c-rations, might jolt some sense into that thick skull
> of yours so you'd understand the concept that "ISP down" doesn't equal
> "phone lines down".

(1) You have a helluva lot of months in the woods to go to catch up
with my time in the bush. But I have to concede I never did it with a
sat phone. Three cheers for you. Didja build it from scratch or was it
a kit? (2) I'm licensed to operate on freqs which allow me operate
point-to-point globally without having to depend on any comms
infrastructure widgets like satellites, phones or the Internet. And
yes I've done that. In volume. (3) This group is about ham RADIO, it
is not about the Internet. There isn't anybody in this NG who didn't

already know everything you condecendingly babbled on about at great length WRT chasing down alternative ISPs. Rendering your post not only anecdotal but inane to boot. (4) I have no idea what your "position" is WRT to CW or the code tests nor do I give a shit. But lemmee guess . .

> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/11/2003

WHO CARES??

w3rv

2726. Re: Word from Geneva...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 03:35:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306161935.4465872d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68864

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bckne3$44e$0@208.207.71.152>...
> The International Telecommunication Union's (ITU) World
> Radiocommunication
> Conference 2003 got under way June 9 in Geneva, Switzerland. More than
>
> 2600 delegates and other participants are expected to attend the
> four-week
> conference, chaired by Dr Veena Rawat of Canada.
>
> "Several items on the conference agenda are of great importance to
> radio
> amateurs, so the International Amateur Radio Union has fielded its
> largest
> team of observers at an ITU conference in more than a decade," noted
> IARU
> Secretary (and ARRL CEO) David Sumner, K1ZZ,
>
>
>
> And now, a NOTE TO ALL THE HOPEFUL.....
>
>
> Sumner said that, while there's been plenty of informal discussion about
>
> the issues, no final decisions have been made yet. "It is important to
>
> remember that nothing is final until the second reading of a document
> in
> the Plenary, which--in the case of controversial issues--will not take
>
> place until the final week of the conference, June 30-July 4," he
> said.--IARU news release
>
>
> Whew! At least you can hope they don't run out of time before it
> happens....

Luv it! We have a nocode in the neigborhood who has a matched pair of TS-940S and is dying by the minute. A CPA who claims he has a "mental block" when it comes to copying 5 wpm.

And in the end no skin off our teeth one way or the other huh?

w3rv

2727. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 03:49:09 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030616234909.09515.00002477@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 68865

Thursday of last week, I was at an antenna takedown. They were taking down some tower sections and other stuff from somewhere to be able to have a bigger Field Day setup.

Last weekend, I mentioned Ham radio to a friend. He has an EE degree, but he is now working in the software field. Before I told him about it, he had never heard of Ham radio.

I mentioned that Field Day is coming up pretty soon. I told him when it was- last weekend in June. I told him that Field Day would be the first place to get info about Ham radio, rather than at a club meeting, because you can see actual station setups. He is in another state. He said he would find out where it is in his state.

I told him about the licensing requirement - a simple multiple-choice test that many can pass in one day. I told him about some of the rules of operation and he seemed interested. He seemed interested in the capabilities when I told him about it.

After Field Day, I'll find out if he likes Ham radio.

2728. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 04:40:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617004025.02197.00000736@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 68866

In article <20030616083115.04279.00001165@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> The Associated Press ran a nice pro-Amateur Radio item entitled "Amateur
>radio helps in disasters" in the Sunday papers. Locally it was on B2 of the
>Chattanooga Times Free Press.

. Yes, we all know. All around the southland today folks on break
. were discussing news items in the Chattanooga Times Free
. Press!

> The first rant to fizzle is the assertion that Amateur radio doesn't get
>any "general media" time. Seems to me the Associated Press is sufficiently
>mainstream in anyone's book.

. What "book" is that? :-)
.
. Yes, all over the world folks are even now reading all about amateur
. radio's glowing reputation as a potent, vital need for emergency
. radio communication in the International Editions of the Chattanooga
. Times Free Press!

> The next one is in paragraph three of the story. Seems I am not the only
>one who considers Amateur Radio to be more that "just" a hobby..."Actually,
>it's a public service" says the AP item. "Some" person(s) in this forum
>(unlicensed, and obviously poorly informed...) has insisted that no one
outside
>of Amateur Radio is aware of it's emergency preparedness role. Seems that
>assumption is incorrect.

. Absolutely! Right now, all over the USA eager, interested folks
. are clamoring to get into amateur radio as volunteers to aid in
. disasters and emergencies, forming lines at recruiting stations to
. enlist in the War Against Disasters...all due to the AP wire service
. article in the Chattanooga Times Free Press! Off-duty PD personnel
. have to report in to aid in the crowd control.

> The item goes on to discuss Skywarn and Amateur Radio's move into the
>digital age. More rants fizzle in the hands of disinterested third
parties....

. Absolutely! All over the world radio amateurs are busy hooking up
. their Digital Radios and broadcasting sky warnings digitally, all
. because of an AP article in the Chattanooga Times Free Press!

> It adds a personal touch, mentioning briefly the "family tradition" of
>W5UGD and how KA2CLX and her hubby became Hams together.

. That's so sweet! The couple that beeps together stays together!
.
. Any day now, Hallmark will come out with a special event card
. where some smitten ham swain can send his sweetie a
. Valentine's Day card with a recorded morse mushgram to beep
. his affection! All on account of an AP wire service article in that
. mainstream USA newspaper, the Chattanooga Times Free Press!

> All in all....Good PR for Amatuer Radio from a respected source.

. Tsk, so excited about "amatuer" radio, ey? :-)

> It just keeps getting better and better.

. There you have it! Subscriptions to the Chattanooga Times Free
. Press are at an unprecedented high due to that respected AP
. wire service article! All over the USA there is nothing but constant
. talk of the vital, potent communications through amateur radio.
.
. Next week an entire day of Oprah featuring amateur radio with
. David Sumner in TV makeup, the Washington Post and Wall
. Street Journal having front-page features on ham radio's
. extraordinary emergency service capability, and Katie Couric
. interviewing a typical ham family of six on Today.
.
. Even now the White House is preparing a ceremony where all long-
. time hams who were tested at 20 WPM to be awarded the
. Presidential Medal of Freedom for being there and bulking up
. Homeland Security, Fighting for Ham Decency Through Morse-
. manship, and supporting the Hamerican Way of Code!

> "I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."

. No, Steamy, you are laughing hollowly in the empty arena with
. only a couple of janitors half listening to you bellow and moo into
. your broadcasting keyboard connected to the PA.
.
. The rest of us are just laughing AT you...
.

2729. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 05:23:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617012326.01315.00000285@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68869

In article <bcb4eg$n6m$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on opinions,
>nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used against
>the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?

. Well, there we have it...anyone against the beloved morse code
. test is automatically against all written tests! :-)

2730. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 05:23:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617012327.01315.00000286@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68868

In article <d22b54c3.0306161920.1f8ef11d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
>news:<bck9sr$an6$1@nd.eastky.net>...
>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>> news:d22b54c3.0306160245.6bbf44cc@posting.google.com...
>> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> news:<bchtdrid1@208.206.142.93>...
>> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> > > > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on
>the
>> 'net:
>> > > > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes
>> around it."
>> > > > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as it
>> does to
>> > > > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for
>whatever
>> reason,
>> > > > > you're off-line.
>> > > >
>> > > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell dial
>> > > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
>> > >
>> > I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....
>> >
>> Was prolly not here before desktop computers happened.
>>
>> Long before, half-wit.
>>
>> > Sheltered
>> > existence. Needs to spend a long weekend in the deep woods without a
>> > keyboard, matches or a UPS.
>>
>> I'd like to see you spend a week in the desert with a satellite
>> radio and a case of c-rations, might jolt some sense into that thick skull
>> of yours so you'd understand the concept that "ISP down" doesn't equal
>> "phone lines down".
>
>(1) You have a helluva lot of months in the woods to go to catch up
>with my time in the bush.

. Where was this "bush?" Did you put too much steam in the
. catapult and you got launched to land?!?
.
. Did one of the Bears you photographed do a number on you in
. the "bush?"

2731. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 05:23:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617012328.01315.00000287@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 68867

In article <bclpcf$a3s$0@208.206.142.108>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> Not only all that, "Robert" doesn't seem to be able to properly mix his
>metaphors. C-rations went out with Vietnam and satellite radio sets were not
>in use at the time, that was still the era of the T-368/R390A HF stuff.

. Tell us all about it, great soldier hero of Vietnam. :-)
.
. You forget your MO neighbor who "saved his whole brigade with
. his trusty AN/PRC-25."
.
. Dickie, the "HF stuff" wasn't in the "field" holding down comms
. but a lot of other radios were.
.
. "Satellite radio" started up in the Vietnam War era which ended
. 30 years ago.

>MRE's would have been the proper cuisine to take along to a desert posting
>along with your satellite radio.

. Well, there you have it, an unbiased report from a veteran Who
. Was There!
.
. The first Gulf War was 12 years ago, hero veteran. AN/PSN-11s
. were even then with graves registration details marking burial sites
. of Iraqis killed in the field...probably overdosing on the "cuisine"
. stolen from US forces. [you've never had an MRE in your life]
.
. What will you have for us tomorrow, mighty hero veteran? Morse
. code comms from behind Iraqi lines revealing intelligence data of
. Iraqi troop movements? Beep, beep...

2732. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgldy1c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68870
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 12 Jun 2003 12:16:40 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>> If they can't hobble a radio together out of a
>> foil chewing gum wrapper and a double edged razor blade then the hell
>> with 'em. Now where did I put my microphone?
>
>Don't sweat it Brian....I tried that razor blade deal.....just couldn't make
>it work on SSBsc.

That's 'cause you weren't using a single-edge blade.... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2733. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgleaud.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68871
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 13 Jun 2003 03:53:48 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>You should read about the kid in San Diego, a licensed ham who
>transmitted on the Sheriffs frequency when he thought he had a valid
>emergency reason.

> Ah. More of what passes for Brain logic. Somehow FCC seems to view it
>as a different manner. No surprises there, either,

As did the Sheriff's Department, whose radio tech proved using the
ham's own modified radio that it was possible to make an autopatch
call to 9-1-1 on one or more ham channels from that location. They
had had problems with that individual playing wannabee before.....

So they complained to the FCC, relying on the emphasized-below
phrase of Section 97.403 which stated clearly:

Sec. 97.403 Safety of life and protection of property.

No provision of these rules prevents the use by an amateur
station of any means of radiocommunication at its disposal to
provide essential communication needs in connection with the
immediate safety of human life and immediate protection of
property WHEN NORMAL COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

and the FCC agreed that "normal communications systems" were
available.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2734. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglhame.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68874
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 13 Jun 2003 03:53:50 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> I dont' think so, Bill. More like *anyhone* can use 5.1675 without
> regard to whether or not they're licensed at all. Of course that isn't
> true of the five new 60 meter channels.

Not so. The Rules are quite specific that that frequency is available only to licensed stations in the Maritime, Aviation, Land-Mobile, Alaska Fixed and Amateur Radio Services and only for communications in connection with an emergency.

Broadcast licensees or GMRS licensees or blanket-authorized users in the CB, FRS, and MURS services can't use it unless they are licensed in one of the permitted services.

Amateurs in Alaska were first given permission to use the Alaska Emergency Frequency when it was changed to 5.1675 MHz in 1974. In FCC 86-9, the Report and Order in PR Docket 85-23 in 1986, this permission was clarified by specifying that all classes of amateur licensees in or within 50 miles of Alaska, including both Novice and Technician, were able to use that frequency by having it listed in the tables of frequencies available to each class. With the reorganization of the amateur rules in 1969, the language "any station" was used to cover all classes and the specific listing of that frequency in the tables for each class was dropped.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2735. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgllw9h.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68872
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 14 Jun 2003 07:41:33 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> I can agree with that statement because the ONLY purpose allowed
>> for 5.1675 IS an emergency.
>
>I doubt that. You know there have to be the usual non-critical
>"quickies" on the freq.

This was discussed at length in the 1974 R&O that set up that
frequency. Non-emergency traffic - non-critical "quickies" or
otherwise - is permitted only for non-amateur land mobile stations
and then only to call and move off to some other frequency.

From what I understand from my former compadres in the Anchorage
station, this is observed very closely.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2736. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgljnsg.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68873
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 13 Jun 2003 21:35:14 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>If that is truly what the FCC director said, then that FCC
>director clerly didn't have any idea about the law.

If it was the EIC, he had his own ideas about what the law should
be. He is no longer with the agency.

IIRC it was the case officer, who knew a lot better. He passed away
a while back.

All the FCC supervisors in the region tore that case apart for the
actual details which did not always agree with the published stories.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2737. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglmuei.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68876

On 14 Jun 2003 12:29:09 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>Also the finest ham radio operator ever to key a microphone.
>
>I disagree. He singlehandedly undermined the examination process.
>Then FCC completed the process.

Out of sheer desperation.
>
>He may be a nice guy but he's no hero of amateur radio.

He was "plying his trade" at my office (San Francisco) and I had to
deal with him face-to-face. I considered him a sleaze for what he
was doing.

HOWEVER, I have found out that there are several Richard Bash-es
floating around. Are we sure that this one is "the" Dick Bash?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2738. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglqlyj.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68875

On Sat, 14 Jun 2003 12:40:17 -0500, David Lafferty wrote:

>I dunno Jim. It always confused me that for several years, you could get
>the questions and answers for the FAA pilot exams, but not for the FCC
>amateur exams or commercial radio exams.

The availabilty of the FAA Q&A is what nailed down the FCC HQ's
decision to go to published Q&As in spite of the wall-to-wall
opposition of the field examining and enforcement staff.

>I recall having to use study material with no questions and answers for my
>ham exams and 1st class commercial phone,

I used commercially-published study guides for those tests in the
1950s and they were in Q&A format - the questions were pretty close,
too.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2739. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglqszk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68878

On 15 Jun 2003 01:56:23 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>I think if we reviewed the timeline we'd find that the FCC led the
>way in mediocrity and foolheartiness.

I second the motion but the FAA exams were first.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2740. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglr4ml.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68877

On Sun, 15 Jun 2003 23:43:22 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:

>Bash was the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's
>high school algebra tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or
>the frat house's library of previous year's tests at some college.

Bash was the equivalent of someone breaking into the school and
rummaging through the teacher's desk until he found the questions
and answers to the algebra exam.

Those exams were not public information, and the examinees were not
authorized to carry the information out od the exam room or to tell
him what the questions and answers were. It is the equivakent of
stolen material.

We went through this before - do we need to resurrect the dispute
again?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2741. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglrvmm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68879

On 16 Jun 2003 10:07:39 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>Note that back in those days the Q&A pools were much smaller. In fact,
>I have read that there were only 2 or 3 versions of each written test,
>and that the reason FCC required a 30 day wait before retesting was to
>prevent recognition of the fact that there were so few versions.

There were five different "series" for each element, and the 30-day
waiting period was to give the applicant an opportunity to repent
for his wayardness, to do some more and better quality studying, and
to avoid waves and waves of applicants at each session.

>I think there are several reasons Bash got away with what he did:
>
>1) It would have been embarrassing to the FCC to actuallyadmit that
>they only had a few different tests for each level of license.

That was not the problem.

>2) Bash did not act alone - he had lots of help from those who gave
>him the information. Prosecuting all of those people would have been
>difficult.

Especailly when the attorney who would have had to do the work was
an "avoid hard work at all costs" person. We went head to head on
that issue.

>3) Bash never had access to the actual test materials. There were
>warnings about those taking tests divulging their contents, but the
>rules were vague about someone asking testees about the test. It could
>be argued that Bash did not violate any rules or laws, but that those
>who gave him info were the real criminals.

See my response to (2) above.

>4) (This may be the biggest one): FCC was considering getting out of
>the testing business anyway, so there was no point in prosecuting
>someone for what would no longer be a violation.

Not exactly. The HQ people - who didn't give or grade any tests
anyhow - were looking for ways for their staff to do less work,
and this was a golden opportunity which eventually ended in
privitization (the VE program). As I said before, those of us who
actually ran the sessions and gave the tests and cared about doing it
right were not in favor of the open book method.

>All of this is kind of academic now, because FCC isn't about to go
>back to private, secret tests.

Unfortunately.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2742. Re: FCC (was Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgls76n.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68880

On Thu, 12 Jun 2003 15:12:22 -0700, Vito wrote:

>Well, most likely in mid-management in the coffee industry.

More likely top management.

>Trouble is these appointments are temporary. When you leave office
>your appointees are going to have to go to their old bosses to find
>jobs.

The opposite...either they were the bosses or their old colleagues
ask them to come back with their new and better connections.

>Need I say that they're likely to feather their nests while
>commissioners?

If they are that good, they will have it all set up before they get
appointed.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2743. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglu0ao.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68883

On 13 Jun 2003 01:05:46 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>The problems between Sarnoff and Armstrong are another matter entirely. I
>think it is fitting that Armstrong's name is remembered the whole world
>over.

Even my antenna rotator honors his name..... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2744. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgluiqp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68881

On 13 Jun 2003 07:16:48 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> Plus there were the weird noises from vacuum formers and diathermies.
>
>For certain. But in that timeframe the FCC also put the clamps on that
>type of equipment WRT to allowable EMI/RFI. That was the real flap in
>that part of the spectrum because it affected big bucks corporate
>fixed investments in capital equipment which suddenly became illegal
>to use.

The main problem was that the harmonics fell in the aviation bands,
so ISM equipment had to be certified - not only the generator, but
the entire plant - to meet strict harmonic standards. We were still
doing a lot of chasing of heat sealers into the mid-1970s when
new designs came out that met specs.

The main mwthod of cleaning it up was screen room enclosures. ISM
equipment itself can legally generate as much power as desired as
long as it is kept in the range of 27.120 MHz +/- 160 kHz. Find a
way to filter the harmonics but let the fundamental through
unattenuated, run it on raw rectified AC, and you got a super CB
jammer - perfectly legal.

The ham side of the overall 11M uproar wasn't even on the
>chart in comparison. And the FCC enforced it. They basically cleaned
>up 11M for the CBers.
>
>> >
>> Speaking of GHz, an IEEE convention was in town the past few days.
>> Lotta neat stuff, lotta emphasis on microwaves. All that RF plumbing
>> looks like an ME's delight...
>
>It is, been there, done it in volume. It's mostly a manufacturing
>engineering challenge. The field is overpoulated with goofy EEs who
>don't know which end of a wrench ya grab and come off the wall with
>the weirdest . . "What's the problem Kelly?" All ya gotta do is drill
>a bunch of square holes." "Yeah, with a square hole drill right?"
>
>Ah, never mind . . !
>
>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>w3rv

2745. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 06:11:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hglj9uf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68882
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 13 Jun 2003 03:53:52 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case
>mentioned. In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his
>"oepned up" 2-meter walkie talkie to call the San Diego county
>sheriff's office on their channel when he had what he considered to be
>an appropriate emergency. Not only did the FCC office in San Diego
>confiscate his radio,

The SD seized the radio for evidence so they could make the tests described in another post. Their charge supporting the seizure was interfering with a police officer in the performance of his/her duties (Cal. Penal Code Sect. 148).

At no time was the radio "confiscated"...it was seized as evidence, a big legal difference.

>they made statements to the effect that the mere
>possession of a radio capable of doing that was not legal.

That was a bit of run-off-at-the-mouth by the case officer who is no longer with the agency - he passed away shortly after retiring not all that voluntarily.

>Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.

The plea bargain, common for first offenders, was that he would voluntarily surrender the modified radio for destruction in exchange for the FCC suspending any further action on his unlicensed operation, contingent on his not violating the law again. Were he to be caught violating again, he would be charged with this offense as well.

Had he not surrendered the radio coluntarily, the Commission would have gone to Federal court to get a seizure warrant and the U S Attorney would institute a forfeiture proceeding, which would have been a routine but time-consuming matter. Meanwhile the SD was holding the radio safe and sound.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2746. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 10:46:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617064621.10078.00000261@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68884

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgluiqp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 13 Jun 2003 07:16:48 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>>> Plus there were the weird noises from vacuum formers and diathermies.
>>
>>For certain. But in that timeframe the FCC also put the clamps on that
>>type of equipment WRT to allowable EMI/RFI. That was the real flap in
>>that part of the spectrum because it affected big bucks corporate
>>fixed investments in capital equipment which suddenly became illegal
>>to use.
>
> The main problem was that the harmonics fell in the aviation bands,
> so ISM equipment had to be certified - not only the generator, but
> the entire plant - to meet strict harmonic standards. We were still
> doing a lot of chasing of heat sealers into the mid-1970s when
> new designs came out that met specs.

There was a QST article way back in the late 1940s or early '50s. I think the
author was W1DBM. Lot of detail about cleaning up heat sealers whose signals
were chewing up various parts of the bands and causing TVI. Guess who would get
blamed for the TVI.

I recall one Philly business, circa 1965, that got a visit from several of the
local gendarmes. They'd gotten a really good price on a used heatsealer, toted
it up to the 3rd floor of their plant, plugged it in and went to work......
>
> The main mwthod of cleaning it up was screen room enclosures. ISM
> equipment itself can legally generate as much power as desired as
> long as it is kept in the range of 27.120 MHz +/- 160 kHz. Find a
> way to filter the harmonics but let the fundamental through
> unattenuated, run it on raw rectified AC, and you got a super CB
> jammer - perfectly legal.

Generate or radiate, Phil?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2747. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 11:24:50 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcmtpkcbd1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69017

```
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306161920.1f8ef11d@posting.google.com...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:<bck9sr$an6$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0306160245.6bbf44cc@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:<bchtdr$id$1@208.206.142.93>...
> > > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > > > > old expression may apply, regarding why censorship won't work on
the
> > 'net:
> > > > > > "The internet interprets censorship as damage and simply routes
> > around it."
> > > > > > Anyway, the whole backup concept applies here, just as
it
> > does to
> > > > > > power sources. If you only use one ISP, and it vanishes for
whatever
> > reason,
> > > > > > you're off-line.
> > > > >
> > > > > When suddenly there are no functioning Comcast cables or Ma Bell
dial
> > > > > tones hardwired or otherwise what ISP do you dial into?
> > > >
> > > > I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up.....
> > >
> > > Was prolly not here before desktop computers happened.
> >
> > Long before, half-wit.
> >
> > > Sheltered
> > > existence. Needs to spend a long weekend in the deep woods without a
> > > keyboard, matches or a UPS.
> >
> > I'd like to see you spend a week in the desert with a satellite
> > radio and a case of c-rations, might jolt some sense into that thick
skull
> > of yours so you'd understand the concept that "ISP down" doesn't equal
> > "phone lines down".
>
```

> (1) You have a helluva lot of months in the woods to go to catch up
> with my time in the bush.

Months? I've lugged my radios around in Honduras, Jordan, Egypt,
Oman, Greece and the US. And inside a submarine. I seriously doubt I could
learn much about field operations from you.

>But I have to concede I never did it with a
> sat phone. Three cheers for you. Didja build it from scratch or was it
> a kit?

After the slew of tech schools I've been to, I'm more interested in
expedient antennas, not radios.

>(2) I'm licensed to operate on freqs which allow me operate
> point-to-point globally without having to depend on any comms
> infrastructure widgets like satellites, phones or the Internet. And
> yes I've done that. In volume.

What, you assume I haven't just because I _prefer_ (and have more
training in) VHF/UHF satcom? I've operated encrypted receiver systems in
VLF/LF, transmit/recieve in HF, VHF, UHF and SHF - teletype and voice,
secure and non-secure.

>(3) This group is about ham RADIO, it
> is not about the Internet.

(4) Uh-oh. Can I see your badge, Mr. NetCop?

>There isn't anybody in this NG who didn't
> already know everything you condecendingly babbled on about at great
> length WRT chasing down alternative ISPs.

That just means they can't _read_, then.

> Rendering your post not only
> anecdotal but inane to boot.

Yer nearly as big a hoot as ol' Dicky.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.489 / Virus Database: 288 - Release Date: 6/10/2003

2748. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 12:23:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617082321.18497.00000755@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 68885

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of June 15, 2003:

Novice - 34,004 (decrease of 15,325)
Technician - 255,356 (increase of 49,962)
Technician Plus - 67,854 (decrease of 61,006)
General - 140,983 (increase of 28,306)
Advanced - 83,318 (decrease of 16,464)
Extra - 104,088 (increase of 25,338)
Total - 685,603 (increase of 10,811)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2749. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 12:39:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306170439.1f2a9e0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68886

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030616192426.12195.00001059@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/16/03 1:42 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306161042.14ece7c6@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Japan chose, for reasons and with justifications detailed by N2EY, to
> >> institute a domestic HF codeless license.
> >
> >On the amateur bands, which Jim and Steve say can't be.
>
> A lie.
>
> Please cite the quote wherein I said "...(it) ca't be"...

Why? It was dumb enough the first time around.
>
> >> No other countries have protested
> >> on the same basis-there are no negative effects noted on them. No other
> >> country has to "consider" Japan's decision in any way. No other country is
> >> invoved. If Japan wants to do that, no one else is involved.
> >
> >They are, none-theless, in violation.
>
> That is true.
>
> >Dick, you're not writing code, so please try to keep the punctuation
> >within the proper structure.
>
> Plucked right out of Lennie's behind, I see.

Ew. You're nasty.

> >Meanwhile, all I said was the the FCC could have gone that way. Jim
> >and Steve say they couldn't have because of the treaty.
>
> I have said I want my country to observe the treaties it signs the same as
> it would expect me to observe the laws to which I am bound.

Even if they are bad treaties? bad laws?

> How can we expect other nations to respect us if we pick and choose the
> laws we care to "adhere" to, even the small ones...?!?!

Do other nations not respect Japan? A few years back everyone wanted
to model themselves after the Japanese, even as they violated
international code and fishing treaties.

> >I think you all need a nice warm sitz bath.
>
> I think you need to follow your own advice, Lennie...I mean
> Brain...er...BRIAN...

I think you are easily confused. Perhaps a good head dunk in the sitz
bath would help.

2750. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 12:54:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617085442.17727.00000575@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68887

>Subject: Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/16/03 2:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306161108.17a2dd81@posting.google.com>

>As opposed to Steve who bought hisself a box full of medals.

Ahhhhh, yes...I did...And that's where the one's I didn't earn stay...Along
with other "collectables".

Now, about that T5 operation...WHERE are the logbooks again?

Steve, K4CAP

2751. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 13:00:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617090059.17727.00000576@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68888

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/17/03 7:39 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306170439.1f2a9e0c@posting.google.com>

>> Please cite the quote wherein I said "...(it) can't be"...
>
>Why? It was dumb enough the first time around.

Yes, you're right...Getting caught lying was a dumb thing for you to do the
first time. No use exacerbating it, huh?

>> Plucked right out of Lennie's behind, I see.
>
>Ew. You're nasty.

No one ever said the truth had to be pretty.

>> I have said I want my country to observe the treaties it signs the
>same as
>> it would expect me to observe the laws to which I am bound.
>
>Even if they are bad treaties? bad laws?

There has been AMPLE time AND opportunity to change that which YOU think
is "bad", Brain. More than a few men and women have gone over those
regulations on more than a few occassions and found them to be adequate and
appropriate for the times and situations.

That those laws are an inconvienience to you and others is
inconsequential.

>> How can we expect other nations to respect us if we pick and choose
>the
>> laws we care to "adhere" to, even the small ones...?!?!
>
>Do other nations not respect Japan? A few years back everyone wanted
>to model themselves after the Japanese, even as they violated
>international code and fishing treaties.

And others didn't. Many find some of Japan's "culture" and "laws" to be
racist and barbaric. YMMV.

>> >I think you all need a nice warm sitz bath.
>>
>> I think you need to follow your own advice, Lennie...I mean
>> Brain...er...BRIAN...

>
>I think you are easily confused. Perhaps a good head dunk in the sitz
>bath would help.

I see that originality is not high on your list of "things to do", Brain.

Steve, K4CAP

2752. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 13:04:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617090434.17727.00000577@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68889

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/17/03 12:23 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030617012326.01315.00000285@mb-m18.aol.com>

>>What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on
>opinions,
>>nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used against
>>the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
>
>. Well, there we have it...anyone against the beloved morse code
>. test is automatically against all written tests!

You didn't answer the question, Rectum Breath...Would YOU use the same
arguments per the WRITTEN tests as you have the code test?

Steve, K4CAP

2753. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 13:11:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617091152.17727.00000578@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68890

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/16/03 2:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306161102.1d9de06@posting.google.com>

>> Such an idiot. Can't read a sentence. Shameshameshame.
>
>Poor Steve, he cannot structure a sentence properly.

Poor Brain. Can't figure out what to do without input from Lennie, so
just copies his "techniques". Yet another putz.

>> You still have not shown how Japanese radio policy has affected UN
>policy.
>
>It should be obvious, Steve, but just for you I'll point it out.
>
>It has weakened the treaty.

Oh? How? What overwhelming breakdown in international politics has
occured as a result of this? What major internal, US policy has been affected
due to Nippon's failure to follow the law?

>>It sets a precedent for making up one's own rules when the rules they
>> agreed to don't suit them anymore. See: Japan.
>
>Yes, Steve. I've been saying See: Japan. Now you get it.

Got your nose rubbed in your own dung and you think you're ahead...! Thanks
for the laugh!

>> >Wonder whatever happened to all those US callsigns issued for Japan.
>>
>> No US callsigns are presently assigned to Japan.
>
>So Japan is once again a soverign nation?

When since 1954 has it not been?

>> There ARE callsigns assigned to US Armed Forces in Japan when
>operating
>> from US bases, under US control, and in accordance with rules established
>by
>> the United States Air Force.
>
>What other country does this?

Does it matter? But case in point, Great Britian, Argentina, New Zealand, Austrailia, Russia (and many of it's satellites), Poland, and I am sure others.

>> See: Auxiliary Military Radio System.
>>
>> No, this is not a backwards accronym for MARS.
>>
>> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ
>
>When did you get your old call back?

In about a week. See: ULS

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2754. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 13:25:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617092522.17727.00000579@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68891

>Subject: Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/16/03 11:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030617004025.02197.00000736@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030616083115.04279.00001165@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> The Associated Press ran a nice pro-Amateur Radio item entitled
>"Amateur
>>radio helps in disasters" in the Sunday papers. Locally it was on B2 of the
>>Chattanooga Times Free Press.
>
>. Yes, we all know. All around the southland today folks on break
>. were discussing news items in the Chattanooga Times Free
>. Press!

Can't stand having your rants screwed up, can ya, Putzy?

>> The first rant to fizzle is the assertion that Amateur radio doesn't
>get
>>any "general media" time. Seems to me the Associated Press is sufficiently
>>mainstream in anyone's book.
>
>. What "book" is that?

The one you have to figuratively sit on to reach the keyboard, Oh Childish
One.

>Yes, all over the world folks are even now reading all about amateur
>. radio's glowing reputation as a potent, vital need for emergency
>. radio communication in the International Editions of the Chattanooga
>. Times Free Press!

So, Your Scumminess, The LA Times no longer uses the AP? You don't have
access to the AP via AOL in SoCal?

>Absolutely! Right now, all over the USA eager, interested folks
>. are clamoring to get into amateur radio as volunteers to aid in
>. disasters and emergencies, forming lines at recruiting stations to
>. enlist in the War Against Disasters...all due to the AP wire service
>. article in the Chattanooga Times Free Press! Off-duty PD personnel
>. have to report in to aid in the crowd control.

Who knows. Can YOU absolutely assert that no one might take the time to look up "Ham Radio" after reading the article and follow up on it?

I bet somone does. And if they do, that will be one more test than YOU have taken, Lennie.

>> The item goes on to discuss Skywarn and Amateur Radio's move into the
>>digital age. More rants fizzle in the hands of disinterested third
>parties....
>
>. Absolutely! All over the world radio amateurs are busy hooking up
>. their Digital Radios and broadcasting sky warnings digitally, all
>. because of an AP article in the Chattanooga Times Free Press!

Or perhaps of the AP article in the LA Times...Or the Cleveland Plain Dealer...or the Philadelphia Inquirer...or the New York Times...or...well, WE get the picture.

>> It adds a personal touch, mentioning briefly the "family tradition" of
>>W5UGD and how KA2CLX and her hubby became Hams together.
>
>. That's so sweet! The couple that beeps together stays together!

Once again you try to make a "code issue" out of something that is not germane to the code issue.

Nice try. Does it get lonely being that much of a loser, Your Dimwittedness?

>> "I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."
>
>. No, Steamy, you are laughing hollowly...(SNIP)

No, Lennie, WE are laughing at YOU. Again.

What a putz.

>The rest of us are just laughing AT you...

Oh...you mean you, Brain and Vipul? Brain doesn't know the difference between "permission" and "credit", and Vippy doesn't know if he's anything. Some great crowd YOU are running in.

What a BIG putz.

Again.

Steve, K4CAP

2755. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 13:29:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617092957.17727.00000580@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 68892

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/16/03 10:49 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030616234909.09515.00002477@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>Thursday of last week, I was at an antenna takedown. They were taking down
>some
>tower sections and other stuff from somewhere to be able to have a bigger
>Field
>Day setup.

>>I<< am impressed.

>Last weekend, I mentioned Ham radio to a friend. He has an EE degree, but he
>is
>now working in the software field. Before I told him about it, he had never
>heard of Ham radio.

Good for you.

>I mentioned that Field Day is coming up pretty soon. I told him when it was-
>last weekend in June. I told him that Field Day would be the first place to
>get
>info about Ham radio, rather than at a club meeting, because you can see
>actual
>station setups. He is in another state. He said he would find out where it is
>in his state.

You COULD send an e mail to the League and ask them for the addresseses of
ARRL-affiliated clubs in his area and give them to him. He probably doesn't
know about ARRL, either, and your tip might save him a lot of grief searching.

>I told him about the licensing requirement - a simple multiple-choice test
>that
>many can pass in one day. I told him about some of the rules of operation and
>he seemed interested. He seemed interested in the capabilities when I told
>him
>about it.

Well good for you, Vipul.

>After Field Day, I'll find out if he likes Ham radio.

You do that...and let us know. I'll be the blue one in the corner holding
my breath.......

Steve, K4CAP

2756. Re: Word from Geneva...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 15:15:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcnba6$to5$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 68893

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> And in the end no skin off our teeth one way or the other huh?
>

Exactly.

2757. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 15:16:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306170716.4a315ef6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68894
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgllw9h.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 14 Jun 2003 07:41:33 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> I can agree with that statement because the ONLY purpose allowed
> >> for 5.1675 IS an emergency.
> >
> >I doubt that. You know there have to be the usual non-critical
> >"quickies" on the freq.
>
> This was discussed at length in the 1974 R&O that set up that
> frequency. Non-emergency traffic - non-critical "quickies" or
> otherwise - is permitted only for non-amateur land mobile stations
> and then only to call and move off to some other frequency.
>
> From what I understand from my former compadres in the Anchorage
> station, this is observed very closely.

It's unavoidable, give a guy a radio and a common gathering channel
and it'll happen. We hear it all the time on the local small-town PD
freqs.

w3rv

2758. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 15:25:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcnbsuuot0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 68895

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <bcb4eg$n6m$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
>
> >What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on opinions,
> >nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used against
> >the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
>
> . Well, there we have it...anyone against the beloved morse code
> . test is automatically against all written tests! :-)

Gawd! actually a *two-liner* from Lennie!!! I'm feeling faint!
His rants are becoming more efficient!

But how's he ever gonna pass *any* test when he can't even get
his attributions right?

2759. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 15:46:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcnd5i$1te$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 68896
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 13 Jun 2003 03:53:52 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > Yes they can, and you might bring yourself up to date on the case
> >mentioned. In San Diego a few years ago a licensed ham uses his
> >"oepned up" 2-meter walkie talkie to call the San Diego county
> >sheriff's office on their channel when he had what he considered to be
> >an appropriate emergency. Not only did the FCC office in San Diego
> >confiscate his radio,
>
> The SD seized the radio for evidence so they could make the tests
> described in another post. Their charge supporting the seizure was
> interfering with a police officer in the performance of his/her
> duties (Cal. Penal Code Sect. 148).
>
> At no time was the radio "confiscated"...it was seized as evidence,
> a big legal difference.
>
> >they made statements to the effect that the mere
> >possession of a radio capable of doing that was not legal.
>
> That was a bit of run-off-at-the-mouth by the case officer who is no
> longer with the agency - he passed away shortly after retiring not
> all that voluntarily.
>
> >Far as I ever learned they did NOT return his radio to him.
>
> The plea bargain, common for first offenders, was that he would
> voluntarily surrender the modified radio for destruction in exchange
> for the FCC suspending any further action on his unlicensed
> operation, contingent on his not violating the law again. Were he
> to be caught violating again, he would be charged with this offense
> as well.
>
> Had he not surrendered the radio coluntarily, the Commission would
> have gone to Federal court to get a seizure warrant and the U S
> Attorney would institute a forfeiture proceeding, which would have
> been a routine but time-consuming matter. Meanwhile the SD was
> holding the radio safe and sound.....

Aw, yes, we can't forget the legelese can we? But the bottom line remains.

2760. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 17:30:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcnj7ades0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 68897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 13 Jun 2003 03:53:48 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >You should read about the kid in San Diego, a licensed ham who
> >transmitted on the Sheriffs frequency when he thought he had a valid
> >emergency reason.
>
> > Ah. More of what passes for Brain logic. Somehow FCC seems to view it
> >as a different manner. No surprises there, either,
>
> As did the Sheriff's Department, whose radio tech proved using the
> ham's own modified radio that it was possible to make an autopatch
> call to 9-1-1 on one or more ham channels from that location. They
> had had problems with that individual playing wannabee before.....
>
> So they complained to the FCC, relying on the emphasized-below
> phrase of Section 97.403 which stated clearly:
>
> Sec. 97.403 Safety of life and protection of property.
>
> No provision of these rules prevents the use by an amateur
> station of any means of radiocommunication at its disposal to
> provide essential communication needs in connection with the
> immediate safety of human life and immediate protection of
> property WHEN NORMAL COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS ARE NOT AVAILABLE.
>
> and the FCC agreed that "normal communications systems" were
> available.

That's why I said "you better be ready to prove it..." And seems that some

publishers like to gloss over such small details. (Pop Com for one)

2761. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 17:40:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306170940.606d14e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68898

> There was a QST article way back in the late 1940s or early '50s.

QST for September, 1951, page 29. "Curing Industrial TVI"

> I think the
> author was W1DBM.

Also known as Phil Rand (SK).

> Lot of detail about cleaning up heat sealers whose signals
> were chewing up various parts of the bands and causing TVI.
> Guess who would get
> blamed for the TVI.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2762. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 17:42:21 UTC
From: itzack@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <457c1251.0306170942.3075744d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68899
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Hams seek to learn the law and to use what they have learned and been tested on. "freebanders" ignore the law and choose to look the other way when they blindly stumble across a law that they are in violation of.
.-.. .- .-- -... .-. . .- -.- . .-. ...
(use a cheat sheet if you must)

2763. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 19:02:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617150237.10078.00000264@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68900

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hglr4ml.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sun, 15 Jun 2003 23:43:22 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
>
>>Bash was the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's
>>high school algebra tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or
>>the frat house's library of previous year's tests at some college.
>
> Bash was the equivalent of someone breaking into the school and
> rummaging through the teacher's desk until he found the questions
> and answers to the algebra exam.
>
> Those exams were not public information, and the examinees were not
> authorized to carry the information out od the exam room or to tell
> him what the questions and answers were. It is the equivakent of
> stolen material.

. Legally and technically, isn't that exam material "intellectual
. property?" If so, wouldn't it fall under the Copyright Laws (Title
. 17)? The US government cannot copyright its own work.
.
. Exactly what would the charges be if someone was arrested
. for divulging exact question-answer content? I'm just asking a
. question on law there. Would it be a criminal or civil case?
.
. Well before "Dick Bash" material there were the "Q&A" books
. on many different federal tests, including radio (both commercial
. and amateur). Younger folks in here don't remember them but
. they were in many bookstores and radio stores back then.

> We went through this before - do we need to resurrect the dispute
> again?

. Absolutely! It is a question of Glorious Honor to Preserve the
. Mightiness of the Old-Tyme Hams showing how great they were
. to have Survived The Ordeals of the Amateur Test! No one dare
. question their claims of greatness and superiority! :-)

2764. Rants Fizzle...Steamy's Down For The Count!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 19:02:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617150239.10078.00000265@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 68901

In article <20030617092522.17727.00000579@mb-m23.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>> The Associated Press ran a nice pro-Amateur Radio item entitled "Amateur
>>>radio helps in disasters" in the Sunday papers. Locally it was on B2 of the
>>>Chattanooga Times Free Press.
>>
>>. Yes, we all know. All around the southland today folks on break
>>. were discussing news items in the Chattanooga Times Free
>>. Press!
>
> Can't stand having your rants screwed up, can ya, Putzy?

. Nothing is "screwed up." Only your personal rage and
. vindictiveness. :-)

>>. What "book" is that?
>
> The one you have to figuratively sit on to reach the keyboard, Oh Childish
>One.

. Another good remark on the subject, ey? :-)
.
. Seems that all you can do is insult other people having opposite
. opinions to yours. Tsk, tsk.

>>. Yes, all over the world folks are even now reading all about amateur
>>. radio's glowing reputation as a potent, vital need for emergency
>>. radio communication in the International Editions of the Chattanooga
>>. Times Free Press!
>
> So, Your Scumminess, The LA Times no longer uses the AP? You don't have
>access to the AP via AOL in SoCal?

. The Los Angeles TIMES is affiliated with Associated Press and several
. other news wire services. Daily subscription is about 1.5 million and the
. paper was founded in 1881.
.
. The choice of each edition's content is determined by the editors as
. in every newspaper in the USA. Since the LA TIMES covers such a
. large area, there are several regional editions...we get the "Valley"
. edition. The TIMES chose not to print that particular AP article...if it
. existed at all.
.

. The on-line "morgue" of the AP isn't complete and no trace of that
. alleged story could be found on-line. Neither did it show up in the
. on-line morgue of the LA TIMES. ["morgue" is the newspapers'
. common name for archives]
.
. In the on-line archives of the LA TIMES for 7 years back to 1996 there
. are 80 hits for any article having the word groups "amateur radio" or
. "ham radio." Of those, only 20 are featuring amateur radio as the main
. topic of the article...two of them (for 2000 and 1996) cover Field Day.
. The most recent article concerning amateur radio was 27 Dec 02
. about hacker Kevin Mitnick, written by David Ho. [ho ho! :-)]
.
. It's quite safe to say that newspaper editors don't consider amateur
. radio as some of great vital interest to the majority of readers. :-)

>>. Absolutely! Right now, all over the USA eager, interested folks
>>. are clamoring to get into amateur radio as volunteers to aid in
>>. disasters and emergencies, forming lines at recruiting stations to
>>. enlist in the War Against Disasters...all due to the AP wire service
>>. article in the Chattanooga Times Free Press! Off-duty PD personnel
>>. have to report in to aid in the crowd control.
>
> Who knows. Can YOU absolutely assert that no one might take the time to
>look up "Ham Radio" after reading the article and follow up on it?

. All anyone has to do is follow in your illustrious footsteps, oh Great
. Warrior Leader (and veteran a "seven hostile actions"). Raise your
. glorious Flag and bellow "Follow Me!" and all will join your crusade.

> I bet somone does. And if they do, that will be one more test than YOU
>have taken, Lennie.

. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Running out of insults? :-)
.
. I've taken more tests about radio than Glorious Ham Leader has and did
. radio communications before Glorious Ham Leader was born.

>>> The item goes on to discuss Skywarn and Amateur Radio's move into the
>>>digital age. More rants fizzle in the hands of disinterested third
>>parties....
>>
>>. Absolutely! All over the world radio amateurs are busy hooking up
>>. their Digital Radios and broadcasting sky warnings digitally, all
>>. because of an AP article in the Chattanooga Times Free Press!
>
> Or perhaps of the AP article in the LA Times...Or the Cleveland Plain
>Dealer...or the Philadelphia Inquirer...or the New York Times...or...well, WE
>get the picture.

. WHAT "AP article in the LA Times," Glorious Ham Leader?
.
. The one in 2002 about Kevin Mitnick? Oh, my a glorifying story about

. a convicted computer hacker having a ham license! Not exactly a
. positive-image thing for amateur radio that. :-)
.
. By the way, Glorious Ham Leader, how is your "move into the digital
. age?" [does that mean you are taking digitalis?]

>>> It adds a personal touch, mentioning briefly the "family tradition" of
>>>W5UGD and how KA2CLX and her hubby became Hams together.
>>
>>. That's so sweet! The couple that beeps together stays together!
>
> Once again you try to make a "code issue" out of something that is not
>germane to the code issue.

. That sweet couple didn't beep sweet nothings in each other's ear?
.
. I'm disappointed, Chattanooga Chew-Chewer. You've taken the
. romance out of ham radio!

> Nice try. Does it get lonely being that much of a loser, Your
>Dimwittedness?

. Tsk, tsk, tsk, reverting to your old tired tripe insults, are you?
.
. Poor baby...always the vindictiveness pouring out of your keyboard.

>>> "I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."
>>
>>. No, Steamy, you are laughing hollowly...(SNIP)
>
> No, Lennie, WE are laughing at YOU. Again.

. No, you aren't and you are a "we" of one. You are mad as hell
. and are on some idiot "crusade" to eliminate opposition to your
. Glorious Ham Leader opinions. Tsk, tsk.

> What a putz.

. Tsk, tsk, just a constant barrage of personal insults...not a
. good image for a Glorious Ham Leader.

>>The rest of us are just laughing AT you...
>
> Oh...you mean you, Brain and Vipul? Brain doesn't know the difference
>between "permission" and "credit", and Vippy doesn't know if he's anything.
>Some great crowd YOU are running in.

. Tsk, tsk, tsk. More personal insults. That seems to be all the
. Glorious Ham Leader can do in this newsgroup. Disagree with
. Glorious Ham Leader on subjects and get personal insults
. ranging from "putz" to "rectum breath."
.
. At least it is a constant... :-)

.
. ==========
.
. I'm still waiting for the national media to have some action-hero
. shows all about amateur radio to show its vital, potent need as a
. national emergency service or bulwark of homeland security. All
. about strong, heroic, macho white males saving the USA with
. CW on HF, beeping evildoers into oblivion while crowds cheer
. their mighty efforts in the arena. Calls for VERY good F-X, I
. think, the best that Hollywood and Marin County can dream up.
. Ought to get boffo box-office and high Nielsens, creating hordes
. of hamfans and adulation everywhere. :-)
.
. Is YOUR key polished and ready for Independence Day? :-)
.
. Enlist in the Amateur Service now and repulse the Aliens!

2765. Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 20:36:01 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306171236.556a686d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68902

Go get 'em boys...

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/

This group has GOT to be violating Yahoo's Terms of Service. If Yahoo and the FCC get enough complaints, this menace can be shut down before it has the chance to get going.

I notice that there is a marked reduction in the amount of MARS/CAP modified radios being sold by hams (and others) on E-Bay - and it is my understanding that E-Bay finally did something about them once the FCC got into the act (it seems that they didn't do anything about the complaints they got directly, however).

- Stewart (N0MHS)

2766. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 21:18:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306171318.5876d3b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68904
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcnj7ades0@208.207.71.149>...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 13 Jun 2003 03:53:48 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > >You should read about the kid in San Diego, a licensed ham who
> > >transmitted on the Sheriffs frequency when he thought he had a valid
> > >emergency reason.
>
> > > Ah. More of what passes for Brain logic. Somehow FCC seems to view it
> > >as a different manner. No surprises there, either,
> >
> > As did the Sheriff's Department, whose radio tech proved using the
> > ham's own modified radio that it was possible to make an autopatch
> > call to 9-1-1 on one or more ham channels from that location. They
> > had had problems with that individual playing wannabee before.....
> >
> > So they complained to the FCC, relying on the emphasized-below
> > phrase of Section 97.403 which stated clearly:
> >
> > Sec. 97.403 Safety of life and protection of property.
> >
> > No provision of these rules prevents the use by an amateur
> > station of any means of radiocommunication at its disposal to
> > provide essential communication needs in connection with the
> > immediate safety of human life and immediate protection of
> > property WHEN NORMAL COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS ARE NOT AVAILABLE.
> >
> > and the FCC agreed that "normal communications systems" were
> > available.
>
> That's why I said "you better be ready to prove it..." And seems that some
>
> publishers like to gloss over such small details. (Pop Com for one)

I had subscribed to PopComm the 1st year. Quit it because of the
lawless attitude concerning pirate boradcasts.

How do you prove you saved a life? I think the emergency is better
"proved" by having a cold body as evidence. Slick talking attorneys
will argue that the danger to life was exaggerated unless you can
produce a body.

2767. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 21:24:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306171324.31efa33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68905

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030617090059.17727.00000576@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/17/03 7:39 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306170439.1f2a9e0c@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Please cite the quote wherein I said "...(it) can't be"...
> >
> >Why? It was dumb enough the first time around.
>
> Yes, you're right...Getting caught lying was a dumb thing for you to do the
> first time. No use exacerbating it, huh?

No use arguing with an idiot.

> >> Plucked right out of Lennie's behind, I see.
> >
> >Ew. You're nasty.
>
> No one ever said the truth had to be pretty.

Lies are usually ugly.

> >> I have said I want my country to observe the treaties it signs the
> same as
> >> it would expect me to observe the laws to which I am bound.
> >
> >Even if they are bad treaties? bad laws?
>
> There has been AMPLE time AND opportunity to change that which YOU think
> is "bad", Brain. More than a few men and women have gone over those
> regulations on more than a few occassions and found them to be adequate and
> appropriate for the times and situations.

Steve, yes, I've done my part in getting bad FCC regulations changed.

> That those laws are an inconvienience to you and others is
> inconsequential.

Your views were considered inconsequential to the FCC.

> >> How can we expect other nations to respect us if we pick and choose
> the
> >> laws we care to "adhere" to, even the small ones...?!?!
> >
> >Do other nations not respect Japan? A few years back everyone wanted

> >to model themselves after the Japanese, even as they violated
> >international code and fishing treaties.
>
> And others didn't. Many find some of Japan's "culture" and "laws" to be
> racist and barbaric. YMMV.

That sounds racist.

> >> >I think you all need a nice warm sitz bath.
> >>
> >> I think you need to follow your own advice, Lennie...I mean
> >> Brain...er...BRIAN...
> >
> >I think you are easily confused. Perhaps a good head dunk in the sitz
> >bath would help.
>
> I see that originality is not high on your list of "things to do", Brain.
>
> Steve, K4CAP

I'm sure you can find a bedpan somewhere.

2768. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 21:30:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306171330.1d396313@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68906

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030617091152.17727.00000578@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/16/03 2:02 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306161102.1d9de06@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Such an idiot. Can't read a sentence. Shameshameshame.
> >>
> >Poor Steve, he cannot structure a sentence properly.
>
> Poor Brain. Can't figure out what to do without input from Lennie, so
> just copies his "techniques". Yet another putz.

You're so obsessed with Len that you imagine traits of Len in anyone
who doesn't agree with you.

> >> You still have not shown how Japanese radio policy has affected UN
> >policy.
> >>
> >It should be obvious, Steve, but just for you I'll point it out.
> >>
> >It has weakened the treaty.
>
> Oh? How? What overwhelming breakdown in international politics has
> occured as a result of this? What major internal, US policy has been affected
> due to Nippon's failure to follow the law?

Why does the it have to be an overwhelming breakdown? You're so
friggin bipolor that you cannot see nuances in change.

> >>It sets a precedent for making up one's own rules when the rules they
> >> agreed to don't suit them anymore. See: Japan.
> >>
> >Yes, Steve. I've been saying See: Japan. Now you get it.
>
> Got your nose rubbed in your own dung and you think you're ahead...! Thanks
> for the laugh!

Must be one of those insane laughs.

> >> >Wonder whatever happened to all those US callsigns issued for Japan.
> >>
> >> No US callsigns are presently assigned to Japan.
> >>
> >So Japan is once again a soverign nation?

>
> When since 1954 has it not been?

Gud question.

> >> There ARE callsigns assigned to US Armed Forces in Japan when
> operating
> >> from US bases, under US control, and in accordance with rules established
> by
> >> the United States Air Force.
> >
> >What other country does this?
>
> Does it matter? But case in point, Great Britian, Argentina, New Zealand,
> Austrailia, Russia (and many of it's satellites), Poland, and I am sure others.

What US callsigns has Great Britian issued to personnel stationed in
Japan?

>
> >> See: Auxiliary Military Radio System.
> >>
> >> No, this is not a backwards accronym for MARS.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ
> >
> >When did you get your old call back?
>
> In about a week. See: ULS
>
What's going on? I liked the new one.

2769. Re: Word from Geneva...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 21:32:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306171332.6b384fd7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68907

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcnba6$to5$0@208.207.71.144>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >
> > And in the end no skin off our teeth one way or the other huh?
> >
>
> Exactly.

You guys have skin on your teeth? PCTA are even more different than I thought.

2770. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 21:34:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306171334.53056469@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68908

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030617085442.17727.00000575@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/16/03 2:08 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306161108.17a2dd81@posting.google.com>
>
> >As opposed to Steve who bought hisself a box full of medals.
>
> Ahhhhh, yes...I did...And that's where the one's I didn't earn stay...Along
> with other "collectables".
>
> Now, about that T5 operation...WHERE are the logbooks again?
>
> Steve, K4CAP

I have them.

2771. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 21:48:10 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <tHSdnYEXWb33EXKjXTWcow@crocker.com>
Source record: 68909

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0306171236.556a686d@posting.google.com...
> Go get 'em boys...
>
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
>

This is how to report that kind of stuff:

FCC CONSUMER ALERT
Federal Communications Commission
Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau
445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554
1-888-CALL-FCC (voice)
1-888-835-5322 (TTY)
www.fcc.gov/cgb
UNAUTHORIZED EQUIPMENT SOLD ON INTERNET AND IN PUBLICATIONS
The Federal Communications Commission receives hundreds of complaints about alleged illegal (non-FCC certified) equipment being offered for sale on the Internet or in publications. The Commission is monitoring this situation carefully and requests your assistance. If you have any information about illegal or uncertified equipment being offered for sale, please forward it to the FCC. Useful information for the FCC includes:
* An original advertisement or Web address where the illegal equipment is being advertised or offered for sale with the types of equipment about which the allegations are being made, highlighted.
* If it is a Web-auction we will need the name of the auction site, the exact
item number, and auction opening and closing dates.
* Name and address of the individual or business offering the item(s) for sale.
* Complainant's name and telephone number in the event follow-up is necessary.
This information can remain confidential, if requested.
* Specifically, why you think the equipment is not in compliance with FCC rules.
* Number of pieces or types of equipment about which the allegations are being
made (one piece, five pieces, how many models, etc.).
Information can be mailed to the FCC at the address below or e-mailed to fccinfo@fcc.gov.
###

2772. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 21:56:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306171356.4a747faa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68910

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hglr4ml.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On Sun, 15 Jun 2003 23:43:22 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >Bash was the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's
> >high school algebra tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or
> >the frat house's library of previous year's tests at some college.
>
> Bash was the equivalent of someone breaking into the school and
> rummaging through the teacher's desk until he found the questions
> and answers to the algebra exam.

Bingo. Wish I'd thought to express it that way. Tnx, Phil.
>
> Those exams were not public information, and the examinees were not
> authorized to carry the information out od the exam room or to tell
> him what the questions and answers were. It is the equivakent of
> stolen material.

'zactly.

I remember when K3NYT gave me the Novice exam back in 1967. The
written exam was inside a sealed envelope covered with instructions. I
recall that the envelope was not opened until the exam started, and
the finished papers were put into another envelope and sealed up. That
and all the other papers including a signed statement from 'NYT
asserting that things were done according to the rules. He didn't even
look at the exam papers. The isntructions were clear that neither of
us was to reveal the contents of the exams. Neither of us did.
Wouldn't have been honest.
>
> We went through this before - do we need to resurrect the dispute
> again?

When someone describes Mr. B. as "the finest ham ever to key a
microphone" and other unearned accolades, I feel somewhat duty-bound
to protest.

73 es tnx de Jim, N2EY

WWHD

2773. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 22:10:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617181025.08122.00001075@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68911

>Subject: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 6/17/03 3:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0306171236.556a686d@posting.google.com>

>I notice that there is a marked reduction in the amount of MARS/CAP
>modified radios...(SNIP)

A lot of this is due to the requirement of radios to be NTIA compliant.
Unfortunately most Amateur rigs on the market today do not meet these
requirements, either "barefoot" or with add-in TXCO ovens added.

Several of the high-end Icom rigs as well as thier "budget" IC-718 meet
the requirements as well as Kenwood's high end rigs and the TS-50 and Yaesu's
FT-1000 variants.

The only Amateur VHF radio (that I am aware of...) that meets any of the
requirements is the Vertex VX-150 HT, and that is only for the "wideband"
requirements which expire in 2K5, I believe.

Steve, K4CAP
TennesseeCAP 250

2774. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 22:27:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617182705.08122.00001077@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68912

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/17/03 4:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306171324.31efa33@posting.google.com>

>> Yes, you're right...Getting caught lying was a dumb thing for you to do
>the
>> first time. No use exacerbating it, huh?
>
>No use arguing with an idiot.

Sure there is...entertainment...that's why I keep you on the hook these
days, Brain.

>> No one ever said the truth had to be pretty.
>
>Lies are usually ugly.

Usually...unless you're trying to keep your wife happy about that obscene
haircut she just got and you don't want to listen to 3 days of crying.

>> There has been AMPLE time AND opportunity to change that which YOU
>think
>> is "bad", Brain. More than a few men and women have gone over those
>> regulations on more than a few occassions and found them to be adequate and
>> appropriate for the times and situations.
>
>Steve, yes, I've done my part in getting bad FCC regulations changed.

Then quityerwhining, Brain. Sometimes it goes "your way", othertimes it
doesn't. That's the roll of the dice you play in a democracy.

>> That those laws are an inconvienience to you and others is
>> inconsequential.
>
>Your views were considered inconsequential to the FCC.

Not completely, Brain. I suggested slower code speeds and reduced classes
too, if you cared to read them. They went further than what I thought we
needed to, but oh well.

Like I said, it's the roll of the dice.

>> And others didn't. Many find some of Japan's "culture" and "laws" to
>be
>> racist and barbaric. YMMV.
>

>That sounds racist.

How? It is true. Some people DO find many of Japan's "culture" and "laws" to be racist and barbaric. Espeically thiose relating to the role of women, the stature of the first born son, and thier own generally held views on non-Japanese.

Please try to disprove my assertions if you care to.
>I'm sure you can find a bedpan somewhere.

Bedpans are not used for Sitz's, Brain. Care to try again?

(You're sinking fast, Brain..Ya really wanna keep this up and take ANOTHER round of embarrassment?)

Steve, K4CAP

2775. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 22:37:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617183733.08122.00001078@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68913

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/17/03 4:30 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306171330.1d396313@posting.google.com>

>> >Poor Steve, he cannot structure a sentence properly.
>>
>> Poor Brain. Can't figure out what to do without input from Lennie, so
>> just copies his "techniques". Yet another putz.
>
>You're so obsessed with Len that you imagine traits of Len in anyone
>who doesn't agree with you.

Hmmmmmm....letsee about that...

Unable to argue or otherwise "debate" the content of a statement, you
attempt to attack the method in which the subject was delivered.

And the "soak your head" comments, etc...Straight out of Lennie's
playbook, thoroughly archived in Google and Deja before it.

Lot's of people here don't "agree" with me, Brain...Very few emulate The
Scummy One in doing it. You do, however.

>> Oh? How? What overwhelming breakdown in international politics has
>> occured as a result of this? What major internal, US policy has been
>affected
>> due to Nippon's failure to follow the law?
>
>Why does the it have to be an overwhelming breakdown? You're so
>friggin bipolor that you cannot see nuances in change.

The "nuances in change" have been in the works a heckovalot longer than
with the inception of Japan's 4th class license, Brainiac...The Japanese were
just the first (that I am aware of) to implement some sort of practical form of
that concept.

>> Got your nose rubbed in your own dung and you think you're ahead...!
>Thanks
>> for the laugh!
>
>Must be one of those insane laughs.

Nope, just the usual "too bad this guy ain't got a clue as to how
rediculous he looks" kinda laughs...The kind you let slip when some guy in an
expensive suit walks out of the men's room with his fly open, or when a woman
has her skirt stuck in her panty hose...

>> >So Japan is once again a soverign nation?
>>
>> When since 1954 has it not been?
>
>Gud question.

You're right. It is. Can you answer it since you seem to think it's an issue?

>> Does it matter? But case in point, Great Britian, Argentina, New
>Zealand,
>> Austrailia, Russia (and many of it's satellites), Poland, and I am sure
>others.
>
>What US callsigns has Great Britian issued to personnel stationed in
>Japan?

None in Japan. But they issue calls for use outside of Britian on non-British soil. Are you smart enough to know where? There's more than one place, and no, it is neither Gibralter nor Cypress.

>What's going on? I liked the new one.

I do too, but I liked K4YZ better for me. K4CAP will be "blocked" for two years now. We can apply it to a CAP club station later.

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ.

2776. Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 22:38:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617183815.08122.00001079@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 68914

>Subject: Re: Typical Nocode Brainfart
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 6/17/03 4:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0306171334.53056469@posting.google.com>

>> Now, about that T5 operation...WHERE are the logbooks again?

>I have them.

Uh huh.....

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2777. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 22:48:55 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <CNOdnSX-x51EB3KjRTvU2Q@crocker.com>
Source record: 68915

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:vvMHa.52568$Io.4973006@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> On 17 Jun 2003 13:36:01 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >Go get 'em boys...
> >
> >http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
>
> Discussing 11 meter amplifiers is not illegal.
>
this is true, we are discussing them right now i guess... however, the intent of that group as stated in their welcome page is to: "This group is here to discuss linear amplifiers used on the 11 meter citizens band. Any information on tips, tricks, wiring, and modifications is welcome." so the group discusses amplifiers that are used on the band, not just sitting on the shelf presumably. also, discussing a crime is not illegal, but providing information on how to do it is called 'aiding and abetting'. They also state: "You are welcome to post ads for anything you are selling, looking to buy or want to trade but divulge personal information carefully and at your own risk.". In this they are also providing a forum to sell illegal amplifiers, which is also aiding an illegal act... and they so much as acknowledge that what they are doing may not be legal by warning members about posting such messages.

Now, if the group was run by hams with a charter like:
"To help licensed amateur radio operators modify and properly tune old 11m amplifiers for use on 10m. And to provide information on how to properly measure amplifier characteristics so they can be legally used on 10m." I don't think anyone would have any problem with it as hams can legally buy, sell, build, and modify their equipment as long as they meet the technical requirements and operate within their license limitations.

2778. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 22:53:23 UTC
From: FannyFarmer <ffarm50c5e3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eef9c02@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 68916

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0306171236.556a686d@posting.google.com...

> This group has GOT to be violating Yahoo's Terms of Service. If Yahoo
> and the FCC get enough complaints, this menace can be shut down before
> it has the chance to get going.

Why is this group a "menace"?
I too can think of many yahoo
groups and sites that are on the
razor's edge of legality, however this
is the INTERNET and last I
checked you can discuss anything.

If you don't like it - DON'T GO THERE!

There is a "wastewater treatment plant" about 3
miles West of me. On warm days like we are
having now it stinks of....well...of shi+.
Do I go there and park my car outside the gates
and complain about the smell? No! I just AVOID
the place.

The SAME principal holds true for net sites and Yahoo Groups.

> I notice that there is a marked reduction in the amount of MARS/CAP
> modified radios being sold by hams (and others) on E-Bay - and it is
> my understanding that E-Bay finally did something about them once the
> FCC got into the act (it seems that they didn't do anything about the
> complaints they got directly, however).
>
> - Stewart (N0MHS)

It is not "kosher" to *advertise the fact* that a modified radio
is available on e-Bay. This DOES NOT MEAN that the same
radio for sale/auction is not modified for MARS/CAP.

You are supposed to include a note (taped to the top of
the radio) of such for the buyer. E-BAy need not know
the radio was modified, but the Buyer, should he choose
to operate it, should know. Simple....eh Stewart?

2779. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:16:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617191659.04605.00001441@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 68917

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>>Last weekend, I mentioned Ham radio to a friend. He has an EE degree, but he
>>is
>>now working in the software field. Before I told him about it, he had never
>>heard of Ham radio.
>
> Good for you.

I usually don't tell the full story all at once. You see, this person is very anti-social. I pointed it out to him. He does not deny it and is not ashamed of it.

We listened to some 2 meter freqs. He noticed that people were mostly talking about their equipment, repeaters, tuning. In other words they were talking about the radios themselves- not socializing. He also did not understand some of the codewords used. I "translated" them.

Anyway, this type of person probably would enjoy the Ham culture.

Most Hams I have met are anti-social. Anti-social former co-worker Ham, Hamfests, Field Day, Wouff Hong ceremony at midnight, random Hams contesting while others socialize.

Chance would require all other aspects to be random. They are not. Most are male, older, talk in codewords, and are anti-social. It seems to be the nature of Hams. It seems to be a requirement - one of the "unwritten rules" of Ham radio traditions.

I was going to apologize about my comments about the random group of Hams that I met being anti-social. I want to take that back now.

I appreciated the generosity. However, I don't think one has to give up everything else for the Ham activities. There was no need for the compromise. It was not more expensive, nor was more work required. I guess it's the standard compromise.

2780. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn27ht.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68918

On Mon, 16 Jun 2003 22:20:06 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>To repeat, in the case of the 9/11 disaster, to which the individual was
>referring when he stated his ISP was down, it is documented that some phone
>lines were out completely, some cell towers were out completely, and the
>rest of the system was overloaded to the extent that phone calls took an
>hour or more to get through if they got through at all. Thus using the
>internet, regardless of the status of the ISP, is not a viable choice.

The determining factor is "is there a possibility that it may go
down when needed". If so, it cannot be relied upon to be there for
emergency planning purposes. That's why our local hospitals rely on
ham radio,- voice, packet, and SSTV. It WILL be up, because all
stations - including dual repeaters - are in controlled spaces
(participating hospitals) with backup power and designated
operators.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2781. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn2iev.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68919

On 12 Jun 2003 06:08:36 -0700, Brian wrote:

>Phil, concerning other FCC rules violations where there is "no stink"
>about it, I have been lead to believe that where there is no stink,
>there is no violation. Re: Farnsworth Vs Morse Codes.

The dead horse is shrieking "enough already".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2782. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn2b2u.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68922

On 15 Jun 2003 02:04:37 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>Current FCC policy says the CSCE is good for one year for TESTING credit
>purposes. It is good "forever" for the purpose of granting the Novice HF
>privileges to a Technician.
>
> How's that for Uncle Sam logic?

When is red paint blue? When the can says "Blue Paint".

Whatever works....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2783. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn4rjy.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68923

On Fri, 13 Jun 2003 10:02:16 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>True, yet there hasn't been any wholesale non-adhearance.
>Again, perhaps other countires administrations see no harm
>nor violation in Japan's position.

Most likely, other Administrations reject the "monkey see, monkey do" attitude that seems to propel this issue. Japan did it - why should we? It's the FCC's choice. which has been made clear over the years.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2784. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn4gnx.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68924

On 13 Jun 2003 03:37:10 GMT,, Alun Palmer wrote:

>> The amount of misinformation that is spewed out on a daily
>> basis in this forum defies the imagination. Just got off the phone
>> with W.O. Johnson at USCG , and was informed that C.W.
>> is far from a dead issue with the Coast Guard. In fact, they (USCG)
>> are still training personnel to copy and send C.W.

"W.O. Johnson" may be the only Coastie who knows that secret
information, because all the USCG communications folks that I have
dealt with in recent years, including watchstanders at the USCG
Communication Area Master Station - Pacific (CAMSPAC), have verified
(and in some cases lamented) that they no longer maintain any
capability to communicate with vessels at sea by CW nor do they
stand watch on 500 kHz. In a notable case after they stopped
standing watch, CAMSPAC called up Maritime Coast Station KPH (which
itself has been closed for 5 years now) and asked whether they could
come up on 500 kHz to read the CW traffic because CAMSPAC could
not. That info was relayed to me by the manager of KPH at the time.

>That may be so, and other posts indicate that CW is still used at sea.
>However, the ITU plan was to phase it out by 2000, and the international
>code test requirement for ship's radio operators is gone, as is the
>requirement for shore stations to listen for distress calls on 500 kHz CW.

AFAIK, no US coast station even offers CW traffic service nor has
operators qualified in Morse CW. This I know for a fact.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2785. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn3hyw.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68925

On 12 Jun 2003 09:42:18 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>On the other hand, use of Morse/CW by radio amateurs continues all
>over the world. Participation by hams in contests is increasing, as
>evidenced by more logs being received - but only for CW contests.

Actually, as Dan pointed out, maritime radiotelegraph operation
using Morse ("CW" for short) is still used in some parts of the
world for routine messaging, but not for maritime distress and
safety purposes. There's no problem as long as the operator holds
the proper class of commercial license, the equipment meets the
standards of the ITU and the licensing Administration, and the
operator finds someone to communicate with - which will not include
commercial coast stations nor the USCG (and its equivalent) in the
major maritime countries of the world. Nothing prevents shipping
companies, even in the US, from establishing private coast stations
to communicate with their vessels by CW in the same manner as most
shipping companies have private coast stations for voice communications
("company frequencies") on HF SSB.

Interesting to see if the Philippines is a signatory on the Safety
Of Life At Sea (SOLAS) Convention which requires GMDSS capability on
vessels (over 300 gross tons) registered by its signatory members.

Also interesting to see if the USCG still has the authority to
prevent a foreign-flag vessel which is required to have GMDSS
equipment to sail from a US port if that vessel is not so equipped
and has a valid and current Safety Certificate. They used to have
that authority when MF CW was the required safety system.

Jeff ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2786. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn57vz.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68920

On Fri, 13 Jun 2003 20:20:08 -0400, Robert wrote:

>[snip] Bill, I think Dan's commentary was what they used to call "Heavy
>Sarcasm" on Saturday Night Live......

I respect creative writing.....it sure is a healthy breather in this
group.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2787. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn5v90.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68921

On 15 Jun 2003 21:46:44 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>The tests for an amateur radio license should be based on what hams
>actually do with radio.

Nah...the tests for amateur radio license should be based on what
the FCC thinks/demands hams have to know to do things with radio as
the FCC wants them to do.

If the FCC staff member responsible for that doesn't have such a
clue, send him/her back to stamping applications in, and get someone
who has a clue.

Or are we all retired by now?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

2788. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-17 23:19:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn6691.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68926

On 14 Jun 2003 16:46:14 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>I don't really see how the FCC can do an end run around the usual process,
>which normally takes about a year. So, I for one am not expecting Element
>1 to be dropped until this time next year.

If the Rule revision eases a burden, the FCC can make that revision directly by Order as long as the revision order articulates how the burden is eased.

A good example of that was when the wizards and scholars in the Private Radio Bureau decided that it was no longer necessary to have a specified station location in the Commission's records or on the amateur radio license. POOF ! It was done, even over the violent objections of the more perceptive members of the enforcement staff.

An even more egregious example of that was when the license requirement for Citizens Band operation was dropped. No one was asked. POOF ! Done.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2789. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 00:01:58 UTC
From: You ask w <punisha.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <41328N118@web2news.com>
Source record: 68927
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,

stewart wrote:
> Go get 'em boys...
>
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
>
> This group has GOT to be violating Yahoo's Terms of
> Service. If Yahoo
> and the FCC get enough complaints, this menace can be shut
> down before
> it has the chance to get going.
>
> I notice that there is a marked reduction in the amount
>of MARS/CAP
> modified radios being sold by hams (and others)
>on E-Bay - and it is
> my understanding that E-Bay finally did something
>about them once the
> FCC got into the act (it seems that they didn't do
>anything about the
> complaints they got directly, however).
>
> - Stewart (N0MHS)

Voobner or somebody calling himself voobner already went in there and
shook up the place and planted spies etc. says he is gathering info on
who the cb amp dealers are and there should be some busts within the
next 6 mo.

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

2790. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 00:09:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcoap8$k9b$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68928

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hglr4ml.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 15 Jun 2003 23:43:22 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >Bash was the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's
> >high school algebra tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or
> >the frat house's library of previous year's tests at some college.
>
> Bash was the equivalent of someone breaking into the school and
> rummaging through the teacher's desk until he found the questions
> and answers to the algebra exam.

Bunk...it wasn't equal to any "breakin" at all. It was no
different than a student telling another student what one or more
questions were on the latest history test.

> Those exams were not public information, and the examinees were not
> authorized to carry the information out od the exam room

which they didn't other than in their memory.

> or to tell
> him what the questions and answers were.

In other words, a "gag order" was in place...but the rules never
said that.

> It is the equivakent of stolen material.

Yet no one, including the FCC ever embarked on any prosecution against
Bash.

> We went through this before - do we need to resurrect the dispute
> again?

Only if you keep raising the old arguments/opinions while
ignoring the other perspective.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2791. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 00:19:15 UTC
From: You ask w <punisha.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <41331N155@web2news.com>
Source record: 68929

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> "You ask w" <punisha.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote:
>> stewart wrote:
>>> Go get 'em boys...
>>>
>>> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
>>>
>>> This group has GOT to be violating Yahoo's Terms of
>>> Service. If Yahoo
>>> and the FCC get enough complaints, this menace can be shut
>>> down before
> etc..
>>
>> Voobner or somebody calling himself voobner already went
>> in there and
>> shook up the place and planted spies etc. says he is
>> gathering info on
>> who the cb amp dealers are and there should be some busts within the
>> next 6 mo.
>>
> See more about Voobner here:
>
> http://www.geocities.com/aarronvoobner/voobinc.html#prod3

And don't forget Moparholic@hotmail.com is Steve Parks an admitted
freebander and illegal cb amp user who supports Twistedhed who is the
self-proclaimed "king of freeband". See more about Twistedhed here:

http://www.geocities.com/antitwisty/index.htm

--
Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

2792. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 00:23:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617202304.12501.00000247@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68930

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hglu0ao.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 13 Jun 2003 01:05:46 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>The problems between Sarnoff and Armstrong are another matter entirely. I
>>think it is fitting that Armstrong's name is remembered the whole world
>>over.
>
> Even my antenna rotator honors his name..... <ggg>

Then there's Jack Armstrong, the All American Boy!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2793. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 00:36:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn7pp2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68931

On 17 Jun 2003 00:54:22 GMT, Dick Carroll; wrote:

>Akhbar Balink wrote:

>> Who gives a camel shit?
>
>Why, you do, Sahib.

Please, Dick, the proper term of address is "Habibi"....that is, if
you want to be courteous. If not, just call him "Ya Kharra".

With apologies to other Arabic-speakers... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2794. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 01:04:48 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306171704.7546bf06@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68932

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<tHSdnYEXWb33EXKjXTWcow@crocker.com>...
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5f4fe4c2.0306171236.556a686d@posting.google.com...
> > Go get 'em boys...
> >
> > http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
> >
>
> This is how to report that kind of stuff:
>
> FCC CONSUMER ALERT
> Federal Communications Commission
> Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau
> 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554
> 1-888-CALL-FCC (voice)
> 1-888-835-5322 (TTY)
> www.fcc.gov/cgb
> UNAUTHORIZED EQUIPMENT SOLD ON INTERNET AND IN PUBLICATIONS

Thanks... and here's the link to Yahoo's Abuse reporting page:

http://add.yahoo.com/fast/help/us/groups/cgi_abuse

However, I doubt if Yahoo will do anything about it, until the FCC
gets on them about it (as I suspect happened on E-Bay).

- Stewart

2795. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 01:14:50 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306171714.64de1603@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68933

"FannyFarmer" <ffarm50c5e3@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3eef9c02@snipnews.snip.net>...
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5f4fe4c2.0306171236.556a686d@posting.google.com...
>
> > This group has GOT to be violating Yahoo's Terms of Service. If Yahoo
> > and the FCC get enough complaints, this menace can be shut down before
> > it has the chance to get going.
>
> Why is this group a "menace"?
> I too can think of many yahoo
> groups and sites that are on the
> razor's edge of legality, however this
> is the INTERNET and last I
> checked you can discuss anything.

BS. Conspiracy is against the law - even on the Internet.

> If you don't like it - DON'T GO THERE!

So - if I hear/see two guys planning to rob a bank, I shouldn't call
the cops?

> There is a "wastewater treatment plant" about 3
> miles West of me. On warm days like we are
> having now it stinks of....well...of shi+.
> Do I go there and park my car outside the gates
> and complain about the smell? No! I just AVOID
> the place.

Quit changing the subject. We were talking about ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES,
not legal wastewater treatment plants.

> The SAME principal holds true for net sites and Yahoo Groups.

Legal ones yes. Illegal ones, no.

Given your slant on things, Yahoo should allow the "Bankrobber's of
America Group", or the "Terrorist's Bombmaking Tips Group".

This group has been in existance for only a few weeks now... but now
that the light of day is being placed on it, I don't expect it to last
more than a few more weeks.

- Stewart

2796. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 01:49:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030617214922.23406.00000218@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68934

In article <3EED0F8A.7080606@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> BTW, I agree that he's a very nice chap to know. I met him at Dayton many
>> years ago, and I bought one of his books, even though I had been an Extra
>> for a couple of years. I find it interesting that to this day he's still
>an
>> Advanced,
>> even though he could pass the final remaining Extra test in his sleep!
>
>Not everyone has to have an extra ticket to feel like they are
>somebody.
>

JJ:

Hmmm -- however, apparently you do, or you wouldn't have made a point
of it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2797. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 02:12:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bcoj42$64u@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 68936

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:YJ9Ha.4208$a7.1559232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
[snip]
> > > > Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> > >
> > > I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.
> >
> > Perhaps you bought your license?
>
> You are way off base here.
>

Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|

> >
> > The FCC didn't make the distinction between Technicians with code and
> without
> > until June 1994 - at least as far as their licensing database goes.
>
> I don't know what the database said but I do know what my license said.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

2798. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 02:23:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617222311.14458.00000363@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 68935

In article <3EED39EE.60905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>>Now, as for "logic", note that only an expired Novice or Technician license
>can
>>give credit for code, while expired (beyond the grace period) General,
>>Advanced, or Extra licenses will not - yet they oviously have a code element
>>embedded in them. There was LITTLE to no logic in the FCC's ruling.
>>
>>
>But those licenses (general, advanced & extra) required code faster than
>5WPM.

Exactly.

>To some brearucrat, faster code speed is not the same as 5WPM,
>and the new rules spelled out "5 WPM".

Actually, they spell out "Element 1" which IIRC is defined as "not less than 5
wpm".

>He may have thought that 13 or 20 was easier than 5? The guy
>was probably
>someone who usually did rules for broadcast radio or TV.....

Back when there was more than one code test, passing a faster test gave credit
for the lower speeds. IOW if someone walked in and took 20 wpm code as their
first element, they got credit for 5 and 13 wpm without actually taking those
slower tests.

Here's what I think FCC was thinking:

Before 1967, the Novice was a one-time license. If you did not upgrade after
the one year term, you were out of luck and off the air until you could pass
the Tech or General. A lot of newbies dropped out because of that rule. In 1967
the Novice was made a two-year license. In the early 1970s there were several
quick changes - first it became retakeable after a one-year off-the-air period,
then it became immediately retakeable, then it became 5 year renewable.

I think FCC wanted to give those dropouts a chance to get back in without
having to pass another code test, hence the original rule.

Then somebody noticed that if someone bypassed Novice and went straight to
Tech, they were out of luck. So the rule was changed to include Techs. But
since Tech has always been renewable, that rule seems a bit odd. Whole thing
may be academic soon anyway.

Remember the original restructuring NPRM and the contradictions in it? And how the FCC issued an "Errata" that simply made it more confusing?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2799. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 03:14:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68938

Len Over 21 wrote:

> . Absolutely! Right now, all over the USA eager, interested folks
> . are clamoring to get into amateur radio as volunteers to aid in
> . disasters and emergencies, forming lines at recruiting stations to
> . enlist in the War Against Disasters...all due to the AP wire service
> . article in the Chattanooga Times Free Press! Off-duty PD personnel
> . have to report in to aid in the crowd control.

> . Any day now, Hallmark will come out with a special event card
> . where some smitten ham swain can send his sweetie a
> . Valentine's Day card with a recorded morse mushgram to beep
> . his affection!

> . Next week an entire day of Oprah featuring amateur radio with
> . David Sumner in TV makeup, the Washington Post and Wall
> . Street Journal having front-page features on ham radio's
> . extraordinary emergency service capability, and Katie Couric
> . interviewing a typical ham family of six on Today.

But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur radio in general."

As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.

Dave K8MN

2800. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 03:14:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617231424.09237.00001076@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68937

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/17/03 6:16 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030617191659.04605.00001441@mb-m21.aol.com>

>You see, this person is very
>anti-social. I pointed it out to him. He does not deny it and is not ashamed
>of
>it.

Most people suffer some form of mental health abberation usually do deny
it, or actually assert "pride" in thier illness. Take Lennie and Brain for
example....

>We listened to some 2 meter freqs. He noticed that people were mostly talking
>about their equipment, repeaters, tuning. In other words they were talking
>about the radios themselves- not socializing. He also did not understand some
>of the codewords used. I "translated" them.

Talking, regardless of the content of the conversation, IS "socializing".

>Most Hams I have met are anti-social.

Then you do not understand the definition of "anti-social".

>I was going to apologize about my comments about the random group of Hams
>that
>I met being anti-social. I want to take that back now.

You were going to apologize about apologizing, or you're apologizing for
having been apologetic about verbally abusing those Amateurs?

>I appreciated the generosity. However, I don't think one has to give up
>everything else for the Ham activities. There was no need for the compromise.

There was a thought in there somewhere, but I'll be danged if I know what
it was.....

>It was not more expensive, nor was more work required. I guess it's the
>standard compromise.

"Standard compromise"...?!?! Yet another "Vipinition" that requires
translation.

Steve, K4CAP

2801. Re: Rants Fizzle...Steamy's Down For The Count!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 03:29:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617232916.09237.00001077@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68939

>Subject: Rants Fizzle...Steamy's Down For The Count!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/17/03 2:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030617150239.10078.00000265@mb-m26.aol.com>

>> Can't stand having your rants screwed up, can ya, Putzy?
>
>. Nothing is "screwed up." Only your personal rage and
>. vindictiveness.

Yes, Lennie, something is VERY "screwed up". A "man" of your alleged years, repeatedly antagonizing a group of people for whom you have obvious disdain, repeatedly lying in an archived forum..

"Screwed up" is an understatement, now that I think about it.

>Seems that all you can do is insult other people having opposite
>. opinions to yours.

To someone who keeps making indefensible allegations, I guess it appears that way. YMMV.

>The on-line "morgue" of the AP isn't complete and no trace of that
>. alleged story could be found on-line.

Gee, Your Putziness...I am (per your assertions) no where near teh electronics genius you profess to be, yet I found it.

Why is that?

>All anyone has to do is follow in your illustrious footsteps, oh Great
>. Warrior Leader (and veteran a "seven hostile actions"). Raise your
>. glorious Flag and bellow "Follow Me!" and all will join your crusade

Nope. All they ahve to do is read what YOU say to know what >>I<< say is true. Doesn't matter to me...BAD for you...

>> I bet somone does. And if they do, that will be one more test than YOU
>>have taken, Lennie.
>
>. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Running out of insults?

Not with you, Lennie. You are your own best insult.

>I've taken more tests about radio than Glorious Ham Leader has and did
>. radio communications before Glorious Ham Leader was born.

Ummmmm.....Not in the eyes of the FCC you haven't, Lennie.

>By the way, Glorious Ham Leader, how is your "move into the digital
>. age?" [does that mean you are taking digitalis?]

I dare say it is a bit more agressive than yours, Oh Licenseless One.
How's that Part 15 station you plan on getting on 20 meters with?

>> Nice try. Does it get lonely being that much of a loser, Your
>>Dimwittedness?
>
>. Tsk, tsk, tsk, reverting to your old tired tripe insults, are you?

Nothing is "tripe" with you, Your Scumminess. You lie. You antagonize.
You spew forth unfounded and deceitful rhetoric.

It's not an "insult" if it's true.

>Poor baby...always the vindictiveness pouring out of your keyboard.

Not mine, Your Silliness. I have nothing to be "vindictive" for. You, on
the otherhand, obviously do.

>> What a putz.
>
>. Tsk, tsk, just a constant barrage of personal insults...not a
>. good image for a Glorious Ham Leader.

It's not an insult if it's true...And you ARE a putz.

>Enlist in the Amateur Service now and repulse the Aliens!

We'll start on Lanark Drive. I'll lead.

Steve, K4CAP

2802. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 03:31:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030617233118.09237.00001078@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68940

>Subject: Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/17/03 10:14 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>

>But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
>radio in general."

What can we expect from a documented pathological liar?

>As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.

An incompetent liar, at that.

73

Steve, K4CAP

2803. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 04:04:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618000456.17796.00000918@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 68941

In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
>radio in general."
>
>As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.

. I still haven't done any general insulting. I've done SATIRE on
. some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
. crackpots in this groupie fest.
.
. Tell us, oh Glorious Ham Leader, is "rectum breath" NOT an
. insult? :-)
.
. Of course it isn't if uttered by an extra. The old Double Standard
. at work!
.
. Go back to reading your AARP bulletin, old man.

2804. Re: Rants Fizzle...Steamy's Down For The Count!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 04:21:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618002156.12501.00000248@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 68942

In article <20030617232916.09237.00001077@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Rants Fizzle...Steamy's Down For The Count!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/17/03 2:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030617150239.10078.00000265@mb-m26.aol.com>
>
>>> Can't stand having your rants screwed up, can ya, Putzy?
>>
>>. Nothing is "screwed up." Only your personal rage and
>>. vindictiveness.
>
> Yes, Lennie, something is VERY "screwed up". A "man" of your alleged
>years, repeatedly antagonizing a group of people for whom you have obvious
>disdain, repeatedly lying in an archived forum.

No "lying" you poor obsessed, vindictive person.

You just cannot stand any opposing opinion to yours.

You must win at all costs...even if that means deliberate
personal insults thrown out in total disregard of any civil
propriety. See "rectum breath" as a recent example.

>>. Seems that all you can do is insult other people having opposite
>>. opinions to yours.
>
> To someone who keeps making indefensible allegations, I guess it appears
>that way. YMMV.

Poor baby. Only YOUR viewpoint is "good," all others are
"indefensible positions," "lying," or "rectum breath."

You need mental help, Steamy. GET it.

>>> The on-line "morgue" of the AP isn't complete and no trace of that
>>. alleged story could be found on-line.
>
> Gee, Your Putziness...I am (per your assertions) no where near teh
>electronics genius you profess to be, yet I found it.

Found what where? It wasn't in the Valley edition of the LA TIMES.
It isn't found on the Archives page of the LA TIMES.

> Why is that?

Then you are seeing things that aren't there. More evidence
that you need mental help.

>>. All anyone has to do is follow in your illustrious footsteps, oh Great
>>. Warrior Leader (and veteran a "seven hostile actions"). Raise your
>>. glorious Flag and bellow "Follow Me!" and all will join your crusade
>
> Nope. All they ahve to do is read what YOU say to know what >>I<< say is
>true. Doesn't matter to me...BAD for you...

Poor thing, in addition to self-righteousness and delusions, Steamy
is now suffering from megalomania.

You need mental help, Steamy. Go get it from some medical
expert...the type who can sign his name "doctor" because he
graduated from medical school.

You can't take opposing opinion in any form without becoming
aggressively vindictive, insulting, and generally unpleasant.

That's enough for Steamy for the month of June...

2805. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 05:17:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnbkp3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68944

On 17 Jun 2003 10:46:21 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>> The main mwthod of cleaning it up was screen room enclosures. ISM
>> equipment itself can legally generate as much power as desired as
>> long as it is kept in the range of 27.120 MHz +/- 160 kHz. Find a
>> way to filter the harmonics but let the fundamental through
>> unattenuated, run it on raw rectified AC, and you got a super CB
>> jammer - perfectly legal.
>
>Generate or radiate, Phil?

Both. Have fun.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2806. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 05:17:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnmyy6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68943

On Tue, 17 Jun 2003 22:48:55 -0000, David Robbins wrote:

>Now, if the group was run by hams with a charter like:
>"To help licensed amateur radio operators modify and properly tune old 11m
>amplifiers for use on 10m. And to provide information on how to properly
>measure amplifier characteristics so they can be legally used on 10m." I
>don't think anyone would have any problem with it as hams can legally buy,
>sell, build, and modify their equipment as long as they meet the technical
>requirements and operate within their license limitations.

But such amplifiers marketed (sold or otherwise transferred) by
non-amateurs to amateurs must have a grant of certification
(formerly known as type-acceptance) from the FCC.

See Sects. 2.815(c) and 97.315 of the Rules.

Above information may save your own a** when the FCC comes knocking
on your door after they bust the seller for selling to CBers (yes,
that's one of the few things that they still do, albeit not enough)
and go checking out the folks that the seller sold to.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2807. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 05:17:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnmce5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68945

On 17 Jun 2003 22:37:33 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> None in Japan. But they issue calls for use outside of Britian
>on non-British soil. Are you smart enough to know where? There's
>more than one place, and no, it is neither Gibralter nor Cypress.

Is it safe to presume that it isn't Gibraltar or Cyprus as well?

>>What's going on? I liked the new one.
>
>I do too, but I liked K4YZ better for me. K4CAP will be "blocked" for two
>years now. We can apply it to a CAP club station later.

So now you will have paid fees for two "vanity" calls.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2808. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 05:17:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnbwt4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68946

On 16 Jun 2003 18:35:53 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>That's interesting. So the HF phone distress frequency still exists but is
>no longer 2182 kHz, having moved to 2187.5, and listening at specific
>times is now superceded by DSC. But are the actual transmissions still
>USB? Presumably they are, or everyone would have to invest in new radios?
>
The distress frequencies (upon which voice calls are made and
traffic is passed) remain 2182 kHz and VHF Channel 16. The
continuous monitoring requirement has shifted to DSC on 2187.5 kHz
and VHF Channel 70, but the 2182 "silent period" remains.

In all cases except in the Mediterranean (the so-called Area A1) the
primary distress call is made on INMARSAT, though, if the vessel has
it. The Marine Safety Agency responding (USCG in the US) will shift
the traffic to MF or VHF depending on the location. In the Med, the
primary call is on MF.

>It also seems that the VHF channels have been changed. Presumably they
>still use FM?

Yes, all VHF Marine channels are FM (5 kHz deviation).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2809. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 05:42:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgno937.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68947

On Tue, 17 Jun 2003 20:09:12 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> or to tell
>> him what the questions and answers were.
>
>In other words, a "gag order" was in place...but the rules never
>said that.

The instructions on the exam package were very clear about that.

>> It is the equivakent of stolen material.

>Yet no one, including the FCC ever embarked on any prosecution against
>Bash.

Only because of the laziness of the attorney at headquarters who
would have had to do the work.

We went through this all before. Nothing new will be raised by
either side.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2810. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 05:57:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnpj29.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68948

On 18 Jun 2003 02:23:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Remember the original restructuring NPRM and the contradictions in
>it? And how the FCC issued an "Errata" that simply made it more
>confusing?

"It's so hard to hire competent help nowadays...."

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2811. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 09:21:06 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618052106.08432.00001978@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 68949

>Subject: Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/18/03 12:04 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030618000456.17796.00000918@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
>>radio in general."
>>
>>As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.
>
>. I still haven't done any general insulting.

....No, just major insulting

>. I've done SATIRE on
>. some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
>. crackpots in this groupie fest.

....In the limited time I have been reading rrap, it has become
....clear that you (Len) are the most militant one-sided
....my-view-is-the-only-view crackpot in this groupie fest.

....Basic logic 101:

....Satire is a form of humour
....All humor is funny
....Len's posts are not funny
....Len's posts are neither satire nor humour

2812. Re: Rants Fizzle...Steamy's Down For The Count!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 09:56:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618055650.27030.00001594@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 68950

>Subject: Re: Rants Fizzle...Steamy's Down For The Count!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/17/03 11:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030618002156.12501.00000248@mb-m04.aol.com>

>No "lying" you poor obsessed, vindictive person

I am neither poor, obsessed, nor vindictive, Lennie.

My bills are paid.

I do not go into newsgroups of activites of which I am not a participant
and tell those who ARE participants how to "do business".

And in order to be "vindictive", I must be vindicating something. I
don't. However judging by your incessant rants, copious mistruths and putrid
rhetoric, one must question YOUR "motives".

You are not here for "civil" debate.

>You just cannot stand any opposing opinion to yours.

Sure I can. I disagree with Bill Sohl, Cecil Moore, and a handfull of
others all the time. I even disagree with those whom I agree on some points,
ie Larry and Kim.

The difference is they know what is play rom serious, and to this date, I
cannot say any of them are overtly lying about anything.

On the otherhand, we've caught you in any number of mistruths, errors and
blatant lies.

Too bad for you, huh...?!?!

>You must win at all costs...even if that means deliberate
> personal insults thrown out in total disregard of any civil
> propriety. See "rectum breath" as a recent example.

Hmmmmmmmmm..."civil propriety"....Interesting term coming from you,
Lennie...the same guy who called me "Gunny" one week, then was calling me a
"jackbooted thug" the next.

>Poor baby. Only YOUR viewpoint is "good," all others are
> "indefensible positions," "lying," or "rectum breath."

Nope...Only those that are indefensible, lies or smell of one's rectum.

See: Leonard H Anderson.

>You need mental help, Steamy. GET it.

From who? Your correspondence course shrink wife???

>> Nope. All they have to do is read what YOU say to know what >>I<< say
>is
>>true. Doesn't matter to me...BAD for you...
>
> Poor thing, in addition to self-righteousness and delusions, Steamy
> is now suffering from megalomania.

I'd ask you how you got "meglomania" from taht, but I figger there's
already about 1536 unanswered questions in the que already. Best to let you
get on with those others.

>You need mental help, Steamy. Go get it from some medical
> expert...the type who can sign his name "doctor" because he
> graduated from medical school.

Sorry, Lennie...You suggest I get mental help then suggest I get it from
somone who went to medical school.

Again, your rush to be insulting and "score points" in your imaginary
"messaging points system" has allowed you to screw up again.

>You can't take opposing opinion in any form without becoming
> aggressively vindictive, insulting, and generally unpleasant.

I get that way dealing with antagonists, liars and social ner-do-wells.

That would be.......YOU.

>That's enough for Steamy for the month of June.

Sorry, Lennie. Twelve more days to go yet. Unless you are going into a
lock-down mental health program of your own? And I KNOW you weren't yet AGAIN
trying to moderate or control USENET content, like YOU accuse OTHERS of doing,
now were you...?!?!

Geritol time for Lennie.

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2813. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 10:50:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618065020.20038.00000730@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 68951

>Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 6/18/03 12:17 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnmce5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>>I do too, but I liked K4YZ better for me. K4CAP will be "blocked" for two
>>years now. We can apply it to a CAP club station later.
>
> So now you will have paid fees for two "vanity" calls.....

In the bigger picture of life, Phil, I've paid more and gotten less for
some things. It's the value you attach to it.

Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ

2814. S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 12:25:49 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf0ml2ca5n3s4b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68952

The ITU web site list ten proposals for rule S25.5. They are:

ARB mod (modify)
ASP sup (suppress, delete)
EENA noc (no change)
EUR mod
IAP sup
IND mod
KEN mod
TZA mod
UKR NOC (strongly support no change)
USA sup

The last proposal (USA) is the United States proposal,
which is to delete S25.5.

You must have a special account and password to view the
text of the proposal.

Can anyone provide addition information on the other
proposal?

Larry KC8EPO

2815. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 13:29:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68953

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most
> of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use phone, but I
> think you probably guessed that already.

From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
ask for because they might get it.

w3rv

2816. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 13:46:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306180546.1faffb32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68954

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030617183733.08122.00001078@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 6/17/03 4:30 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0306171330.1d396313@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Poor Steve, he cannot structure a sentence properly.
> >>
> >> Poor Brain. Can't figure out what to do without input from Lennie, so
> >> just copies his "techniques". Yet another putz.
> >
> >You're so obsessed with Len that you imagine traits of Len in anyone
> >who doesn't agree with you.
>
> Hmmmmmm....letsee about that...
>
> Unable to argue or otherwise "debate" the content of a statement, you
> attempt to attack the method in which the subject was delivered.

That would be your statement about scooping things out of Len's
behind.

> And the "soak your head" comments, etc...Straight out of Lennie's
> playbook, thoroughly archived in Google and Deja before it.

A mild insult with creativity with respect to the sitz bath.
>
> Lot's of people here don't "agree" with me, Brain...Very few emulate The
> Scummy One in doing it. You do, however.

You are the one commenting on Len's rear end. Consider yourself
"Lennyesque."

> >> Oh? How? What overwhelming breakdown in international politics has
> >> occured as a result of this? What major internal, US policy has been
> affected
> >> due to Nippon's failure to follow the law?
> >
> >Why does the it have to be an overwhelming breakdown? You're so
> >friggin bipolor that you cannot see nuances in change.
>
> The "nuances in change" have been in the works a heckovalot longer than
> with the inception of Japan's 4th class license, Brainiac...The Japanese were
> just the first (that I am aware of) to implement some sort of practical form of
> that concept.

Then why do you need to see catastrophic change for it to register???

> >> Got your nose rubbed in your own dung and you think you're ahead...!
> Thanks
> >> for the laugh!
> >
> >Must be one of those insane laughs.
>
> Nope, just the usual "too bad this guy ain't got a clue as to how
> rediculous he looks" kinda laughs...The kind you let slip when some guy in an
> expensive suit walks out of the men's room with his fly open, or when a woman
> has her skirt stuck in her panty hose...

You hang out in front of public restrooms?

> >> >So Japan is once again a soverign nation?
> >>
> >> When since 1954 has it not been?
> >
> >Gud question.
>
> You're right. It is. Can you answer it since you seem to think it's an
> issue?

When a nation relinquishes a small part of its soverignty to a treaty,
then breaks the treaty, they are re-asserting their soverignty.

> >> Does it matter? But case in point, Great Britian, Argentina, New
> Zealand,
> >> Austrailia, Russia (and many of it's satellites), Poland, and I am sure
> >others.
> >
> >What US callsigns has Great Britian issued to personnel stationed in
> >Japan?
>
> None in Japan. But they issue calls for use outside of Britian on
> non-British soil. Are you smart enough to know where? There's more than one
> place, and no, it is neither Gibralter nor Cypress.

Welp, there's a speck of rock in the IO, and then there's some rock
and ice in the South Seas.

> >What's going on? I liked the new one.
>
> I do too, but I liked K4YZ better for me. K4CAP will be "blocked" for two
> years now. We can apply it to a CAP club station later.
>
> Steve, K4CAP/K4YZ.

Mike Deignan would be proud.

2817. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 13:51:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF06EA9.2E842A33@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68955

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
> >radio in general."
> >
> >As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.
>
> . I still haven't done any general insulting. I've done SATIRE on
> . some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
> . crackpots in this groupie fest.

Sure, Len. You're simply engaging in civil debate by hurling SATIRE.
Your conveniently snipped SATIRE has been seen by all. We're now aware
that your own militant, crackpot one-sided, my-view-is-the-only view is
the only one you consider.

> . Tell us, oh Glorious Ham Leader, is "rectum breath" NOT an
> . insult? :-)

I'd certainly have felt insulted if called "rectum breath", Len.
Do you consider any of the many names you've called Steve to be
insulting? I'm not insulted by your use of the term "Glorious Ham
Leader" though. I figure that its use by you is simply more evidence
that you don't know much about amateur radio.

> . Of course it isn't if uttered by an extra. The old Double Standard
> . at work!

Why no, Leonard. Here, I'll show you.

Steve, please stop insulting Leonard. He's only here to engage in civil
debate over the morse test and for the imposition of a minimum age in
amateur radio licensing.

> . Go back to reading your AARP bulletin, old man.

...and you may resume reading the consumer information provided on the
side of your box of prunes, even older man.

Dave K8MN

2818. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 13:55:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306180555.76c62987@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68956

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgluiqp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 13 Jun 2003 07:16:48 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> Plus there were the weird noises from vacuum formers and diathermies.
> > >
> > >For certain. But in that timeframe the FCC also put the clamps on that
> > >type of equipment WRT to allowable EMI/RFI. That was the real flap in
> > >that part of the spectrum because it affected big bucks corporate
> > >fixed investments in capital equipment which suddenly became illegal
> > >to use.
> >
> > The main problem was that the harmonics fell in the aviation bands,
> > so ISM equipment had to be certified - not only the generator, but
> > the entire plant - to meet strict harmonic standards. We were still
> > doing a lot of chasing of heat sealers into the mid-1970s when
> > new designs came out that met specs.
> >
> > The main mwthod of cleaning it up was screen room enclosures. ISM
> > equipment itself can legally generate as much power as desired as
> > long as it is kept in the range of 27.120 MHz +/- 160 kHz. Find a
> > way to filter the harmonics but let the fundamental through
> > unattenuated, run it on raw rectified AC, and you got a super CB
> > jammer - perfectly legal.

Uggg . . yeah, I never looked at it from that perspective, the fourth
harmonic falls right into the air band.

I rented some industrial space in which there was also an outfit which
fabricated huge sheet vinyl products like tarps and swimming pool
covers. The machinery of course included a row of monster 27 mHz. seam
welders. You'd have to have seen this junk to believe it. It was all
antique equipment plus he "improved" the cooling by yanking the covers
off the equipment which exposed the 4 kV wiring to his crew. A screen
room would have to have been maybe 150 feet long by 40 feet wide.
Forget that!

To really cork it the location is directly under the final approach to
one of the rwys into PHL maybe two miles off the threshhold.

I always wondered who would nab him first, the FCC or OSHA. But nope,
he moved about five years ago untouched and as far as I know he's
still at it.

w3rv

2819. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 13:59:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF07053.30500@psu.edu>
Source record: 68957

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>>>Last weekend, I mentioned Ham radio to a friend. He has an EE degree, but he
>>>is
>>>now working in the software field. Before I told him about it, he had never
>>>heard of Ham radio.
>>
>> Good for you.
>
>
> I usually don't tell the full story all at once.

Very True
> You see, this person is very
> anti-social. I pointed it out to him. He does not deny it and is not ashamed of
> it.

> We listened to some 2 meter freqs. He noticed that people were mostly talking
> about their equipment, repeaters, tuning. In other words they were talking
> about the radios themselves- not socializing. He also did not understand some
> of the codewords used. I "translated" them.

Wow, no kidding! Were you surprised? Kind of like gamers getting
together and talking about games, or computer jocks talking about
computers or programming, or model plane builders talking about model
planes.

> Anyway, this type of person probably would enjoy the Ham culture.

> ---
> Most Hams I have met are anti-social. Anti-social former co-worker Ham,
> Hamfests, Field Day, Wouff Hong ceremony at midnight, random Hams contesting
> while others socialize.

What on earth do you mean by socializing or not socializing? All of
those things ARE socializing.

I'm getting the impression that by socializing, you are talking about
some hypothetical "party" where beautiful people who maybe are movie
stars, or perhaps CEO's and their lovely wives mingle and talk abour
their latest promotion, movie, or real estate deal while drinking the
latest trendy drink or bottled water. Then they move on to scintillating
discussions about the latest Survivor series.

Otherwise, what you are saying doesn't make any sense.

>
> Chance would require all other aspects to be random. They are not. Most are
> male, older, talk in codewords, and are anti-social. It seems to be the nature
> of Hams. It seems to be a requirement - one of the "unwritten rules" of Ham
> radio traditions.

Troll

> I was going to apologize about my comments about the random group of Hams that
> I met being anti-social. I want to take that back now.
>
> I appreciated the generosity. However, I don't think one has to give up
> everything else for the Ham activities. There was no need for the compromise.
> It was not more expensive, nor was more work required. I guess it's the
> standard compromise.

What on earth ARE you talking about? Do you think all hams are only
hams and do nothing else? Most everyone in here has other things that
they do. The ARS is a very enjoyable part of my life, but is by no means
the only part.

Troll

- Mike KB3EIA -

2820. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 14:07:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF0723C.1050408@psu.edu>
Source record: 68958

No CW Test wrote:

>
> ....No, just major insulting
>
>
>>. I've done SATIRE on
>>. some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
>>. crackpots in this groupie fest.
>
>
> ....In the limited time I have been reading rrap, it has become
> ....clear that you (Len) are the most militant one-sided
> ....my-view-is-the-only-view crackpot in this groupie fest.
>
> ....Basic logic 101:
>
> ....Satire is a form of humour
> ....All humor is funny
> ....Len's posts are not funny
> ....Len's posts are neither satire nor humour

Oh-oh!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2821. Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 15:07:30 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <vf10bhbihkaqf0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68959
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> How do you prove you saved a life? I think the emergency is better
> "proved" by having a cold body as evidence. Slick talking attorneys
> will argue that the danger to life was exaggerated unless you can
> produce a body.

I think in this case the issue was not what the emergency was at all.
(Although I did hear it wasn't much.) The controversy hinged on
the fact that OTHER ALTERNATE and ACCEPTABLE means
of communications were readily available, but the kid chose to
step in on the sheriff frequency. That, coupled with 'alleged' previous
issues between the kid and the sheriff department, probably had
more to do with the way it was handled than any attorney involvement.

Mike

2822. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 15:36:07 UTC
From: twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <22840-3EF086E7-53@storefull-2314.public.lawson.webtv.net>
Source record: 68960

From: punisha.news.invalid@web2news.net (You ask w)
Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
"You ask w" <punisha.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote:
stewart wrote:
Go get 'em boys...
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
This group has GOT to be violating Yahoo's Terms of Service. If Yahoo
and the FCC get enough complaints, this menace can be shut down before
etc..

_
>Voobner or somebody calling himself voobner

>already went in there and

>shook up the place and planted spies etc.

LOL.

>says he is gathering info on

>who the cb amp dealers are and there should

>be some busts within the next 6 mo.

See more about Voobner here:
http://www.geocities.com/aarronvoobner/voobinc.html#prod3

>And don't forget Moparholic@hotmail.com is

>Steve Parks an admitted freebander and

>illegal cb amp user who supports Twistedhed

>who is the self-proclaimed "king of freeband".

>See more about Twistedhed here:

>http://www.geocities.com/antitwisty/index.htm

_
LOL....still acting like a virtuous hammie while lying your collective
tail off and utilizing a throwaway AOL account to abuse terms of
services....."self-proclained king-of-freeband"? LOL..those words only
exist in your forges ("Respect for freebanders... 64.12.102.48") of
myself and others, of which Charles Johnson fell for hook line and
sinker and crossposted like a raving lunatic.......the late Dick
McCollum N0BK also pointed out that Lelnad C. Scott KC8LDO was forging
me (and others) in your hammie rooms....when you found you were unable
to debate intelligently (communication deficit) you expressed yourself

in the only manner you know,,,,,personal off-topic attacks and lies. I believe your precious but fictional "voobner" nailed it when he claimed: "If you got rid of me, you would still have Doug Adair, Dave Hall, Lelnad Scott, George Busch, and Sparky to deal with."

Indeed. These named hammies are indicative of all that is wrong with hammie radio today, illustrated by their numerous lost ISP's for violations of TOS.s. These are the type hammies that permanently stain hammie radio and mar it for those seeking betterment of the amateur hobby. You really need to get over yourself with your lies, obsessions and "Twisted" this and "twisted" that. The time you devote to myself and others that have you frustrated is telling of your agenda and mindset. Thank you for illustrating once again, what is fast becoming worldwide knowledge among the amateur community. Getting the word out concerning hammies that deliberately hamper efforts by the ARRL and others who work tirelessly and effortlessly to better the hobby is no longer a difficult task, thanks to posts such as yours and actions such as yours. I find it amusing you diseased few are licensed for communications, yet spend your time trolling in a cb forum illustrating the irony that you also suffer the greatest deficits where communication skills are required. Try not to muck your fellow hammies forum up too bad with your juvenile obsessive off-topic rants, personal shortcomings and inadequacies concerning those that demonstrate your incompetence and laugh at your impotence on a continued and regular basis.

2823. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 16:10:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306180810.41867465@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68961

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030618000456.17796.00000918@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
> >radio in general."
> >
> >As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.
>
> . I still haven't done any general insulting.

Just lots and lots of specific insulting.

> . I've done SATIRE on
> . some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
> . crackpots in this groupie fest.

Satire? Nobody else thought it was funny.

When someone satirized or parodied you, Len, you got really upset.
Double standard...
> .
> . Tell us, oh Glorious Ham Leader, is "rectum breath" NOT an
> . insult? :-)

It's an insult to rectums.
> .
> . Of course it isn't if uttered by an extra.

I just wrote that it is an insult.

> . The old Double Standard at work!

Your double standard is quite evident, Len.
> .
> . Go back to reading your AARP bulletin, old man.

Typical ad hominem from you, Len.

Here's a tip, Len: Try being positive in your postings here, instead
of negative. You project an extremely negative persona and energy. The
headshrinkers have a term for it: 'toxic personality'. You're always
talking about what's wrong, what has to be eliminated, how bad others
are, how awful Morse code and its tests are, making false accusations
of fraud, getting all worked up over typos, defending the "honor" of
worthless, thieving, lying long-dead corporate robber-barons, name

calling, insulting, ridiculing, making bad "jokes" that nobody finds funny, yada, yada, yada.

What a sourpuss! The negative kharma you've acquired must be staggering.

You never talk about how much FUN amateur radio is, how great a lot of hams are as people, how many accomplishments hams have made...

oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful way.

2824. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 16:11:32 UTC
From: Pat Richardson <reply@newsgroup.only>
Message-ID: <ef01fvou0q139423aa4vrjn66pl50gadgr@4ax.com>
Source record: 68962
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Freebanders have a strong need to be noticed - trolling the Ham newsgroups and generating lots of noise provides the same thrill that drives them to exhibit similar behavior on the Ham bands. They know that they are lawbreakers - that is what makes it fun!

These guys have a pathological need to rebel against the establishment - and they need to tell the world about it! "Look at me!", they are yelling - and they need us to listen. If they wanted to be Hams, they would be. They have the technical ability to operate (and even modify) radio equipment, and the inclination to learn how - just like us. For them, however, it's much more fun to annoy others than to join a community. And, just like radio, the Internet provides a place to hide while committing these 'brave' acts of defiance and individualism - have you ever heard one of these guys articulating their views at your local club, or a Hamfest? That would require a journey out of the comfort of the darkness that these folks need to empower them. As well, the possibility of being held accountable for the laws that they wilfully violate is too much for these brave souls to face - I suspect that there are few Nelson Mandelas in the Freebander ranks.

As Hams, the wisest thing that we can do is to not get suckered into flame wars and discussions with these folks - this simply encourages similar behaviour in future. Ignoring them on the newsgroups denies the gratification which they crave. Do the same on the radio - follow standard procedure for handling QRM. When we acknowledge the existence of someone creating QRM, we are creating QRM ourselves - and we encourage the offender to do it again, as the desited result was achieved. When we ignore those offending transmissions, we cause the offender to question whether his equipment is working - did his signal get out there? Did it interfere? Did it disrupt communications? DID ANYONE HEAR ME ?? Maybe - but doubt has been created, the conversation that was supposed to be interrupted continued as if the offender did not exist - and the fun was removed from the act. We can do that here on the newsgroups too by not responding to posts from these folks. Like the tree that falls in the woods with no one around (and hence, makes no sound) - if we all ignore them, then they don't exist. They are there because we acknowledge them, plain and simple. All parasites die when denied a host.

Ignore the QRM, and continue to report all offences to the regulatory and law enforcement authorities. Log them, tape record them, triangulate / locate them, identify them - but do it quietly, and deny them the ear that they so desperately need.

We should be part of the solution, not the problem - that's what being a Ham is all about!

Pat

On 17 Jun 2003 10:42:21 -0700, itzack@hotmail.com (Kc4npd) wrote:

>Hams seek to learn the law and to use what they have learned and been
>tested on. "freebanders" ignore the law and choose to look the other
>way when they blindly stumble across a law that they are in violation
>of.
>.-.. .- .-- -... .-. . .- -.- . .-. ...
> (use a cheat sheet if you must)

2825. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 16:43:23 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF096AB.CC48DA47@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 68963

> > >http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
> >
> > Discussing 11 meter amplifiers is not illegal.

Then you also need to go after all the 11 meter DX groups on Yahoo.

Wouldn't it be easier to elmer some of them and let them tell their friends?

2826. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 17:13:37 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <551la.15$b8.14@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 68964

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message
news:3EF096AB.CC48DA47@yahoo.slam...
> > > >http://groups.yahoo.com/group/11meteramps/
> > >
> > > Discussing 11 meter amplifiers is not illegal.
>
>
> Then you also need to go after all the 11 meter DX groups on Yahoo.

Why stop at Yahoo, Scott. What about going after ALL the 11-meter DX groups
on the ENTIRE internet?

> Wouldn't it be easier to elmer some of them and let them tell their
friends?

That'd require the patience and temperment to not let the ones that don't
want to be helped dissuade one from reaching those who are but a helpful
nudge in the right direction away from amateur radio. Historically, the
"damn 'em all" mind-set has always been easier. 'Sides, you don't know any
ex-11-meter DXers that subsequently became law abiding hams, do you? ;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2827. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 17:33:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306180933.1a419108@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68965

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcnbsuuot0@208.207.71.144>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > In article <bcb4eg$n6m$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
> > >
> > >What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on opinions,
> > >nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used against
> > >the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
> > >
> > . Well, there we have it...anyone against the beloved morse code
> > . test is automatically against all written tests! :-)
>
> Gawd! actually a *two-liner* from Lennie!!! I'm feeling faint!
> His rants are becoming more efficient!
>
> But how's he ever gonna pass *any* test when he can't even get
> his attributions right?

Stay on topic, Dick.

Why do you believe that people who are against an outdated,
unnecessary, and superfluous code exam against all exams?

Brian

2828. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 17:36:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306180936.2b7e75ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68966

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030617090434.17727.00000577@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 6/17/03 12:23 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030617012326.01315.00000285@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
> >>What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on
> opinions,
> >>nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used against
> >>the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
> >
> >. Well, there we have it...anyone against the beloved morse code
> >. test is automatically against all written tests!
>
> You didn't answer the question, Rectum Breath...Would YOU use the same
> arguments per the WRITTEN tests as you have the code test?
>
> Steve, K4CAP

S25 is an opinion?

And why are you so fixated on Len's rear end? Get help.

2829. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 17:43:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306180943.53208fc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 68967

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com>...
> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>
> > Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> > call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most
> > of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use phone, but I
> > think you probably guessed that already.
>
> From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> ask for because they might get it.
>
> w3rv

Like having to beam across Japan to work Europe from Guam. I would
have to work hundreds of JA's hoping the band didn't close before I
got thru them all.

Or I would call Europe only, and the JA's were very respectful and
polite. No problems. When I would slip and leave Europe out of the
CQ, there the JAs were again. Again, no problem.

If only the Yanks were as well behaved, your premonition of DX having
to hide...

2830. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 17:44:48 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF0A510.49A1053E@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 68968

[Keith]
> Maybe you misunderstood what *I* wrote:
>
> Discussing 11 meter amplifiers is *NOT* illegal.

It's not aimed at you. One of our trolls posted Stu's message on another group,
so I subscribed here. I'm allowed. I've had my ticket for the past month.

[Bert]
>'Sides, you don't know any
>ex-11-meter DXers that subsequently became law abiding hams, do you? ;-)

If they ever do away with code, I can pull the 2950 out of hiding!!!
I hadn't used any extra channels is a long time. My Yaesu HT was
opened when I got it, but has since been restored to factory. I've
got a 19-1210 for MURS use. Except for the TS-250 on my PC-122 in the
mobile, I _AM_ legal. I only use power when needed. Otherwise, I'm barefoot.

26 years in radio, including CB, SWL, scanners, and now amateur.

Scott, KB3xxx

2831. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 18:17:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcqamnpoe1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 68969

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgno937.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 17 Jun 2003 20:09:12 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >> or to tell
> >> him what the questions and answers were.
> >
> >In other words, a "gag order" was in place...but the rules never
> >said that.
>
> The instructions on the exam package were very clear about that.

Like "shrink-wrap" licensing I presume :-) :-0

> >> It is the equivakent of stolen material.
>
> >Yet no one, including the FCC ever embarked on any prosecution against
> >Bash.
>
> Only because of the laziness of the attorney at headquarters who
> would have had to do the work.

So you have claimed.

> We went through this all before. Nothing new will be raised by
> either side.

Agreed...all we can do is agree to disagree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2832. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 18:47:23 UTC
From: mrcoily <comnet.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <41714N641@web2news.com>
Source record: 68970

Scott #69!!! wrote:
> [Keith]
>> Maybe you misunderstood what *I* wrote:
>>
>> Discussing 11 meter amplifiers is *NOT* illegal.
>
> It's not aimed at you. One of our trolls posted Stu's
> message on another group,
> so I subscribed here. I'm allowed. I've had my ticket for
> the past month.
>
> [Bert]
>>'Sides, you don't know any
>>ex-11-meter DXers that subsequently became law abiding
>> hams, do you? ;-)
>

"11 meter DXers"? Call them by their real name. FREEBANDERS. i.e.
outlaws.

> If they ever do away with code, I can pull the 2950 out of hiding!!!
>
> I hadn't used any extra channels is a long time.

Sigh. "Extra channels"? Call them by their real name: ILLEGAL
FREQUENCIES.

>My Yaesu HT was
> opened when I got it, but has since been restored to factory. I've
> got a 19-1210 for MURS use. Except for the TS-250
> on my PC-122 in the
> mobile, I _AM_ legal. I only use power when needed.
> Otherwise, I'm barefoot.

You only operate "AM" CB ILLEGALLY "when needed". How about that. Jeez,
that's quite a triumph. No wonder you won't post your callsign.

> 26 years in radio, including CB, SWL, scanners, and now amateur.
>
> Scott, KB3xxx

Sad that a guy with that much experience and potential won't give up his
illegal CB behavior -- to the point where he's ashamed to post his
amateur callsign.

>Then you also need to go after all the 11 meter DX groups on Yahoo.

Scott, first of all, freebanding is ILLEGAL no matter if you call it "11 meter DX" or "upper channels" or "international DX" or whatever. Secondly, the sheer number of people breaking a law doesn't make it right, i.e. "mob rule" over the airwaves.

>Wouldn't it be easier to elmer some of them and let them tell their friends?

Yes, elmer them, BUT elmer them to show respect for the law.

And talk about lack of respect.....here's a piece written by "twistedhed" glorifying the joys of "freebanding". It was at http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html. This url has disappeared, I don't know why, maybe they were ashamed of it. Here is the original article from SPORADIC WAVES which may give you some insight into what we freebanders concerns are:

==========

by Twistedhed@webtv.net

DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter and free-band is there for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small, intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a permanent-like residential status there, and in the process, completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.

27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency. Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call frequency open at all times for contacts.

This small but nefarious group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts from being made on frequency.

In case you haven't listened in on 555 as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their wattage rather than surrender the frequency.

While I can somewhat empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and are permitted to transmit there,

I can't seem to shake the old adage that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem."

Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies many have attempted to elude.

While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent, I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.

Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy, Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few.

27.415 to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get them.

Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by.

Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38 with said offenders. I can say one thing with absolute certainty, the offending signals are coming from the southwest U.S.

Of all the DX and countries I have ever heard, I find myself embarrassed for our own operators here in the states.

The high profile spectrum splatterers usually get their clue, one way or another.

Unfortunately, for many fine operators and listeners it doesn't come soon enough. Rather than retaliate with gobs of power, it is simply easier to find another frequency until the problem rights itself.

While some may continue to pull out the A/C mauls, this is actually compounding the problem. If no one would react to these types and totally ignore them they would long tire of talking to themselves. But I guess that is just the optimist in me.

The flames continue to be fanned, albeit not always intentionally, by ops who feel it is their right to "give back what is being doled out."

There are no easy answers. As stated priorly, there are many other frequencies yielding great DX. Here are a few heard as of late. A good hint to use while searching for long distance DX is to move s-l-o-w-l-y and if possible, in 5 kHz steps. If you believe the solar scientists,

the current cycle is now projected to peak around May or June. If this prediction proves accurate, this should give us some more time to enjoy the incredible skip propagation that has been the norm as of late.

I continue to receive e-mail concerning the comments I made about some of the larger radio distribution companies and the still-unfounded-rumors of a litany of back orders. Judging by some of the responses I received, it is inevitable that there is a basis of truth to the allegations concerning a connection between easily modifieable 10 meter radios and companies not having them in stock.

However, it appears that this is confined to just one or two companies at this time.

Keep sending me your personal experiences about backorders. So far, they range from the slight inconveniences to the outrageous(3 months or more), I will compile all I receive in an honest effort to find out if these experiences are due to increased pressure from the Feds or just attributed to shoddy customer service.

Feel free to share your thoughts with me on this or an other subject you my wish. If you wish a reply, please provide a valid e-mail address. 3s from Keyholder's Korner,

Twistedhed@webtv.net
==========

--
Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

2833. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 19:25:03 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <j03Ia.598$Aa.336@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 68971

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message
news:3EF0A510.49A1053E@yahoo.slam...
> [Bert]
> >'Sides, you don't know any
> >ex-11-meter DXers that subsequently became law abiding hams, do you? ;-)
>
> If they ever do away with code, I can pull the 2950 out of hiding!!!

No need to hide it, Scott. Use it to listen all you want. When you nail the code, (...& you WILL, trust me!) gimme a call on 28.4440 MHz around dusk. Can't transmit on 11m though. Trust me again, the risk's just not worth it.

> I hadn't used any extra channels is a long time.

Relegate it to listening only now.

<snip>

> Except for the TS-250 on my PC-122 in the
> mobile, I _AM_ legal. I only use power when needed. Otherwise, I'm
barefoot.

Be warned, many view it as "in for a penny, in for a pound" re. ANY illegal activities. So I really wouldn't advertise the use of the TS-250 on 11m. However, you can use that TS-250 on 10m without much hassle after you pass Element 1. (Which you WILL.) Somewhat will point out why you can't, I'm sure. But we ARE talking realistically, yes?

A word about legality. As with ALL laws, there's IS a point of balance between true disregard for others in the form of harmful lawlessness in society and the 100% pure perfect law abiding citizen. This requires some common sense. Many throw this common sense approach aside when it gets in the way of being able to label an individual (or group) as <a> criminal. Let's face it, the stigma of being called a criminal implies that you are of bad character and/or poor moral fiber, (Or is that fibre?) right? Why do I bring this up? To caution you that it is truly in your best interest to fly straight and narrow now that you have chosen to join the amateur radio community. I hope you take that in the best of spirit as this is how I mean it. You wouldn't regard a jaywalker or someone who occassionally drives at 60 m.p.h. on a 55 m.p.h. hwy. with the same regard as a burglar or a rapist, would you? Neither do I. Well, be warned that there WILL be those who will equate ANY 11m associated transgressions the same as if you dumped a kilowatt of voice on 28.085 MHz. Lest I come off as preachy of holier than thou, what violations DON'T get my tail feathers ruffled? I really don't worry about folks working DX on the legal frequencies at legal power levels. The antenna height restrictions don't bug me to much either. Say as a ham,

you have a 200 ft. tower and run your CB through the tuner to that monster tri-bander on top, bully for you. Mind you, I don't do either of these...hence no risk to me. However, there are some for which this type of nitpicking is a sub-hobby unto itself. Hey remember, the addition of an amplified mic can be construed as a modification to the transmitter circuit of a type-accepted CB and thus, be considered illegal. Common sense, however, dictates otherwise.

As for me, I just want to extend you a hearty "welcome to amateur rdio," Scott. I'm sure you'll have a blast. Take care and hope to work you on 10m soon. :-)

> 26 years in radio, including CB, SWL, scanners, and now amateur.

Two thumbs up!

> Scott, KB3xxx

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2834. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 19:35:03 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <H93Ia.603$Aa.402@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 68972

"mrcoily" <comnet.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in message
news:41714N641@web2news.com...
> > [Bert]
> >>'Sides, you don't know any
> >>ex-11-meter DXers that subsequently became law abiding
> >> hams, do you? ;-)
>
> "11 meter DXers"? Call them by their real name. FREEBANDERS. i.e.
> outlaws.

Exhibit A re. my last post, Scott. Tune o ch. 38 LSB on any given evening and you'll rarely hear any two stations from the same state. (Except for Texas.) Ch. 38 is 27.385 MHz and does fall within 11-meters, hence 11-meter DXers. Illegal, yes..."freebanders," no.

> >Wouldn't it be easier to elmer some of them and let them tell their
> friends?
>
> Yes, elmer them, BUT elmer them to show respect for the law.

Agreed.

<snipped due to irrelavance to Scott's post>

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2835. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 19:43:59 UTC
From: Upton O'Good <markmywords.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <41747N039@web2news.com>
Source record: 68973

Bert Craig wrote:
> Many throw this common sense approach aside
> when it gets in
> the way of being able to label an individual (or group) as
> <a> criminal.
> Let's face it, the stigma of being called a criminal
> implies that you are of
> bad character and/or poor moral fiber, (Or is that fibre?)
> right? Why do I
> bring this up? To caution you that it is truly in your
> best interest to fly
> straight and narrow now that you have chosen to join the
> amateur radio
> community. I hope you take that in the best of spirit as
> this is how I mean
> it. You wouldn't regard a jaywalker or someone who
> occassionally drives at
> 60 m.p.h. on a 55 m.p.h. hwy. with the same regard as a
> burglar or a rapist,
> would you? Neither do I. Well, be warned that there WILL
> be those who will
> equate ANY 11m associated transgressions the same as if you dumped a
> kilowatt of voice on 28.085 MHz.

No, that's not it at all. Hams should not hesitate to elmer a freebander or a CB outlaw. What is past is forgiven, get your ticket, go and sin no more, etc. But to say that this person's current (or continuing) "freeband" violations are trivial and acceptable reinforces disrespect for the FCC and FCC rules --- a disrespect he will carry over to his ham career.

--
Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

2836. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 20:51:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgosz70.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68974

On 18 Jun 2003 06:55:19 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>I always wondered who would nab him first, the FCC or OSHA. But nope,
>he moved about five years ago untouched and as far as I know he's
>still at it.

The FCC would usually get into it after the FAA reported harmful IX.
This is one of the few items that the local office District Director
has absolute authority to issue a Cease and Desist Order without
futzing around. Failure to observe same brings the Marshals. We
issued a bunch of Orders in the late 60s but never had to go the
Marshal route.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2837. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 20:51:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgoter1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68975

On 18 Jun 2003 10:50:20 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>>I do too, but I liked K4YZ better for me. K4CAP will be "blocked" for two
>>>years now. We can apply it to a CAP club station later.
>>
>> So now you will have paid fees for two "vanity" calls.....
>
>In the bigger picture of life, Phil, I've paid more and gotten less for
>some things. It's the value you attach to it.

In the era when one could get a specific call issued if one had the
right connections (over 40 years ago), a then-buddy of mine, SDimon
Holzman, a well-placed design engineer for a major (non-amateur)
antenna manufacturer, got the former callsign of the editor of CQ
Magazine when the latter used -his- juice to get a snazzy call.

After going on the air with it and being called a "bootlegger" with
practically every attempt at a QSO, Sy turned it back in and got a
plain WA2 2x3 call.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2838. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 21:07:08 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <0w4Ia.641$Aa.425@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 68976

"Upton O'Good" <markmywords.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in message
news:41747N039@web2news.com...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > Many throw this common sense approach aside
> > when it gets in
> > the way of being able to label an individual (or group) as
> > <a> criminal.
> > Let's face it, the stigma of being called a criminal
> > implies that you are of
> > bad character and/or poor moral fiber, (Or is that fibre?)
> > right? Why do I
> > bring this up? To caution you that it is truly in your
> > best interest to fly
> > straight and narrow now that you have chosen to join the
> > amateur radio
> > community. I hope you take that in the best of spirit as
> > this is how I mean
> > it. You wouldn't regard a jaywalker or someone who
> > occassionally drives at
> > 60 m.p.h. on a 55 m.p.h. hwy. with the same regard as a
> > burglar or a rapist,
> > would you? Neither do I. Well, be warned that there WILL
> > be those who will
> > equate ANY 11m associated transgressions the same as if you dumped a
> > kilowatt of voice on 28.085 MHz.
>
> No, that's not it at all.

George, you do not speak for everybody nor can you claim to have experienced
every ham's reaction. Also, by selecting only this paragraph, the message
appears a tad out of context.

> Hams should not hesitate to elmer a freebander
> or a CB outlaw. What is past is forgiven, get your ticket, go and sin no
> more, etc.

Agreed.

> But to say that this person's current (or continuing)
> "freeband" violations

Stop right there, George. Go back and reread the ENTIRE post and you'll see
that "freebanding" is in no way "trivialized." I personally DO trivialize
DXing on the legal 40 @ 12 watts P.E.P. and the use of one's ham band
antenna @ 200 ft. for CB. No sweat, that's just MHO and I'm man enough to
stand behind it. (Out in the open, I might add.)

> are trivial and acceptable reinforces disrespect
> for the FCC and FCC rules --- a disrespect he will carry over to his ham
> career.

Answered above. BTW, respect is something that's earned...not granted. While I may repect the FCC, I don't necessarily have to agree with every single one of their rules...despite following said rules. Hence, not getting my tail feathers ruffled.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2839. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 21:07:28 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF0D490.29928CEC@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 68977

> > Except for the TS-250 on my PC-122 in the
> > mobile, I _AM_ legal. I only use power when needed. Otherwise, I'm
> barefoot.

mrcoily, I don't use AM mode. Everybody has their limiter clipped and I
can't stand to listen to them.

> As for me, I just want to extend you a hearty "welcome to amateur rdio,"
> Scott. I'm sure you'll have a blast. Take care and hope to work you on 10m
> soon. :-)

I'd have a better chance of linking to you on IRLP. Email for details.
I've got too much to do to learn code now.

> > 26 years in radio, including CB, SWL, scanners, and now amateur.
>
> Two thumbs up!

That beats a pair...

...of middle fingers! <VBG>

2840. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 21:11:29 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF0D581.4B8B2D1E@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 68978

> No, that's not it at all. Hams should not hesitate to elmer a freebander
> or a CB outlaw. What is past is forgiven, get your ticket, go and sin no
> more, etc. But to say that this person's current (or continuing)
> "freeband" violations are trivial and acceptable reinforces disrespect
> for the FCC and FCC rules --- a disrespect he will carry over to his ham
> career.

Using a very clean 2 pill on sideband from the mobile, when needed, is
very different then running many Kilos in class C on AM all the time.

I had always told folks NOT to run heat in the house. You're a sitting
duck for your neighbor's complaints.

> Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
> http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

Still hiding behind a remailer? What a goof.

2841. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 21:45:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618174505.14837.00000794@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 68979

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnbkp3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 17 Jun 2003 10:46:21 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>> The main mwthod of cleaning it up was screen room enclosures. ISM
>>> equipment itself can legally generate as much power as desired as
>>> long as it is kept in the range of 27.120 MHz +/- 160 kHz. Find a
>>> way to filter the harmonics but let the fundamental through
>>> unattenuated, run it on raw rectified AC, and you got a super CB
>>> jammer - perfectly legal.
>>
>>Generate or radiate, Phil?
>
> Both.

oh mama mia.....

> Have fun.

That company with the heat sealers I mentioned earlier eventually junked it and got more modern equipment. I somehow wound up with the spare tubes - an 833 and two 866As. My RCA Transmitting Tube Manual has a schematic in the back....

Killing the harmonics is basically a matter of tank circuit Q and class of operation. Those ancient sealers were usually extreme Class-C, in an effort to develop high efficiency. But a nice MOPA design with a Class AB final could do the job, too....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2842. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 21:55:07 UTC
From: mrcoily <comnet.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <41786N907@web2news.com>
Source record: 68981

Scott #69!!! wrote:
> Using a very clean 2 pill on sideband from the mobile,
> when needed, is
> very different then running many Kilos in class C
>on AM all the time.

Gee I love how you view FCC regs governing the use of the RF spectrum as
suggestions you can or can't follow depending on what rationalization
you come up with.

--
Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

2843. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 21:55:36 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF0DFD8.49691B50@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 68980

> Sad that a guy with that much experience and potential won't give up his
> illegal CB behavior -- to the point where he's ashamed to post his
> amateur callsign.

I'm not ashamed to post my call. I don't do it because of the bunch
of internet stalkers on rec.radio.cb, just trying too hard to find
a shred of info about me. They claim to know, but have never produced
any info when asked to.

[repost, in case you missed these words from me]
mrcoily, I don't use AM mode. Everybody [here] has their limiter clipped and I
can't stand to listen to them.

Using a very clean 2 pill on sideband from the mobile, when needed, is
very different then running many Kilos in class C on AM all the time.

I had always told folks NOT to run heat in the house. You're a sitting
duck for your neighbor's complaints.

> Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
> http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy

Another anonymous acolyte...

...you _might_ be a stalker.

2844. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 22:31:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618183141.23406.00000249@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 68982

In article <vf0ml2ca5n3s4b@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>The ITU web site list ten proposals for rule S25.5. They are:
>
>ARB mod (modify)
>ASP sup (suppress, delete)
>EENA noc (no change)
>EUR mod
>IAP sup
>IND mod
>KEN mod
>TZA mod
>UKR NOC (strongly support no change)
>USA sup
>
>The last proposal (USA) is the United States proposal,
>which is to delete S25.5.
>
omigosh, Larry - ten proposals, of which only three are two suppress/delete?

I wonder what the modification proposals look like?

>You must have a special account and password to view the
>text of the proposal.

dang

>Can anyone provide addition information on the other
>proposal?

Sorry - but thanks for the info

73 de Jim, N2EY

>Larry KC8EPO
>

2845. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 23:26:30 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 68983

On Tue, 17 Jun 2003, Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:YJ9Ha.4208$a7.1559232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> [snip]
> > > > > > Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> > > > >
> > > > > I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps you bought your license?
> > >
> > > You are way off base here.
> > >
>
> Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|

What "game?"

Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The fact that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include a "Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there was NO SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is the June 1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the contrary, the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim - that she had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.

I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't demonstrated her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be false.

> > > The FCC didn't make the distinction between Technicians with code and
> > without
> > > until June 1994 - at least as far as their licensing database goes.
> >
> > I don't know what the database said but I do know what my license said.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2846. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-18 23:31:12 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <4D6Ia.15644$Y32.6959694@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 68984

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message
news:3EF0D581.4B8B2D1E@yahoo.slam...
> > No, that's not it at all. Hams should not hesitate to elmer a freebander
> > or a CB outlaw. What is past is forgiven, get your ticket, go and sin no
> > more, etc. But to say that this person's current (or continuing)
> > "freeband" violations are trivial and acceptable reinforces disrespect
> > for the FCC and FCC rules --- a disrespect he will carry over to his ham
> > career.
>
>
> Using a very clean 2 pill on sideband from the mobile, when needed, is
> very different then running many Kilos in class C on AM all the time.

Depends on the frequency, Scott. If it's on 10m, fine. Run it on 11m and you risk a multi-kilobuck NAL. Excessive power is not something I trivialize. Personally, I'd lose the TS-250 or run it on 10m.

> I had always told folks NOT to run heat in the house. You're a sitting
> duck for your neighbor's complaints.

Knock out that code and add Element 3 and you can run a full gallon and a half of clean "heat" from the house and you probably won't get any complaints running an amp that employs a properly designed low pass filter. I'd be happy to send you my ARRL Morse code CD's. It really is not hard at all.

> > Direct access to this group with http://web2news.com
> > http://web2news.com/?rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
>
> Still hiding behind a remailer? What a goof.

No comment. ;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2847. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 00:21:32 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939ECF0EB4283elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68985

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgnbwt4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com:

> On 16 Jun 2003 18:35:53 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>That's interesting. So the HF phone distress frequency still exists but
>>is no longer 2182 kHz, having moved to 2187.5, and listening at
>>specific times is now superceded by DSC. But are the actual
>>transmissions still USB? Presumably they are, or everyone would have to
>>invest in new radios?
>>
> The distress frequencies (upon which voice calls are made and
> traffic is passed) remain 2182 kHz and VHF Channel 16. The
> continuous monitoring requirement has shifted to DSC on 2187.5 kHz
> and VHF Channel 70, but the 2182 "silent period" remains.
>
> In all cases except in the Mediterranean (the so-called Area A1) the
> primary distress call is made on INMARSAT, though, if the vessel has
> it. The Marine Safety Agency responding (USCG in the US) will shift
> the traffic to MF or VHF depending on the location. In the Med, the
> primary call is on MF.
>
>>It also seems that the VHF channels have been changed. Presumably they
>>still use FM?
>
> Yes, all VHF Marine channels are FM (5 kHz deviation).
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

This is confusing. What's the poiint in calling 'Mayday' on 2.182 or
156.800 if everyone is listening on 2.1875 and 156.525? What am I missing
here?

2848. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 00:23:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618202333.23307.00000759@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68986

In article <bcoap8$k9b$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.hglr4ml.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On Sun, 15 Jun 2003 23:43:22 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>> >Bash was the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's
>> >high school algebra tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or
>> >the frat house's library of previous year's tests at some college.
>>
>> Bash was the equivalent of someone breaking into the school and
>> rummaging through the teacher's desk until he found the questions
>> and answers to the algebra exam.
>
>Bunk...it wasn't equal to any "breakin" at all. It was no
>different than a student telling another student what one or more
>questions were on the latest history test.

It's "no different" only if the teacher and the school had made it clear that
students taking the test were NOT to discuss the actual test with others.
>
>> Those exams were not public information, and the examinees were not
>> authorized to carry the information out od the exam room
>
>which they didn't other than in their memory.

True - and divulging said information was against the rules. As I recall the
old exams, when someone signed the 610 as part of applying for the license,
they agreed to abide by ALL of the rules and instructions involving the exams.
>
>> or to tell
>> him what the questions and answers were.
>
>In other words, a "gag order" was in place...but the rules never
>said that.
>
The instructions on the exams I saw said it. 1967, K3NYT's house, Keystone
Avenue in Upper Darby.

>> It is the equivakent of stolen material.
>
>Yet no one, including the FCC ever embarked on any prosecution against
>Bash.

It was the FCC's job, and they didn't do it. Phil was there, literally, he's told the story.
>
>> We went through this before - do we need to resurrect the dispute
>> again?
>
>Only if you keep raising the old arguments/opinions while
>ignoring the other perspective.

What's the other perspective, Bill? That it's OK to violate the exam rules and procedures?

How about this scenario:

Back in those days, all Novice and Tech exams were done "by mail", using a single volunteer examiner. Would it have been OK for a volunteer examiner to make copies of the exams he/she proctored? How about distributing those copies to prospective hams as "study guides"?

Why or why not?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2849. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 00:24:51 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcqvrn$v14$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69018

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Tue, 17 Jun 2003, Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:YJ9Ha.4208$a7.1559232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > [snip]
> > > > > > > Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.
> > > >
> > > Perhaps you bought your license?
> > >
> > > You are way off base here.
> > >
> >
> > Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|
>
> What "game?"
>
> Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The
fact
> that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include a
> "Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there was
NO
> SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is the
June
> 1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
contrary,
> the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
that she
> had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.
>
> I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
demonstrated
> her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be
false.

Oh, please. Far be it from me to stick up for one of the rrap ct
loonies, but the level of "demonstrated evidence" for _anything_ around here
is pathetic. One supposed 'net expert says I'm posting anonymously and Dick
Carrol used his powers of deduction to determine I'm a "phony" veteran based

on his (lack of) knowledge regarding military rations and satellite technology.
On top of that, the lot of ya get anal if somebody doesn't use his callsign in his postings.
People here have serious issues, and they ain't to do with ham radio, that's for sure.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.490 / Virus Database: 289 - Release Date: 6/16/2003

2850. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 00:31:58 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 68987

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>
>> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
>> call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down
>> most of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use
>> phone, but I think you probably guessed that already.
>
> From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> ask for because they might get it.
>
> w3rv

Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it. They
will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to call
them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do that below
7100.

2851. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 00:40:11 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 68989

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030618183141.23406.00000249@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <vf0ml2ca5n3s4b@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
> writes:
>
> >The ITU web site list ten proposals for rule S25.5. They are:
> >
> >ARB mod (modify)
> >ASP sup (suppress, delete)
> >EENA noc (no change)
> >EUR mod
> >IAP sup
> >IND mod
> >KEN mod
> >TZA mod
> >UKR NOC (strongly support no change)
> >USA sup
> >
> >The last proposal (USA) is the United States proposal,
> >which is to delete S25.5.
> >
> omigosh, Larry - ten proposals, of which only three are suppress/delete?

Two are "noc" no change, i.e. S25.5 remains the same.
Three are "sup" suppress, i.e. S25.5 is deleted.
It would be interesting to known what was in the five "mod" modifications.

UKR probably stand for Ukrania (russia), who we know strongly opposes
the supression of S25.5. Leading manufacture of vaccum tubes supports
Morse code exams. No suprise there. :-) Who is EENA?

Larry KC8EPO

2852. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 00:40:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF10697.6000206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 68988

>
>
> 'Sides, you don't know any
>ex-11-meter DXers that subsequently became law abiding hams, do you? ;-)
>
>
>
Back in 1975 or so I played with CB radio. Had various "QSOs" with
various people
around town. No real DX though. Didn't have an amp though, just a type
accepted CB set. Then decided
to get the ham license and the CB ended up in the closet. Got my
current callsign
WA2ISE in Oct 76, took the tech test in NYC that summer. I had to send
code in
that test.....

2853. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 00:44:46 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <3l7la.64077$Pc5.51804@fed1read01>
Source record: 68990

Well my info sez:
"In 1991, no-code licenses -- and the No-Code Technician is born.
Technicians with code requirements are now Technician Plus. Since existing
Techs had Novice HF privileges and new Techs would have only VHF/UHF,
another semi license class, the Technician Plus, was created. Existing
Technicians, and those who passed the 5 wpm code test, became Technician
Plus class."

But durned if I can find it on the FCC or ARRL site -- maybe someone has a
URL

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Tue, 17 Jun 2003, Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:YJ9Ha.4208$a7.1559232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > [snip]
> > > > > > > Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.
> > > >
> > > Perhaps you bought your license?
> > >
> > > You are way off base here.
> > >
> >
> > Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|
>
> What "game?"
>
> Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The
fact
> that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include a
> "Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there was
NO
> SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is the
June
> 1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
contrary,
> the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
that she
> had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.

>
> I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
demonstrated
> her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be
false.
>
> > > > The FCC didn't make the distinction between Technicians with code
and
> > > without
> > > > until June 1994 - at least as far as their licensing database goes.
> > >
> > > I don't know what the database said but I do know what my license
said.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2854. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 01:19:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <oc8Ia.10$Vx2.6893@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 68991

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > Perhaps you bought your license?
> > > >
> > > > You are way off base here.
> > > >
> > >
> > Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|
>
> What "game?"
>
> Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The
fact
> that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include a
> "Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there was
NO
> SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is the
June
> 1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
contrary,
> the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
that she
> had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.
>
> I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
demonstrated
> her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be
false.
>

However you made a very strong and unjustified implication that I obtained
my license illegally. Regardless of whether or not my statements were
correct or in error there is NO reason to make such an implication.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2855. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 02:35:38 UTC
From: You ask w <punisha.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <41831N738@web2news.com>
Source record: 68992
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>>> "Dave VanHorn" <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote:
>>>> "North" <northmt@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:57h1fvcd1jgdlpkepm0me5a3bstnpb8p36@4ax.com...
>>>>>
>>>>> I missed the beginning of this thread. Why are they calling this
>>>>> group illegal ?
>>>>
>>>> Wrong parse.
>>>>
>>>> Not Illegal group about 11m amps, but group about
>>>> illegal 11m amps.
>>>>
>>>> Any 11m amp is illegal though, so it's maybe redundant.
>>>>
>>>> Fairly pointless anyway, if 5W won't get you there on
>>>> 11, 1500 won't
>>>> help much.
>>>> Unless you're trying to shout down your neighbor, in which case it
>>>> seems REALLY pointless.
>>>>
>>> Not according to Stewart, (the OP). He claims it takes more than
>>> 4 watts to talk dx on 11 meters.
>>>
>> Here's the post, in case you thought I was just
>> making this shit up.
>>
>> http://tinyurl.com/eo8w
>>
>> In article <5f4fe4c2.0205281616.4a5ccf0@posting.google.com>,
>> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:
>>
>>>Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF
>>> frequencies. To
>>>take advantage of this propagation requires running more than the
>>>legally-allowed 4W output allowed on 11m CB

Everyone knows 11 meter amps are illegal to sell and use on CB. That doesnt leave you with much of a comeback, so I guess you must attack Stewart now.

Pretty weak, Scott.

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

2856. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 02:48:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcr890$k9t$0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 68993

lk wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030618183141.23406.00000249@mb-m27.aol.com...
> > In article <vf0ml2ca5n3s4b@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >The ITU web site list ten proposals for rule S25.5. They are:
> > >
> > >ARB mod (modify)
> > >ASP sup (suppress, delete)
> > >EENA noc (no change)
> > >EUR mod
> > >IAP sup
> > >IND mod
> > >KEN mod
> > >TZA mod
> > >UKR NOC (strongly support no change)
> > >USA sup
> > >
> > >The last proposal (USA) is the United States proposal,
> > >which is to delete S25.5.
> > >
> > omigosh, Larry - ten proposals, of which only three are suppress/delete?
>
> Two are "noc" no change, i.e. S25.5 remains the same.
> Three are "sup" suppress, i.e. S25.5 is deleted.
> It would be interesting to known what was in the five "mod" modifications.
>
> UKR probably stand for Ukrania (russia), who we know strongly opposes
> the supression of S25.5. Leading manufacture of vaccum tubes supports
> Morse code exams. No suprise there. :-) Who is EENA?
>
> Larry KC8EPO

Hey guys-- to quote a famous wordsmith, "It ain't over till it's over". And to add Phil's observation on top of that, it may not be over even then.

It's entirely possible that S25 won't be suppressed. Even if it isn't that doesn't mean there will ever be much of a code test again for an HF ham radio license. FCC could dilute the test so much that it would be completely meaningless, as opposed to almost, as it now is.and it wouldn't surprise me at all if they did that, should S25 survive this round.

2857. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 02:50:44 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcr8e4$k9t$1@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 68994

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > > > Perhaps you bought your license?
> > > > >
> > > > > You are way off base here.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|
> > >
> > > What "game?"
> > >
> > > Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The
> fact
> > > that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include a
> > > "Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there was
> NO
> > > SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is the
> June
> > > 1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
> contrary,
> > > the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
> that she
> > > had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.
> > >
> > > I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
> demonstrated
> > > her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be
> false.
> > >
> >
> > However you made a very strong and unjustified implication that I obtained
> > my license illegally. Regardless of whether or not my statements were
> > correct or in error there is NO reason to make such an implication.

Actually, Dee, there is. The simple fact that you got an Extra ticket under
the old scheme where you had to pass a 20WPM code test is enough for some
people. It's a sad situation, but that's about it.
It may not be over in our lifetimes, something like the Civil War.

Dick W0EX

2858. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 03:07:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgpcb91.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 68995

On 19 Jun 2003 00:21:32 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>> The distress frequencies (upon which voice calls are made and
>> traffic is passed) remain 2182 kHz and VHF Channel 16. The
>> continuous monitoring requirement has shifted to DSC on 2187.5 kHz
>> and VHF Channel 70, but the 2182 "silent period" remains.
>>
>> In all cases except in the Mediterranean (the so-called Area A1) the
>> primary distress call is made on INMARSAT, though, if the vessel has
>> it. The Marine Safety Agency responding (USCG in the US) will shift
>> the traffic to MF or VHF depending on the location. In the Med, the
>> primary call is on MF.
>>
>This is confusing. What's the poiint in calling 'Mayday' on 2.182 or
>156.800 if everyone is listening on 2.1875 and 156.525? What am I missing
>here?

Ships still have to kep a speaker watch, listening on 2182 and
Channel 16 for voice calls. The DSC takes the place of the
auto-alarm in the older systems. One uses the auto-alarm feature on
the MF or VHF radio to alert on 2187.5 and Channel 70, and the
controlling station (coast statsion or USCG) can alert the situation
by DSC.

In the CW syustem, the rationale was that surrounding vessels would
pick up the distress call and go to the aid. In the GMDSS system,
the rationale is that the Maritime Safety Agency responsible for
that portion of the ocean would be the primary "listener" so the
distress calls are made by INMARSAT or HF is the ship does not have
INMARSAT working for some reason. 2 MHz and VHF are used for
relatively close-in distress traffic more than the actual initial
distress call.

Remember that this system is for large ocean-going vessels who
have the obligation to carry the modern equipment necessary. If the
country of registry is on the ball, the ships will have the gear or
they won't sail.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2859. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 03:28:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bcrapa$3iu@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 68996

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:oc8Ia.10$Vx2.6893@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > > > Perhaps you bought your license?
> > > > >
> > > > > You are way off base here.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|
> > >
> > > What "game?"
> > >
> > > Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The
> fact
> > > that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include
a
> > > "Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there
was
> NO
> > > SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is
the
> June
> > > 1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
> contrary,
> > > the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
> that she
> > > had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.
> > >
> > > I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
> demonstrated
> > > her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be
> false.
> > >
>
> However you made a very strong and unjustified implication that I obtained
> my license illegally. Regardless of whether or not my statements were
> correct or in error there is NO reason to make such an implication.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Absolutely, and that was my point (and I know you knew that, Dee!).

Kim W5TIT

2860. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 03:29:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bcrapb$3iu@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 68997

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bcr8e4$k9t$1@208.206.142.104...
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > > > > Perhaps you bought your license?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You are way off base here.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or
:|
> > > >
> > > > What "game?"
> > > >
> > > > Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear.
The
> > fact
> > > > that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to
include a
> > > > "Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there
was
> > NO
> > > > SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is
the
> > June
> > > > 1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
> > contrary,
> > > > the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
> > that she
> > > > had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.
> > > >
> > > > I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
> > demonstrated
> > > > her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may
be
> > false.
> > > >
> >
> > However you made a very strong and unjustified implication that I
obtained

> > my license illegally. Regardless of whether or not my statements were
> > correct or in error there is NO reason to make such an implication.
>
> Actually, Dee, there is. The simple fact that you got an Extra ticket
under
> the old scheme where you had to pass a 20WPM code test is enough for some
> people. It's a sad situation, but that's about it.
> It may not be over in our lifetimes, something like the Civil War.
>
> Dick W0EX
>

Oh, good grief, Dick!! What a damned warped mind you have.

Kim W5TIT

2861. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 03:41:44 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030618234144.15932.00000666@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 68998

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

>Most people suffer some form of mental health abberation usually do deny
>it, or actually assert "pride" in thier illness.

Perhaps it is his beliefs, not an illness. Still those beliefs are anti-social
in <American> society.

>Take Lennie and Brain for
>example.

You just make personal attacks to those that disagree with you.

>Talking, regardless of the content of the conversation, IS "socializing".

Its fulfillment of <Ham> dharma (duty). Further support of the belief is done
through contests, where one "works" the <required> bands. Morse code is another
favorable point. One does disservice by operating for any other goals- for
example 10-10 numbers.

>However, I don't think one has to give up
>>everything else for the Ham activities. There was no need for the
>compromise.

Hams are not allowed to participate in non-radio activities. That's the
compromise. The only exception is eating. Eating alot is tradition.

Its an unwritten set of traditions. Its a "requirement" since most Hams don't
deviate from it. Neither is any participant allowed to deviate from it - Its
how the events are organized. Once you are at the event, you have no choice but
to do what's scheduled at that event. Such events make one wait three hours for
a Wuoff Hong ceremony, for example. Fun is not allowed. This must be true at
all such Ham events. That's the standard compromise.

From: Mike Coslo mjc5

>> Hamfests, Field Day, Wouff Hong ceremony at midnight, random Hams
>contesting
>> while others socialize.

>What on earth do you mean by socializing or not socializing? All of
>those things ARE socializing.

No, its group supported anti-social activity. What else would you call fishing
for random contacts on the radio? It quenches the more base, vile, and outright
pathetic.

Disclaimer: I don't mean ALL Hams or Ham-radio activity is anti-social - just most.

>I'm getting the impression that by socializing, you are talking about
>some hypothetical "party" where beautiful people who maybe are movie
>stars, or perhaps CEO's and their lovely wives mingle and talk abour
>their latest promotion, movie, or real estate deal while drinking the
>latest trendy drink or bottled water.

The example you gave is close to what I mean about anti-social activity. Most Hams aren't "cool".

2862. Re: The new (U.S.) 60M band

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 04:15:46 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bcsnoa$mt9pv$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69029
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gee Cecil.... isn't that more like sounding like the Chipmunks? :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"W5DXP" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message
news:3EF102CA.7090300@ieee.org...
> Bill Turner wrote:
> > If "SSB" and "new" automatically pop into your mind together, things are
> > worse than I thought. :-)
>
> You mean those Single-Sidewinders are here to stay? Why would anyone
> want to sound like Mickey Mouse? :-)
> --
> 73, Cecil http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2863. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 04:19:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF1397E.E6F6382C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 68999

Anonymous wrote:
>
> Hey High-el, are you really going to...

Why no, Roger. What I'm really going to do is forward your latest to
Chief Stenger in Glen Dale with a copy to the county prosecutor as I've
been doing with all of your vile, stalker-type postings. I've already
had this particular anonymous remailer block your postings to this group
as I've done with all the other anonymous remailers you've used. That's
why you continually have to seek out new ones.

Looks like the area sociopath has run out of his meds again.
Is your latest just another written manifestation of your Coprolalia,
Roger?

Dave K8MN

2864. Re: The new (U.S.) 60M band

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 04:21:31 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bcsnob$mt9pv$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69030
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick,

I still am curious to find out, if there were any SPECIFIC exclusions to
Part 97.401, 97.403 or 97.405?? I have not been privy to the actual release
issued by the F.C.C. regarding the new band allocations.

Are those parts of Part 97 specifically listed as not applicable or is that
just certain people "reading into it" to serve their own agenda?

Inquiring minds want to know,

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> As always, it depends entirely on the situation. For real time operations,
> where no hard copy is needed and verbal exchange is all that is required,
> voice is always best, assuming of course that radio conditions agree. But
> for passing message traffic, voice is limited by transcription speed as
well
> as quicker deterioration of copy quality as atmospherics and propagation
> fall out of useable range. A good CW op can be going strong still, under
> conditions where voice has deteriorated below usefulness..
> To me the disappointing part of the new 60meter band was the lack of any
> authority to use digital data modes, even in emergencies.
> And of course CW as the base line 'last resort' mode.
> What we got was the vary barest minimum necessary to conduct *any*
> emergency operations.
>
> Dick
>
>

2865. Re: The new (U.S.) 60M band

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 04:24:31 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bcsnoc$mt9pv$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69031
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sex?? What the hell is that?? It's been so long, I think I forgot how to!
Does it require a partner?? (LOL)

(I heard the "retraining course" is alot of fun though :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"W5DXP" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message
news:3EF08774.2010604@ieee.org...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > The basic problem with all the
> > anti-cw whinning is there too dang lazy to actually put out the effort.
>
> Hams like you and I have failed to convince many new hams that
> CW is worth the effort. I'll bet they are not too lazy for sex. :-)
> --
> 73, Cecil http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2866. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 04:28:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619002807.25052.00000668@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 69000

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn2b2u.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>> How's that for Uncle Sam logic?
>
> When is red paint blue? When the can says "Blue Paint".

Ship carrying red paint strikes ship carrying blue paint.
Sailors marooned...

:-)

2867. Rants Fizzle...Jimmie's Going Down For The Long Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 04:28:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619002809.25052.00000669@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 69001

In article <c2356669.0306180810.41867465@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(radio god N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030618000456.17796.00000918@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
>> >radio in general."
>> >
>> >As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.
>>
>> . I still haven't done any general insulting.
>
>Just lots and lots of specific insulting.

. At specific individuals who claim to speak for "all ham radio."
.
. At specific people who think they are radio gods and every-
. thing they opine are the "truth."
.
. At specific people who like to insult, demean, and denigrate
. all those who do not think as they do.

>> . I've done SATIRE on
>> . some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
>> . crackpots in this groupie fest.
>
>Satire? Nobody else thought it was funny.

. Tsk, tsk, tsk...many did. :-)
.
. A problem with the self-righteous is that they cannot see such
. humor. They think it is humiliation of their sacred opinions.

>When someone satirized or parodied you, Len, you got really upset.
>Double standard...

. Nope. I just return the favor. :-)

>> . Tell us, oh Glorious Ham Leader, is "rectum breath" NOT an
>> . insult? :-)
>
>It's an insult to rectums.

. Tsk, tsk, tsk...there you go Jimmie...the olde extra double
. standard. :-)

>> . Of course it isn't if uttered by an extra.
>
>I just wrote that it is an insult.

. You are god. Writing something makes it so? Of course... :-)

>> . The old Double Standard at work!
>
>Your double standard is quite evident, Len.

. I have no double standard, just one standard.

>> . Go back to reading your AARP bulletin, old man.
>
>Typical ad hominem from you, Len.

. Tsk, tsk, tsk...radio god Heil already wrote that he subscribes
. to AARP. If he does, then he gets the regular AARP Bulletin.
.
. What's wrong with being a member of AARP, Jimmie?

>Here's a tip, Len: Try being positive in your postings here, instead
>of negative.

. Now now, PCTA breath, remember you aren't speaking for anyone
. but yourself...

>You project an extremely negative persona and energy.

. Nope, that's your own receiving site, all full of exactly one kind
. of persona and energy...the ARRL kind...the one where you are
. directed to act in a certain way, think in a certain way, even
. worship in a certain way.

>The headshrinkers have a term for it: 'toxic personality'.

. Tsk, tsk, tsk, I meet all EPA and OHSA standards. :-)

>You're always
>talking about what's wrong, what has to be eliminated, how bad others
>are, how awful Morse code and its tests are, making false accusations
>of fraud, getting all worked up over typos, defending the "honor" of
>worthless, thieving, lying long-dead corporate robber-barons, name
>calling, insulting, ridiculing, making bad "jokes" that nobody finds
>funny, yada, yada, yada.

. Wow, you really are into toxicity, aren't you? :-)
.
. You've got a great big whopper of a hero-worship thing along with
. a death wish for all those against your heroes? Tsk, tsk, you are
. as bad off as Steamy Robeson.

>What a sourpuss! The negative kharma you've acquired must be
>staggering.

. Poor baby. My kharma ran over your dogma. :-)

>You never talk about how much FUN amateur radio is, how great a lot of
>hams are as people, how many accomplishments hams have made...

. Tsk, tsk...you haven't been to Google? You will find I DID say
. that amateur radio is indeed a fun hobby. You are wrong, Jimmie.
.
. I've never mentioned Al Walston, W6MJN, the best man at my
. wedding? Or Jim Hall, KD6JG, the best manager I ever had?
. Or Gene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, who was assigned to the same
. Army radio station I was assigned to at the same time? Well, if
. you, a radio god, say I never talked about them, then I must not
. have said they were good. Who can argue with a radio god?

>oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
>way.

. Yes, Jimmie. Only YOU and other radio gods are "involved with
. amateur radio in a meaningful way," trying vainly to keep it the
. way YOU want it regardless of anyone else's desires.

2868. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 04:48:38 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69032
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

That brings up a completely different point of contention for me! Chat programs or other programs (using PC's on the air) is where we have definitely fallen behind as a communications field/hobby.

There are so many services that have dwarfed amateur radio at this point, in regards to digital technology that makes us look like we are in the stone ages. PSK31 is nice, but through a variety of reasons it is primarily only used on HF. It could be utilized on 6 meters where there is some equipment out there for ssb/cw. Technically speaking, it could also be used on FM, as discussed in an article in QST (in a 2000 or 2001 edition, I will look for it again....) for 2 meters or 70cm. There was a experiment done in this article where it showed promise on FM for locally based communications.

As far as packet, that has fallen so far behind, that it is a serious shame. Most of the programs are old, crappy DOS based programs, (am unaware of any Windows based programs) and with incredibly slow transmission speeds and limited file sharing capability, I am surprised it hasn't died out completely.

Other modes of digital communcations, which are in the most basic sense, chat/contact/QSO related, are fine for jsut that, but overall we have fallen behind the mark. Currently there are some cities fairly close to me that have wide-area-internet-service that covers a 20-30 mile radius with speeds of over 20kps, (considering most dialups get 2kps-6kps)
or more and the person can be almost anywhere with that radius and connect. I am not saying we should provide internet access, for those that want to read into that, but can you imagine working a disaster situation, where you have say for instance a dozen different operators able to send digital pics or even streaming video (to a point) possibly even simultaneous to net control or EOC's? Current packet speeds are not worth bothering for regular use, and limited message capability is another issue.

Look at what is commonly used with most law enforcement MDT's, which basically were spawned in part from ham radio packet radio. The are not perfect yet, but the capabilities are phenomenal compared to existing packet capabilities.

I know this is a little different than the intention of the thread, but I think we really need to look at our digital capabilities and see what we could do, work on getting those limitations that we have lifted and designing new and better ways that may make us the envy of other services, and making the technology so good that it may be emulated as other things amateur radio have been in the past such as cellphone technology, mobile data communicators as well as quite a few other technologies the general public now enjoys thanks to ham radio.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Why not keep the argument to ham radio?
> How many of those chat programs have you run over ham radio?
>
> --
>
> ... Hank
>
> Hank: http://horedson.home.att.net
> W0RLI: http://w0rli.home.att.net
>
>

2869. Re: Fight started by taunt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 05:18:24 UTC
From: Tom <tt34@aol.com>
Message-ID: <PeacnfRYzc8-2myjXTWJgA@comcast.com>
Source record: 69002
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,alt.radio.pirate

ROFLMAO

--

The meaning of it all is that there is no meaning.....

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030618234001.918$tF@newsreader.com...
> Fight started by "taunt".
> A CB enthusiast calling himself "Van Gough" because of his love of art was
> accused of assaulting another CB enthusiast. The two had previously been
> good friends but, on this occasion, the accused was said to have gone to
> the home of the victim, knocked on the door and just punched him for no
> reason. The defendant who, in an accident at work, had lost one ear said
> "he taunted me and I just lost it". The victim said "I did nothing wrong,
> just called him on CB..... One-nine Van Gough - have you got your ears
on?"
>
> --
> GO# 40
> --
> http://NewsReader.Com/
> 50 GB/Month

2870. Re: Fight started by taunt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 05:20:03 UTC
From: Richard <anom@anom>
Message-ID: <bcrh970287@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 69003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,alt.radio.pirate

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030618234001.918$tF@newsreader.com...
> Fight started by "taunt".
> A CB enthusiast calling himself "Van Gough" because of his love of art was
> accused of assaulting another CB enthusiast. The two had previously been
> good friends but, on this occasion, the accused was said to have gone to
> the home of the victim, knocked on the door and just punched him for no
> reason. The defendant who, in an accident at work, had lost one ear said
> "he taunted me and I just lost it". The victim said "I did nothing wrong,
> just called him on CB..... One-nine Van Gough - have you got your ears
on?"
>

forty two roger beep beep!

2871. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 05:40:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bcsnoh$mt9pv$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69033

And its hard to afford to pay those people a fair wage either it seems.
Like the saying goes.... "You get what ya pay for!"

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgnpj29.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 18 Jun 2003 02:23:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Remember the original restructuring NPRM and the contradictions in
> >it? And how the FCC issued an "Errata" that simply made it more
> >confusing?
>
> "It's so hard to hire competent help nowadays...."
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

2872. Re: Fight started by taunt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 06:39:57 UTC
From: Richard <anom@anom>
Message-ID: <bcrlv00a1t@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 69004
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,alt.radio.pirate

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030618234001.918$tF@newsreader.com...
> Fight started by "taunt".
> A CB enthusiast calling himself "Van Gough" because of his love of art was
> accused of assaulting another CB enthusiast. The two had previously been
> good friends but, on this occasion, the accused was said to have gone to
> the home of the victim, knocked on the door and just punched him for no
> reason. The defendant who, in an accident at work, had lost one ear said
> "he taunted me and I just lost it". The victim said "I did nothing wrong,
> just called him on CB..... One-nine Van Gough - have you got your ears
on?"
>

A relative of mine actually has only one ear due to an infection and I can
see him doing just that to somebody he knew.
Or he might come back with, "Uh no wait a minute. Ok. They're on now."

2873. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 07:12:53 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns939F20AECCD68elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69005

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgpcb91.pminews@netnews.attbi.com:

> On 19 Jun 2003 00:21:32 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>> The distress frequencies (upon which voice calls are made and
>>> traffic is passed) remain 2182 kHz and VHF Channel 16. The
>>> continuous monitoring requirement has shifted to DSC on 2187.5 kHz
>>> and VHF Channel 70, but the 2182 "silent period" remains.
>>>
>>> In all cases except in the Mediterranean (the so-called Area A1) the
>>> primary distress call is made on INMARSAT, though, if the vessel has
>>> it. The Marine Safety Agency responding (USCG in the US) will shift
>>> the traffic to MF or VHF depending on the location. In the Med, the
>>> primary call is on MF.
>>>
>>This is confusing. What's the poiint in calling 'Mayday' on 2.182 or
>>156.800 if everyone is listening on 2.1875 and 156.525? What am I
missing
>>here?
>
> Ships still have to kep a speaker watch, listening on 2182 and
> Channel 16 for voice calls. The DSC takes the place of the
> auto-alarm in the older systems. One uses the auto-alarm feature on
> the MF or VHF radio to alert on 2187.5 and Channel 70, and the
> controlling station (coast statsion or USCG) can alert the situation
> by DSC.
>
> In the CW syustem, the rationale was that surrounding vessels would
> pick up the distress call and go to the aid. In the GMDSS system,
> the rationale is that the Maritime Safety Agency responsible for
> that portion of the ocean would be the primary "listener" so the
> distress calls are made by INMARSAT or HF is the ship does not have
> INMARSAT working for some reason. 2 MHz and VHF are used for
> relatively close-in distress traffic more than the actual initial
> distress call.
>
> Remember that this system is for large ocean-going vessels who
> have the obligation to carry the modern equipment necessary. If the
> country of registry is on the ball, the ships will have the gear or
> they won't sail.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

>
>
>

OK Say you are on a small privately owned vessel, i.e. not compulsory equipped and no INMARSAT (not mine, but a friend I have in mind, I don't have a boat). God forbid he needs to call Mayday, 2.182 at sea and 156.800 inland, or 2.1875/156.525? He probably already knows the answer, but I don't and I am curious.

2874. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 11:56:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69019

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >
> >> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> >> call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down
> >> most of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use
> >> phone, but I think you probably guessed that already.
> >
> > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> > nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> > by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> > signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> > ask for because they might get it.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it. They
> will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to call
> them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do that below
> 7100.

So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even 7300?
Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more space which
could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100. Beyond that I
don't know why you have such a big problem with working split in the
first place. The dx phone contesters routinely work dozens upon dozens
dx stations inside 48 hours of operating time. I sure have my piles of
40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto 75M.

w3rv

2875. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 12:06:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306190406.fed9817@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69020

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030618174505.14837.00000794@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgnbkp3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On 17 Jun 2003 10:46:21 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>> The main mwthod of cleaning it up was screen room enclosures. ISM
> >>> equipment itself can legally generate as much power as desired as
> >>> long as it is kept in the range of 27.120 MHz +/- 160 kHz. Find a
> >>> way to filter the harmonics but let the fundamental through
> >>> unattenuated, run it on raw rectified AC, and you got a super CB
> >>> jammer - perfectly legal.
> >>
> >>Generate or radiate, Phil?
> >
> > Both.
>
> oh mama mia.....
>
> > Have fun.
>
> That company with the heat sealers I mentioned earlier eventually junked it and
> got more modern equipment. I somehow wound up with the spare tubes - an 833

Do you still have that sucker? One of my all-time favorite jugs, ugly
as sin. I've always wanted to make a lamp outta one of 'em.

and
> two 866As. My RCA Transmitting Tube Manual has a schematic in the back....
>
> Killing the harmonics is basically a matter of tank circuit Q and class of
> operation. Those ancient sealers were usually extreme Class-C, in an effort to
> develop high efficiency. But a nice MOPA design with a Class AB final could do
> the job, too....

Would you pay the delta PECO bill for the drop in efficiency??

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2876. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 12:23:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619082307.02197.00000770@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 69021

In article <Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:
>
>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>
>>
>>> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
>>> call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down
>>> most of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use
>>> phone, but I think you probably guessed that already.
>>
>> From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
>> scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
>> nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
>> by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
>> signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
>> ask for because they might get it.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Nonsense.

Not nonsense at all, Alun, it's what would happen.

>You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.

You missed a key point. W3RV wrote:

"In a scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody.."

>They
>will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to call
>them on frequency.

That's not the scenario W3RV is describing. If they can go below 7150 and you
can't, then everybody can't transceive with everybody.

>As opposed to now, when they can only do that below 7100.

Main point is that if all regions have 7000-7200 or 7000-7300, there will be
lots of places where you can work 'phone DX non-split - if that's what the DX
wants to do. If the US phone band stops at 7150, the DX will still be able to
operate split from outside the US phone band, or transceive completley outside

the US phone band, without moving below 7100 or even 7050.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2877. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 12:32:10 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf3bcuhd349s7a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69022
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:temkcvcj8pguq9u833t386kv6lstlsgm2s@4ax.com...
> I calculate a quarter-wave antenna for 5 millihertz to be roughly 9
million
> miles long.
>
> What did I miss?

He meant microhertz, so the quarter-wave would be 9 billion miles.

Larry

2878. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 14:38:49 UTC
From: Angelo Campanella <a.campanella@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EF1C9EC.5000202@att.net>
Source record: 69023
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

D. Stussy wrote:

> The vagueness is due to the custom of specifying a frequency by where the
> supressed carrier would fall (had it not been supressed). That's not what the
> FCC did but that's how plenty of people will interpret it - because they won't
> read it the same way as we do.

You give the FCC bureauheads credit for more intelligence than they have. Consider that it is a 10 (20?)kHz wide band of space. Put appropriate RF anywhere, and only in, that band. Let the FCC fret as to why they can't understand some of the chirps, sputs and duck talk that they hear when they monitor it.

Angelo Campanella

--------- www.CampanellaAcoustics.com ---------
"I have simply studied carefully whatever I've undertaken, and tried to hold a reserve that would carry me through." - Charles A. Lindbergh.

2879. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 14:50:32 UTC
From: Angelo Campanella <a.campanella@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EF1CCAB.809@att.net>
Source record: 69024
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Others wrote:

>>>Ultimately, to be sure we are able to make quick contacts for
>>>emergency comms, we'll likly all agree via the ARRL that the
>>>supp. carrier frequency for the channels is a specific frequency
>>>(offset 1.4 from the FCC rules specified center freq.)
>>Except it should be 1.5!
> If that were true, then the bandwidth would have to be 3kHz.
> Another candidate for "stereo-quality SSB?" :-)
> If we can't even agree on this, that is an indication of the problem right
> there.

The writers probably had the CB paradigm of upper/lower, upper-upper/lower/lower in mind when they wrote it, implying 4 channels within a 10 or 12 kHz total band width. We should presume at least this.
We might also argue that really a 20 kHz band is a fair assignment pending interference free software and hardware implementations. We should then lead the way in the new millennium spectrum utilization protocols.

Angelo Campanella, W8EDR

--
--------- www.CampanellaAcoustics.com ---------
"I have simply studied carefully whatever I've undertaken, and tried to hold a reserve that would carry me through." - Charles A. Lindbergh.

2880. Re: Rants Fizzle...Jimmie's Going Down For The Long Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 15:01:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF1D064.C4BEF9A6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69025

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0306180810.41867465@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (radio god N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030618000456.17796.00000918@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
> >> >radio in general."
> >> >
> >> >As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.
> >>
> >> . I still haven't done any general insulting.
> >
> >Just lots and lots of specific insulting.
>
> . At specific individuals who claim to speak for "all ham radio."

...then you'll want to direct some of your invectives toward yourself.

> . At specific people who think they are radio gods and every-
> . thing they opine are the "truth."

...then you'll want to direct some of your invectives toward yourself.

> . At specific people who like to insult, demean, and denigrate
> . all those who do not think as they do.

...then you'll want to direct some of your invectives toward yourself.

> >> . I've done SATIRE on
> >> . some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
> >> . crackpots in this groupie fest.
> >
> >Satire? Nobody else thought it was funny.
>
> . Tsk, tsk, tsk...many did. :-)

Maybe I erred on my comments above. Change those to read "toward
yourselves".

> . Nope, that's your own receiving site, all full of exactly one kind
> . of persona and energy...the ARRL kind...the one where you are

> . directed to act in a certain way, think in a certain way, even
> . worship in a certain way.

You've never hurled any insults toward the ARRL or toward those who are members, have you?

> >oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
> >way.
>
> . Yes, Jimmie. Only YOU and other radio gods are "involved with
> . amateur radio in a meaningful way," trying vainly to keep it the
> . way YOU want it regardless of anyone else's desires.

- Why, Foggy, you aren't involved in amateur radio any ANY way.
- That hasn't stopped you from trying to mold it into what YOU
- want regardless of the desires of those who are actually radio
- amateurs. What is any of this to you?

Dave K8MN

2881. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 15:12:47 UTC
From: Angelo Campanella <a.campanella@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EF1D1E1.4000300@att.net>
Source record: 69026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
> the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
> whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.

I have out a lot of thought into this (speech intelligibility vs audio frequencies). So much so that I limit the low frequency audio in all my household devices such as TV and radio audio. The brain requires little or no audio below about 300 Hz. That is where the voice fundamental is located (100=basso, 300=soprano). The vowels and consonant are all at 500 and above. The energy up to 10 kHz is "useful", but not mandatory.

> What does the Bell standards say?

Ma Bell determined generations ago that up less than 2,000 is bad, to 2500Hz is vital, 3000 is nice, and beyond 3000 as not price effective (but sure sounds pretty). On the low end, "Naturalness" ("nice") required 200. I say that the audio below 500 is not worth the bandwidth it devours.

An article by Kryter in the 1950's declared that if you wanted to do speech with the absolute MINIMUM band, a 500Hz wide band from 750-1250 Hz was appropriate. If you decided at devote 1 kHz of spectrum to the task, then two bands, one from 250-750 and one from 1250 to 1750 would do. If three 500 Hz bands, then add a third 500 as from 2250 to 2750.

> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
> filters?

Probably the Ma Bell band of 200-3000. The only change I suggest is that we raise the bottom to 500Hz.

It is reasonable to apply a 1400 Hz wide 2nd IF or post-IF filter and slide it around the audio spectrum. I suspect that centering it at 1200+-200 Hz will give the best result.

At one point in the 1960's (I was K3IQU then), I had built a crystal lattice SSB filter with its two resonant peaks 1 kHz apart, using it according to Kryter's 500&1500 rue to some success. Today, I would probably place the same two peaks at 700&1700 Hz.

Angelo Campanella W8EDR
--
--------- www.CampanellaAcoustics.com ---------
"I have simply studied carefully whatever I've undertaken, and tried to hold a reserve that would carry me through." - Charles A. Lindbergh.

2882. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 15:19:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF1D3EF.5A3FAD91@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69027

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> >Talking, regardless of the content of the conversation, IS "socializing".
>
> Its fulfillment of <Ham> dharma (duty).

I don't have any "ham duty", Vipul. I wasn't obligated to obtain an amateur license. When I obtained a license, I wasn't obligated to do anything at all with it.

> Further support of the belief is done
> through contests, where one "works" the <required> bands.

One isn't obligated to operate in contests but if I decide to enter a contest, I'd be foolish not to operate in the "required" bands.

> Morse code is another
> favorable point.

Yes, it is, isn't it?

> One does disservice by operating for any other goals- for
> example 10-10 numbers.

You don't have it quite right. One does disservice by stopping to exchange 10-10 numbers in the middle of operating in a DX contest or in exchanging 10-10 numbers in the middle of participation in a traffic net.

> >However, I don't think one has to give up
> >>everything else for the Ham activities. There was no need for the
> >compromise.
>
> Hams are not allowed to participate in non-radio activities. That's the
> compromise.

I don't know where you gained your knowledge of amateur radio, Vipul, but that's one strange outlook you've developed.

> The only exception is eating. Eating alot is tradition.

...and I'm proud to say that I've been eating for 54 years. The tradition is a strong one in my family. My parents both ate and their parents ate too. We trace out eating traditions back at least fifteen generations.

> Its an unwritten set of traditions.

That's quite an understatement. It would appear that you've made them up.

> Its a "requirement" since most Hams don't
> deviate from it.

What's a requirement, Vipul--eating, not exchanging 10-10 numbers, not taking part in things which don't involve amateur radio?

> Neither is any participant allowed to deviate from it - Its
> how the events are organized. Once you are at the event, you have no choice but
> to do what's scheduled at that event.

That's pretty much right. They don't let you do the egg-in-a-spoon race during the three-legged race.

> Such events make one wait three hours for
> a Wuoff Hong ceremony, for example.

Nobody made me wait for the *Wouff Hong* ceremony. I understood that it would take place at midnight. I was free to do other things before the ceremony. I was also free not to participate at all.

> Fun is not allowed.

One would first have to be capable of recognizing fun when it is encountered.

> This must be true at
> all such Ham events. That's the standard compromise.

I'm sure that with your limited experience, that is how it appears to you.

Dave K8MN

2883. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 16:05:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306190805.308c855f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69028

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bcmtpkcbd1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message

> > (1) You have a helluva lot of months in the woods to go to catch up
> > with my time in the bush.
>
> Months? I've lugged my radios around in Honduras, Jordan, Egypt,
> Oman, Greece and the US. And inside a submarine. I seriously doubt I could
> learn much about field operations from you.

All on your own dime as a private citizen ham radio operator of
course. What were your callsigns?

> >But I have to concede I never did it with a
> > sat phone. Three cheers for you. Didja build it from scratch or was it
> > a kit?
>
> After the slew of tech schools I've been to, I'm more interested in
> expedient antennas, not radios.

I'm a "tech" grad myself, took me five years to get thru the only one
I ever attended but dayum dontcha just know they din teach me a bloody
thing about antennas? Had to learn that game on my own. Like I learned
to copy CW.

What's an "expedient antenna"?? Like the wires I've tossed over more
trees than I can count?

What modeling software do you use?

> >(2) I'm licensed to operate on freqs which allow me operate
> > point-to-point globally without having to depend on any comms
> > infrastructure widgets like satellites, phones or the Internet. And
> > yes I've done that. In volume.
>
> What, you assume I haven't just because I _prefer_ (and have more
> training in) VHF/UHF satcom? I've operated encrypted receiver systems in
> VLF/LF, transmit/recieve in HF, VHF, UHF and SHF - teletype and voice,
> secure and non-secure.

We're all allowed to have our hot buttons but whatever you did for
Uncle or whoever it was does not draw much water in ham radio
particulary amongst those of us who understand the differences and
have broader experiences.

>
> > Rendering your post not only

> > anecdotal but inane to boot.
>
> Yer nearly as big a hoot as ol' Dicky.

Yeah, he's another one who isn't all wrapped around his HT.

w3rv

2884. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 16:13:22 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcsne3$l30$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69079

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> scribbled:

yawn

They sure grow 'em stupid wherever it is you're from.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.490 / Virus Database: 289 - Release Date: 6/16/2003

2885. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 17:28:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF1F307.3040104@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69034

Robert wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>
>>On Tue, 17 Jun 2003, Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>>news:YJ9Ha.4208$a7.1559232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>>
>>>>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>>>>news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>>>
>>>[snip]
>>>
>>>>>>Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
>>>>>
>>>>>I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.
>>>>
>>>>Perhaps you bought your license?
>>>>
>>>>You are way off base here.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|
>>
>>What "game?"
>>
>>Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The
>
> fact
>
>>that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include a
>>"Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there was
>
> NO
>
>>SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is the
>
> June
>
>>1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
>
> contrary,
>

>>the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
>
> that she
>
>>had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.
>>
>>I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
>
> demonstrated
>
>>her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be
>
> false.
>
> Oh, please. Far be it from me to stick up for one of the rrap ct
> loonies, but the level of "demonstrated evidence" for _anything_ around here
> is pathetic. One supposed 'net expert says I'm posting anonymously

Hey Robert! Do you make a habit of searching really hard for something
to argue about? No kidding that I can search out and find out who you
are? Sheesh, I'm getting an education here.

Fact is, you are posting anonymously. If I wanted to find out who you
were, I would have to work at it. And since your not being libelous, I'm
not going to.

Other people on the group don't have a problem with their names:

Dick Carrol, Steve Robinson, Jim Miccolis, etc. Even Lenover21 posts
with his name in the message. Brian Burke puts his name in his messages.
Even Kim of the infamous callsign can be easily ID'ed. THAT is what
we're talking about.

Just like sending a opinion to the newspaper. If you aren't ID'ed, your
opinion usually isn't accepted.

> and Dick
> Carrol used his powers of deduction to determine I'm a "phony" veteran based
> on his (lack of) knowledge regarding military rations and satellite
> technology.
> On top of that, the lot of ya get anal if somebody doesn't use his
> callsign in his postings.
> People here have serious issues, and they ain't to do with ham
> radio, that's for sure.
>

And here you are! I think you'll fit right in here. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2886. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 17:47:46 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcssv1$n4o$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69080

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Hey Robert! Do you make a habit of searching really hard for something
> to argue about? No kidding that I can search out and find out who you
> are? Sheesh, I'm getting an education here.
>
> Fact is, you are posting anonymously.

Do you work this hard at being wrong all the time?

> If I wanted to find out who you
> were, I would have to work at it. And since your not being libelous, I'm
> not going to.

Well, if I wanted to find out who "Mike Coslo" is, I'd have to work
at that, too, and just as hard.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.490 / Virus Database: 289 - Release Date: 6/16/2003

2887. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 17:53:35 UTC
From: see sea oh ecks at you aitch see dot comm <spammers@bugger.off.invalid>
Message-ID: <bcstavumo1@gabriel.uhc.com>
Source record: 69035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.equipment Ryan, KC8PMX <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
> There are so many services that have dwarfed amateur radio at this point, in
> regards to digital technology that makes us look like we are in the stone
> ages. PSK31 is nice, but through a variety of reasons it is primarily only
> used on HF. It could be utilized on 6 meters where there is some equipment
> out there for ssb/cw. Technically speaking, it could also be used on FM, as

There's equipment readily available for doing cw and ssb up through 47GHz.
Joe Taylor's WSJT software has largely usurped psk31's effectiveness for
narrow-band, truly weak-signal DX communications, whether tropo, EME or meteor
scatter.
--
Chris Cox, N0UK/G4JEC NIC Handle: CC345
UnitedHealthGroup, Inc., MN10-W116, UNIX Services & Consulting
6300 Olson Memorial Highway, Golden Valley, MN 55427
email: ccox@uhc.com (work) chrisc@chris.org (home)

2888. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 18:29:39 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <vf40hd71j3urb9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69036
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

NO!!

"Angelo Campanella" <a.campanella@att.net> wrote in message
news:3EF1D1E1.4000300@att.net...
> > What does the Bell standards say?
>
> Ma Bell determined generations ago that up less than 2,000 is bad, to
2500Hz is
> vital, 3000 is nice, and beyond 3000 as not price effective (but sure
sounds
> pretty). On the low end, "Naturalness" ("nice") required 200. I say that
the
> audio below 500 is not worth the bandwidth it devours.

For years, any device that was approved to be connected to the
phone (most notably modems) had to have NO SIGNIFICANT
ENERGY in the area 2500hz and up.

The reason for this is that the trunk disconnect signal is at 2600. You
could inadvertantly disconnect long distance calls. (Heh heh...)

2600 is the magical number here. NOTHING should be there.

2600 is the name of an underground (well, above ground now) magazine
for phone phreaks.

2600 is also refered to as the 'Captain Crunch' signal or tone, due to
the fact that years ago Captain Crunch cerail had this whistle that
really pissed off the phone company.

You do NOT need ANYTHING close to or above 2600.

Sure, it's not hi fi. But we're talking PHONE quality here...

Mike

2889. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 19:51:29 UTC
From: 51629A <allforemus1@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ef214e4@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 69037

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EF1397E.E6F6382C@earthlink.net...
> Anonymous wrote:
> >
> > Hey High-el, are you really going to...
>
> Why no, Roger. What I'm really going to do is forward your latest to
> Chief Stenger in Glen Dale with a copy to the county prosecutor as I've
> been doing with all of your vile, stalker-type postings. I've already
> had this particular anonymous remailer block your postings to this group
> as I've done with all the other anonymous remailers you've used. That's
> why you continually have to seek out new ones.
>
> Looks like the area sociopath has run out of his meds again.
> Is your latest just another written manifestation of your Coprolalia,
> Roger?
>
> Dave K8MN

Remember Dave, we must have the patience
and fortitude of Dr. Phil when dealing with
Woger.

He's obviously off of his meds again and must
have gone back to the variety of the type
available out on the street again.

We must have pity on such lost souls.
It's a difficult life when all your phone calls
are originating from inside the house....

2890. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 20:23:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306191223.8f1e75a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69038

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030619082307.02197.00000770@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> >news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:
> >
> >> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >>
> >>
> >>> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> >>> call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down
> >>> most of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use
> >>> phone, but I think you probably guessed that already.
> >>
> >> From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> >> scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> >> nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> >> by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> >> signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> >> ask for because they might get it.
> >>
> >> w3rv
> >
> >Nonsense.
>
> Not nonsense at all, Alun, it's what would happen.
>
> >You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
>
> You missed a key point. W3RV wrote:
>
> "In a scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody.."
>
> >They
> >will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to call
> >them on frequency.
>
> That's not the scenario W3RV is describing. If they can go below 7150 and you
> can't, then everybody can't transceive with everybody.
>
> >As opposed to now, when they can only do that below 7100.

>
> Main point is that if all regions have 7000-7200 or 7000-7300, there will be
> lots of places where you can work 'phone DX non-split - if that's what the DX
> wants to do. If the US phone band stops at 7150, the DX will still be able to
> operate split from outside the US phone band, or transceive completley outside
> the US phone band, without moving below 7100 or even 7050.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

So harmonization doesn't necessarily lead to harmony? bb

2891. Re: spectrum efficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 20:41:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306191241.f273e27@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69039

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306190406.fed9817@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030618174505.14837.00000794@mb-m03.aol.com>...

>>I somehow wound up with the spare tubes - an 833
>
> Do you still have that sucker?

No. The folly of youth...

> One of my all-time favorite jugs, ugly
> as sin.

Only type to use the special socket designed for it. Kind of a latter-day 204-A.

>I've always wanted to make a lamp outta one of 'em.

All ya need is a socket and a filament transformer.
>
> and
> > two 866As. My RCA Transmitting Tube Manual has a schematic in the back....
> >
> > Killing the harmonics is basically a matter of tank circuit Q and class of
> > operation. Those ancient sealers were usually extreme Class-C, in an effort to
> > develop high efficiency. But a nice MOPA design with a Class AB final could do
> > the job, too....
>
> Would you pay the delta PECO bill for the drop in efficiency??

HAW! Depends on the duty cycle.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2892. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 20:48:29 UTC
From: Hank Oredson <horedson@att.net>
Message-ID: <xkpIa.13473$3o3.983844@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 69040
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> That brings up a completely different point of contention for me! Chat
> programs or other programs (using PC's on the air) is where we have
> definitely fallen behind as a communications field/hobby.

We run chat over NET/ROM here, and could run any of the
tcp/ip based chats as well ... but there is near zero interest.

90% of the users are "stuck" in the 1984 world ... they use some
VT100 emulator program to read and send messages at 1200 baud.

The other 10% use 9600 or 19200 links, run IP as well as AX.25,
and are starting to use 13 cm links (811b) that support both IP
and AX.25. The big question is how to convince that first 90% that
faster links make more interesting applications possible :-)

--

... Hank

Hank: http://horedson.home.att.net
W0RLI: http://w0rli.home.att.net

2893. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 21:20:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306191320.52e89f31@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69041

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bcklpg$f6p$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > > Personally, I found the test to be imbalanced; I'm not
> idealogically
> > >wedded to any ideas about changing it, though.
> >
> > Interesting! I find the test unbalanced, too - tests many things at a very
> > shallow level. Juast my opinion, of course.
> >
> > How do is the test imbalanced in your opinion?
>
> Pretty much what we go into below - too much stuff (like bands) that
> a 'newbie' really should look up before he keys his radio anyway. What I
> think of as regulatory 'trivia', etc.

Problem is, FCC seems to think all that regulatory stuff has to be
there. Since a licensee is responsible for adherence to the rules, the
exams are full of questions about those rules. FCC is satisfied with
questions that require that you know that 50-54 MHz is a ham band. I
don't think they'd be satisfied if the exams said "look it up".

There's a bunch of historical reasons, too. Reading the old License
Manual study guides from decades ago, it's interesting to note how
many questions there are on specific topics like band edges, power
supply filters and harmonic reduction, and how little there is on
other areas like receivers. The obvious reason is that FCC focused the
exams on the areas where hams had problems.

Also, once upon a time, FCC issued licenses in another service with no
exam at all. All a licensee had to do was sign a form certifying that
they had read and understood the rules for that radio service, and
would abide by them. The reality was somewhat different....

> > >> On the HF/MF amateur bands, manual Morse/CW is used widely and
> > >> extensively
> > >> by hams. It's the second-most popular mode on those bands, and there
> > >> are times
> > >> when it is the most popular mode on them. Manual Morse/CW is such a big
> > >> part of
> > >> HF/MF amateur radio that it's only reasonable and rational that there
> > >> should be
> > >> a test for that skill, since skills cannot be tested with written test
> > >> methods alone.
> > >

> > > What a ham _needs_ to be (imo) is a good operator/technician -
> > > his
> > >operations, in whatever mode or band, should be conducted lawfully,
> > >skillfully and with his equipment operating within the specified norms.
> > >That's what the testing should 'select' for, again, imo.
> >
> > OK, fine - then it makes sense for there to ba a test of basic operating
> > skill.
> > And Morse/CW skill is a basic operating skill in amateur radio.
>
> But there's no practical test of any _other_ operating skill.

Maybe there should be!

However, note that most would-be hams already know how to understand
the spoken word and how to read. (I don't think a totally illiterate
person can be licensed in the USA). The Morse test is a basic skills
test, akin to being able to understand 41 words in a new language when
spoken slowly and clearly, or being able to read at the first-grade
level.

> How
> many Techs (or anybody else, for that matter) know the entire phonetic
> alphabet?

I know it - learned it 35+ years ago, as a Novice.

> Too many people grew up on a diet of 1-Adam 12, etc. and have been
> overexposed to the excreble result of the telecom union and "Frank, Adam,
> Baker, heck, lets just make it up as we go' phonetic alphabet. As a
> genuinely fundamental 'skill', an entry-level test ought to at least require
> the examinee write out the phonetic alphabet.

I'll play devil's advocate on this one. Use a common anticodetest
argument against the phonetic alphabet test

If someone doesn't intend to operate 'phone, why require that they
learn the phonetic alphabet? And which one is THE correct one? Use of
any particular phonetics is not required by the regs, so why REQUIRE
that hams learn Alfa, Bravo, Charlie....?

Besides, it should be a spoken test, because the skill is to be able
to say the phonetics, not write them.

See?

> This isn't going to cost more
> than a scrap of paper and a moment of the VE's time. Some _general_
> knowledge of Q and Z signals (well, just Q I guess), net procedures, that
> sort of thing.

Has to be in multiple-guess format - no essays.

> > >> Now some folks may say they have no intention of using Morse/CW, so why
> > >> require
> > >> them to learn it at any level of skill, even the most basic? If we
> > >> follow
> > >> that
> > >> reasoning, however, most of what's in the written tests has to be
> > >> eliminated as
> > >> well. For example, why someone who only wants to operate modern
> > >> manufactured equipment have to learn so much theory?
> > >
> > > Your delving into what some would call part of the very definition
> of
> > >amateur radio, aren't you?
> >
> > Perhaps - but there are plenty of folks who would say Morse/CW skill is
> > part of the very definition of amateur radio, too.
>
> Yes, in the past.

Not just in the past - today. Take a listen on the HF ham bands -
Morse/CW all over the place.

> > It's one thing to say "hams should be knowledgeable about radio theory"
> > and quite a different thing to say "hams should have to pass Test X in
> > radio theory to get the license".

>
> > >Anyway....theory applies across the board, to all
> > >radios, all bands, all antennas and feedlines and what-have-you.
> >
> > But not all of the theory. To operate HF CW, I don't really need to
> > know very much about VHF propagation,
>
> You don't need to know anything about propagation to operate any
> radio in any mode, but that knowledge will make your operation more
> effective.

Sure - but why REQUIRE it if someone isn't going to USE it? Why can't
they just look it up, same as the band edges?

Go down that road a ways and there's not much left of the writtens.
>
> > FM repeaters, satellites,
> > and a whole lot of other stuff that's on the test. But those things are
> > a big part of passing the written test.
>
> There's that imbalance again. Chicken and egg - the first radio I
> bought was a 2-meter, and it's hard to argue that I didn't go that route
> _because_ of a certain amount of emphasis. And now, my existence as a user
> of 2-meter increases the number of users - which in the long haul (generally
> speaking) could lead to even more emphasis on the test, because gee whiz
> we're getting all these people on 2-meter, gotta be sure they know what
> they're doing.....hhmmm.

So what's the alternative - test all subjects equally? Example - some
hams still use mercury-vapor rectifiers, so let's have some test
questions on mercury-vapor rectifiers.

> > >All hams,
> > >sort of by definition, operate radios. They should all have some basic
> > >understanding of what radios do and how they do it, so they can operate
> > >properly, within given parameters.
> >
> > Agreed - but they don't all operate the same radios. How much theory is
> > needed
> > to operate an HT?
>
> None, but that's true of any radio.

Not true of some that I use!

> The argument here is, really, do
> you want just operators, or _skilled_ operators? Learning and knowing theory
> promotes operator _skill_,

whoa there! How does THEORY promote operating skill? Does knowing
Ohm's Law make someone understand SSB better?

> while CW/Morse simply does not, if it did, it'd
> be required for that reason alone for professionals.

Ya lost me there. The pros don't require Morse/CW skill because they
don't use the mode much, if at all, any more. Hams do.

Some of the most skilled operators today are air traffic controllers.
Are they required to know much theory about how radios work? I don't
think so. They have to know procedure and rules and how to keep cool
under pressure, plus a lot of other skills. But their technical radio
theory knowledge doesn't have to be very good at all.

> That it's being phased
> out across the board is sufficient proof that it's irrelevant to having good
> operators;

Not at all! It's being phased out by professionals because their are
other modes with a lower bottom line. Example: By implementing GMDRSS,
the maritime folks could get rid of having radio officers on board
ship.

>a lot of that other 'stuff', on the other hand, isn't.

I've got a list of operating skills you might like. Want me to repost
it?
>
> > >That some few people (or nearly all of
> > >'em) only plan on operating "modern" equipment is irrelevant, possibly
> even
> > >a red herring; we're _all_ operating radios of various types, and they
> all

> > >obey the same laws of physics.
> >
> > Sorry, that "laws of physics" line is a red herring. Practical radio is
> > more
> > about technology and engineering than about physics and science.
>
> I'm not sure what you mean by 'practical' radio.

I mean actually being able to build, and fix radio sets that work on
the air. As opposed to just basic principles.

IOW it's one thing to understand a block diagram, or even a basic
schematic, and quite another to actually build a working set that
meets all the requirements.

> Are you arguing
> (for whatever reason) that theory should be dropped in favor of
> tech/engineering type questions?

I mean the test should include both.

> > >>Why learn the band edges, mode
> > >> designators, or formulas when you can look them up?
> > >
> > > I'll agree with that, actually. A good operator will either wind
> up
> > >knowing 'em through repetition, or look things up to be _sure_. Testing
> for
> > >it seems pointless as it doesn't demonstrate anything but ability to
> > >memorize.
> >
> > So there goes a big chunk of the written test. In fact, most of the regs
> are
> > memorization....
>
> Yep. I'd say the only regs that ought to be tested should do with
> safety and emergencies. Anything else can be looked up and will be learned
> through use.

See above. I don;t think FCC will agree.
>
> > >As to formulas, I have the perfect solution - provide the
> > >formulas, plus some. Print 'em on the back of the circuit diagram sheet,
> and
> > >use questions that'll show knowledge of actually knowing how to put 'em
> to
> > >use.
> >
> > Such as? Remember, the structure of the test is multiple choice.
>
> Testing techniques isn't my strong point, but I've seen it done.
> Having the answers available is a bigger stumbling block.

OK
>
> > And there's still the question - why MUST those things be on the test? Why
> > can't
> > hams simply look up, say, the theory of dipole antennas, rather than
> having to
> > answer any questions on them?
>
> You're arguing from the erroneous position that knowledge of morse
> code is as fundamental as knowledge of radio wave propagation without having
> actually _proven_ that it is, and in the face of a lot of real-world
> evidence that it's not.

Not at all. I'm simply applying the same argument to other parts of
the test.

> If we accept that the idea is true, then to properly test for
> practical knowledge, then facility in all modes needs to be demonstrated.
> This is patently a ridiculous notion.

Then how about this idea:

Perhaps the code test should be replaced by a real practical operating
test. Such a test could work like this: Two typical ham rigs are set
up so that the operators of each one cannot see or hear each other.
The rigs are connected to dummy loads which are located adjacent to
each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to the
other, without putting a signal on the air). The testee sits at one
rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed
envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the
rig. (The operating instructions for the rig would be available at any
time, and in advance of the test). When the actual test begins, the
testee opens the sealed envelope and a timer is started. Inside the
envelope are a set of instructions telling the testee to go to a
specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact, and
send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a
similar sealed envelope, but with a different message, which is to be
received by the testee. The idea is to test the actual radio operating
skills of the testee under controlled conditions. There would be a
time limit, too. The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a
digital mode for the test. Time limits and exact instructions would
vary with the mode and the class of license being tested. Higher class
tests could have shorter time limits, longer messages, and more
complicated instructions, such as having to change frequency at a
certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list
that includes "wrong choices", etc.

Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages
is missing or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure
or phonetics are used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit
is exceeded, each minute over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain
number of mistakes and the test is failed. Getting a repeat of a
missed word would NOT be a mistake. Typical exams (but not the exact

exams themselves) would be available as study guides. Audiotapes and
sound files of typical tests could be used for study as well.

Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and
requires some equipment and VE time to conduct it. But it could be
done quite easily, and in such a way as to test real operating skills.
The rigs used need not have lots of features, and QRPp power levels
would be more than adequate. Or a "rig simulator" that's really a
gussied-up intercom (two networked laptops?) could be used. Is there
any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too
much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!

> > >Throw in some formulas that are just plain _wrong_, like scrambling up
> > >Ohm's law.
> >
> > On the formula sheet?
>
> Yep.
>
> > >If somebody understands _theory_, they can figure out what's
> > >bogus and what isn't.

There's yer multiple choice.
> >
> > Perhaps - but why test for those formulas at all? Our licenses are for
> > operating, not solving problems in theory.
>
> The testing is supposed to be creating a 'pool of skilled operators
> and technicians', if I remember correctly. A skilled operator/technician
> understands theory, and if a person understands theory, they can easily
> solve problems in it, hence testing for it would be a valid requirement.

Morse/CW is an operating skill widely used by hams, though...
>
> > >> What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based on
> > >>opinions,
> > >> nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be used
> > >> against
> > >> the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
> > >
> > > The argument doesn't apply because, as I said, we're _all_ using
> > >radios, and the theory applies across the board.
> > >
> > Only the most basic theory applies across the board.
>
> I disagree with where you went with that.

Perhaps we have to define "theory" first. I think we're talking about
different things
>
> >And there's no requirement
> > to use any particular technology, just as there's no requirement to use

> >any
> > particular mode.
>
> Actually, there is. To use that HF technology, I have to use Morse
> Code at least once.

Only at a basic skill level, and only one skill.

It's like having to solve a couple of simple Ohm's Law problems.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2894. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 22:37:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619183729.15462.00000911@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69042

In article <vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030618183141.23406.00000249@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> In article <vf0ml2ca5n3s4b@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >The ITU web site list ten proposals for rule S25.5. They are:
>> >
>> >ARB mod (modify)
>> >ASP sup (suppress, delete)
>> >EENA noc (no change)
>> >EUR mod
>> >IAP sup
>> >IND mod
>> >KEN mod
>> >TZA mod
>> >UKR NOC (strongly support no change)
>> >USA sup
>> >
>> >The last proposal (USA) is the United States proposal,
>> >which is to delete S25.5.
>> >
>> omigosh, Larry - ten proposals, of which only three are suppress/delete?
>
>Two are "noc" no change, i.e. S25.5 remains the same.
>Three are "sup" suppress, i.e. S25.5 is deleted.
>It would be interesting to known what was in the five "mod" modifications.

Yep - ya gotta winder what they would change. Require a certain speed, maybe?
>
>UKR probably stand for Ukrania (russia), who we know strongly opposes
>the supression of S25.5.

Maybe. Or maybe they took that position as a bargaining chip. Classic
Soviet-style negotiation, don't give away anyhting.

> Leading manufacture of vaccum tubes supports
>Morse code exams. No suprise there. :-)

Huh? They'd sell more tubes abroad for hard cash if the result of suppressing
S25.5 was more hams running high power HF phone.

> Who is EENA?
>

I dunno, but could be some of the old Soviet block countries? As in "Eastern European..."

Maybe the compromise will be to keep S25.5 but allow countries to bypass it for ham licenses with no privileges below 136 kHz.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2895. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 22:38:48 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF23B78.F52EC073@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 69043
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Twistedhed wrote:
>
> I hear only two countries are in favor of actually dropping it all
> together. The remaining majority favor a modification. Keepin' my
> fingers crossed for CW's retention.
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
> ARRL Member
> FISTS Member
> _
> You, me, and a plethora of radio brethren interested in preserving the
> integrity it's mere existence brings to the HF band via hammie radio. It
> is not perfect, but it is definitely a weeding process. To do away with
> it would further dilute what is already partially contaminated.

And I think code could go suck water from a camel's backside.

Those that want to use CW, have my blessing. Just don't force
us to learn something we'll never use. They should make the
test essay or fill-in-the-blank, rather then multiple-guess.

Imagine, a VE would actually have to grade a test, then compare answers.
Make them work for their "reimbursement".

2896. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 22:48:11 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bctejb$ue1$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69082

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0306191320.52e89f31@posting.google.com...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:<bcklpg$f6p$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> > > > Personally, I found the test to be imbalanced; I'm not
> > idealogically
> > > > >wedded to any ideas about changing it, though.
> > >
> > > Interesting! I find the test unbalanced, too - tests many things at a
very
> > > shallow level. Juast my opinion, of course.
> > >
> > > How do is the test imbalanced in your opinion?
> >
> > Pretty much what we go into below - too much stuff (like bands)
that
> > a 'newbie' really should look up before he keys his radio anyway. What I
> > think of as regulatory 'trivia', etc.
>
> Problem is, FCC seems to think all that regulatory stuff has to be
> there. Since a licensee is responsible for adherence to the rules, the
> exams are full of questions about those rules. FCC is satisfied with
> questions that require that you know that 50-54 MHz is a ham band. I
> don't think they'd be satisfied if the exams said "look it up".

Probably not...;) Hopefully I made it clear later on - I'm on-board
with testing on the safety/emergency regulatory portion.

> There's a bunch of historical reasons, too. Reading the old License
> Manual study guides from decades ago, it's interesting to note how
> many questions there are on specific topics like band edges, power
> supply filters and harmonic reduction, and how little there is on
> other areas like receivers. The obvious reason is that FCC focused the
> exams on the areas where hams had problems.

How did enforcement and self-policing evolve during the same period?
I can understand gearing testing towards problem areas - I'm wondering how
the problem(s) start and if testing or enforcement/peer pressure solve them.
Any ideas?

> Also, once upon a time, FCC issued licenses in another service with no
> exam at all. All a licensee had to do was sign a form certifying that
> they had read and understood the rules for that radio service, and

> would abide by them. The reality was somewhat different....

Ahem. ;) But, was it a lack of testing (not that I'm advocating
doing away with testing in the least) or lack of enforcement that caused CB
to spiral out of control?

> > > >> On the HF/MF amateur bands, manual Morse/CW is used widely and
> > > >> extensively
> > > >> by hams. It's the second-most popular mode on those bands, and
there
> > > >> are times
> > > >> when it is the most popular mode on them. Manual Morse/CW is such a
big
> > > >> part of
> > > >> HF/MF amateur radio that it's only reasonable and rational that
there
> > > >> should be
> > > >> a test for that skill, since skills cannot be tested with written
test
> > > >> methods alone.
> > > > >
> > > > > What a ham _needs_ to be (imo) is a good
operator/technician -
> > > > > his
> > > > >operations, in whatever mode or band, should be conducted lawfully,
> > > > >skillfully and with his equipment operating within the specified
norms.
> > > > >That's what the testing should 'select' for, again, imo.
> > > >
> > > > OK, fine - then it makes sense for there to ba a test of basic
operating
> > > > skill.
> > > > And Morse/CW skill is a basic operating skill in amateur radio.
> > >
> > But there's no practical test of any _other_ operating skill.
> >
> Maybe there should be!
> >
> However, note that most would-be hams already know how to understand
> the spoken word and how to read. (I don't think a totally illiterate
> person can be licensed in the USA). The Morse test is a basic skills
> test, akin to being able to understand 41 words in a new language when
> spoken slowly and clearly, or being able to read at the first-grade
> level.

I'm not buying the argument that Morse is a "basic" skill, sorry.

> > How
> > many Techs (or anybody else, for that matter) know the entire phonetic
> > alphabet?
> >

> I know it - learned it 35+ years ago, as a Novice.
>
> > Too many people grew up on a diet of 1-Adam 12, etc. and have been
> > overexposed to the excreble result of the telecom union and "Frank,
Adam,
> > Baker, heck, lets just make it up as we go' phonetic alphabet. As a
> > genuinely fundamental 'skill', an entry-level test ought to at least
require
> > the examinee write out the phonetic alphabet.
>
> I'll play devil's advocate on this one. Use a common anticodetest
> argument against the phonetic alphabet test
>
> If someone doesn't intend to operate 'phone, why require that they
> learn the phonetic alphabet? And which one is THE correct one? Use of
> any particular phonetics is not required by the regs, so why REQUIRE
> that hams learn Alfa, Bravo, Charlie....?

Standardization, for one thing. (And I think the regs should specify
this, myself.)

> Besides, it should be a spoken test, because the skill is to be able
> to say the phonetics, not write them.
>
> See?

I think it has more general application than that.

> > This isn't going to cost more
> > than a scrap of paper and a moment of the VE's time. Some _general_
> > knowledge of Q and Z signals (well, just Q I guess), net procedures,
that
> > sort of thing.
>
> Has to be in multiple-guess format - no essays.

Then no worrys, eh?

> > > >> Now some folks may say they have no intention of using Morse/CW, so
why
> > > >> require
> > > >> them to learn it at any level of skill, even the most basic? If we
> > > >> follow
> > > >> that
> > > >> reasoning, however, most of what's in the written tests has to be
> > > >> eliminated as
> > > >> well. For example, why someone who only wants to operate modern
> > > >> manufactured equipment have to learn so much theory?
> > > >
> > > > Your delving into what some would call part of the very
definition
> > of

> > > >amateur radio, aren't you?
> > >
> > > Perhaps - but there are plenty of folks who would say Morse/CW skill
is
> > > part of the very definition of amateur radio, too.
> >
> > Yes, in the past.
>
> Not just in the past - today. Take a listen on the HF ham bands -
> Morse/CW all over the place.

And I suppose it's good that some people keep a tradition alive -
that's not an argument for maintaining the testing requirement.

> > > It's one thing to say "hams should be knowledgeable about radio
theory"
> > > and quite a different thing to say "hams should have to pass Test X in
> > > radio theory to get the license".
>
> >
> > > >Anyway....theory applies across the board, to all
> > > >radios, all bands, all antennas and feedlines and what-have-you.
> > >
> > > But not all of the theory. To operate HF CW, I don't really need to
> > > know very much about VHF propagation,
> >
> > You don't need to know anything about propagation to operate any
> > radio in any mode, but that knowledge will make your operation more
> > effective.
>
> Sure - but why REQUIRE it if someone isn't going to USE it? Why can't
> they just look it up, same as the band edges?

Because it's one of those core, basic skills - radio theory. Any
specific band edge/plan what-have-you is specific enough that _I_ don't see
a need to test for it.

> Go down that road a ways and there's not much left of the writtens.

Your arguments are unconvincing for me - you haven't demonstrated
that knowledge of Morse contributes _anything_ to producing good operators
and your argument(s) regarding the written test are bordering on reductio
absurdum. Frankly, there's no rebuttal to the idea that propagation theory
isn't a fundamental concept, so I'm not buying.

> > > FM repeaters, satellites,
> > > and a whole lot of other stuff that's on the test. But those things
are
> > > a big part of passing the written test.
> >
> > There's that imbalance again. Chicken and egg - the first radio
I

> > bought was a 2-meter, and it's hard to argue that I didn't go that route
> > _because_ of a certain amount of emphasis. And now, my existence as a
user
> > of 2-meter increases the number of users - which in the long haul
(generally
> > speaking) could lead to even more emphasis on the test, because gee whiz
> > we're getting all these people on 2-meter, gotta be sure they know what
> > they're doing.....hhmmm.
>
> So what's the alternative - test all subjects equally? Example - some
> hams still use mercury-vapor rectifiers, so let's have some test
> questions on mercury-vapor rectifiers.

More emphasis on core fundamentals, I would say.

> > > >All hams,
> > > >sort of by definition, operate radios. They should all have some
basic
> > > >understanding of what radios do and how they do it, so they can
operate
> > > >properly, within given parameters.
> > >
> > > Agreed - but they don't all operate the same radios. How much theory
is
> > > needed
> > > to operate an HT?
> >
> > None, but that's true of any radio.
>
> Not true of some that I use!

Indeed - OK, spill.

> > The argument here is, really, do
> > you want just operators, or _skilled_ operators? Learning and knowing
theory
> > promotes operator _skill_,
>
> whoa there! How does THEORY promote operating skill? Does knowing
> Ohm's Law make someone understand SSB better?

You know the answer(s) as well or better than I do - propagation,
carrier wave creation/suppression, etc. Hell, just see the thread on 5 Mhz
going on right now - unless you can argue that knowing what's going on
inside the radio and out at the antenna is of no help in understanding that.

>
> > while CW/Morse simply does not, if it did, it'd
> > be required for that reason alone for professionals.
>
> Ya lost me there. The pros don't require Morse/CW skill because they
> don't use the mode much, if at all, any more. Hams do.

Some hams do; some have no interest in the subject.

> Some of the most skilled operators today are air traffic controllers.
> Are they required to know much theory about how radios work? I don't
> think so. They have to know procedure and rules and how to keep cool
> under pressure, plus a lot of other skills. But their technical radio
> theory knowledge doesn't have to be very good at all.

It's going to depend on your definition of "skilled operator", isn't it? Yeah, if you've got a technical staff on hand to deal with whatever problems might crop up, maintenance people to maintain the equipment, and very narrow, limited and defined area of operations, then yeah, sure. Basically, this is just your "modern radios that don't break" argument, and more of a narrow look when we need a broader outlook. Is an ATC guy ever going to be installing his own antenna and need to realize that standing in spot "A" when he keys up 1000 watts is probably a Bad Idea? Of course not - engineers take care of that for him. Not so a ham - and being aware of these little things are what go into making a good operator.

> > That it's being phased
> > out across the board is sufficient proof that it's irrelevant to having
good
> > operators;
>
> Not at all! It's being phased out by professionals because their are
> other modes with a lower bottom line. Example: By implementing GMDRSS,
> the maritime folks could get rid of having radio officers on board
> ship.
>
> >a lot of that other 'stuff', on the other hand, isn't.
>
> I've got a list of operating skills you might like. Want me to repost
> it?

Sure, or e-mail it.

> > > >That some few people (or nearly all of
> > > >'em) only plan on operating "modern" equipment is irrelevant,
possibly
> > even
> > > >a red herring; we're _all_ operating radios of various types, and
they
> > all
> > > >obey the same laws of physics.
> > >
> > > Sorry, that "laws of physics" line is a red herring. Practical radio
is
> > > more
> > > about technology and engineering than about physics and science.
> > >
> > I'm not sure what you mean by 'practical' radio.
>
> I mean actually being able to build, and fix radio sets that work on

> the air. As opposed to just basic principles.
>
> IOW it's one thing to understand a block diagram, or even a basic
> schematic, and quite another to actually build a working set that
> meets all the requirements.
>
> > Are you arguing
> > (for whatever reason) that theory should be dropped in favor of
> > tech/engineering type questions?
>
> I mean the test should include both.

OK.

> > > >>Why learn the band edges, mode
> > > >> designators, or formulas when you can look them up?
> > > > >
> > > > > I'll agree with that, actually. A good operator will either
wind
> > up
> > > > >knowing 'em through repetition, or look things up to be _sure_.
Testing
> > for
> > > > >it seems pointless as it doesn't demonstrate anything but ability to
> > > > >memorize.
> > > >
> > > > So there goes a big chunk of the written test. In fact, most of the
regs
> > are
> > > > memorization....
> > >
> > Yep. I'd say the only regs that ought to be tested should do
with
> > safety and emergencies. Anything else can be looked up and will be
learned
> > through use.
>
> See above. I don;t think FCC will agree.

shrug FCC will do what FCC does.

> > > >As to formulas, I have the perfect solution - provide the
> > > >formulas, plus some. Print 'em on the back of the circuit diagram
sheet,
> > and
> > > > >use questions that'll show knowledge of actually knowing how to put
'em
> > to
> > > > >use.
> > > >
> > > Such as? Remember, the structure of the test is multiple choice.

> >
> > Testing techniques isn't my strong point, but I've seen it done.
> > Having the answers available is a bigger stumbling block.
>
> OK
> >
> > > And there's still the question - why MUST those things be on the test?
Why
> > > can't
> > > hams simply look up, say, the theory of dipole antennas, rather than
> > having to
> > > answer any questions on them?
> >
> > You're arguing from the erroneous position that knowledge of
morse
> > code is as fundamental as knowledge of radio wave propagation without
having
> > actually _proven_ that it is, and in the face of a lot of real-world
> > evidence that it's not.
>
> Not at all. I'm simply applying the same argument to other parts of
> the test.

It's only the same argument if you accept that practical Morse
knowledge is as fundamentally applicable as propogation theory.

> > If we accept that the idea is true, then to properly test for
> > practical knowledge, then facility in all modes needs to be
demonstrated.
> > This is patently a ridiculous notion.
>
> Then how about this idea:
>
> Perhaps the code test should be replaced by a real practical operating
> test.

[snip details]

Sounds good to me. I doubt it would ever go anywhere, but hey...

> > > >Throw in some formulas that are just plain _wrong_, like scrambling
up
> > > >Ohm's law.
> > >
> > > On the formula sheet?
> >
> > Yep.
> >
> > > >If somebody understands _theory_, they can figure out what's
> > > >bogus and what isn't.
>
> There's yer multiple choice.

It _can_ be done.

> > > Perhaps - but why test for those formulas at all? Our licenses are for
> > > operating, not solving problems in theory.
> >
> > The testing is supposed to be creating a 'pool of skilled
operators
> > and technicians', if I remember correctly. A skilled operator/technician
> > understands theory, and if a person understands theory, they can easily
> > solve problems in it, hence testing for it would be a valid requirement.
>
> Morse/CW is an operating skill widely used by hams, though...

And this is really the only argument you have that goes anywhere; in
and of itself it's insufficient.

> > > >> What it all boils down to is that the test requirements are based
on
> > > >>opinions,
> > > >> nothing more. Almost all of the anti-code-test arguments can be
used
> > > >> against
> > > >> the writtens - would you want a no-theory license?
> > > >
> > > > The argument doesn't apply because, as I said, we're _all_
using
> > > >radios, and the theory applies across the board.
> > > >
> > > Only the most basic theory applies across the board.
> >
> > I disagree with where you went with that.
>
> Perhaps we have to define "theory" first. I think we're talking about
> different things

I was thinking of your piecemeal approach to propogation.

> > >And there's no requirement
> > > to use any particular technology, just as there's no requirement to
use
> > >any
> > > particular mode.
> >
> > Actually, there is. To use that HF technology, I have to use
Morse
> > Code at least once.
>
> Only at a basic skill level, and only one skill.
>
> It's like having to solve a couple of simple Ohm's Law problems.

Yeah, but all radios obey Ohm's Law.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.490 / Virus Database: 289 - Release Date: 6/16/2003

2897. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 22:52:07 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bcteq2$jip@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 69044

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EF1F307.3040104@adelphia.net...
> Robert wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306182320140.434@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> >
> >>On Tue, 17 Jun 2003, Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:YJ9Ha.4208$a7.1559232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >>>
> >>>>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >>>>news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0306152126470.970@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> >>>
> >>>[snip]
> >>>
> >>>>>>>Code CSCE's before April 15, 2000, are valid forever.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>I got my Tech Plus in 1992 and it said Tech Plus on it.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Perhaps you bought your license?
> >>>>
> >>>>You are way off base here.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>Well, except that he pretty much is the only one in his game ;) or :|
> >>
> >>What "game?"
> >>
> >>Ms. Flint is not telling us a situation that is prima facie clear. The
> >
> > fact
> >
> >>that the FCC didn't even change form 610 until November 1993 to include
a
> >>"Technician with HF" license class IS prima facie evidence that there
was
> >
> > NO
> >
> >>SUCH THING during 1992 when Ms. Flint claimed she had one - and so is
the
> >
> > June

> >
> >>1994 database change as well. Excuse me, but without evidence to the
> >
> > contrary,
> >
> >>the evidence I have in hand says that I should not believe her claim -
> >
> > that she
> >
> >>had a license that said "Technician Plus" issued during 1992.
> >>
> >>I'm not absolutely saying that she is a liar either. She hasn't
> >
> > demonstrated
> >
> >>her claim - but I have demonstrated evidence that shows the claim may be
> >
> > false.
> >
> > Oh, please. Far be it from me to stick up for one of the rrap ct
> > loonies, but the level of "demonstrated evidence" for _anything_ around
here
> > is pathetic. One supposed 'net expert says I'm posting anonymously
>
> Hey Robert! Do you make a habit of searching really hard for something
> to argue about? No kidding that I can search out and find out who you
> are? Sheesh, I'm getting an education here.
>
> Fact is, you are posting anonymously. If I wanted to find out who you
> were, I would have to work at it. And since your not being libelous, I'm
> not going to.
>
> Other people on the group don't have a problem with their names:
>
> Dick Carrol, Steve Robinson, Jim Miccolis, etc. Even Lenover21 posts
> with his name in the message. Brian Burke puts his name in his messages.
> Even Kim of the infamous callsign can be easily ID'ed. THAT is what
> we're talking about.
>
> Just like sending a opinion to the newspaper. If you aren't ID'ed, your
> opinion usually isn't accepted.
>
>
>
> > and Dick
> > Carrol used his powers of deduction to determine I'm a "phony" veteran
based
> > on his (lack of) knowledge regarding military rations and satellite
> > technology.
> > On top of that, the lot of ya get anal if somebody doesn't use

his
> > callsign in his postings.
> > People here have serious issues, and they ain't to do with ham
> > radio, that's for sure.
> >
>
> And here you are! I think you'll fit right in here. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

heh heh heh....I was going to say something sarcastic _ _ _ oh, what the
hell:
I am darned used to being easily IDed, Mike ;)

Kim W5TIT

2898. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 22:59:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jfrIa.422$Vx2.123351@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69045

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bcliq7qtb1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
> ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
> service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
> your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
effectively
> UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
about,
> this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
as
> the internet is concerned.)

If your local lines (phone, DSP, whatever) are down, then you can't get out of your own area to bypass the damage no matter how much you are willing to pay.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2899. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 23:07:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Cmrla.425$Vx2.124204@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69046

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030618234144.15932.00000666@mb-m29.aol.com...
> Hams are not allowed to participate in non-radio activities. That's the
> compromise. The only exception is eating. Eating alot is tradition.
>
> Its an unwritten set of traditions. Its a "requirement" since most Hams
don't
> deviate from it. Neither is any participant allowed to deviate from it -
Its
> how the events are organized. Once you are at the event, you have no
choice but
> to do what's scheduled at that event. Such events make one wait three
hours for
> a Wuoff Hong ceremony, for example. Fun is not allowed. This must be true
at
> all such Ham events. That's the standard compromise.
>

This is true of any activity put on by any organization of any type. I belong to an amateur musical group. When I go to the scheduled rehearsals and concerts, I must play my instrument. EVERY group acts this way. If you participate in a group, the group defines what is allowed in the activity.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2900. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 23:23:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bctgijnlq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69047

My internet and the LL went down....it rained hard yesterday. Its still not up to snuff. Just takes a little glitch and all this hi-tech crap is down the toilet.

At least I can operate on a battery and do CW.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:jfrIa.422$Vx2.123351@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bcliq7qtb1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
> > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without phone
> > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn up
> > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
> _effectively_
> > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
> about,
> > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
> as
> > the internet is concerned.)
>
> If your local lines (phone, DSP, whatever) are down, then you can't get out
> of your own area to bypass the damage no matter how much you are willing to
> pay.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

2901. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 23:27:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bctgqesnp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69048
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Why don't we just give you a license and a callsign because you feel
derpived and think you deserve it?

Dan/W4NTI

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message
news:3EF23B78.F52EC073@yahoo.slam...
>
>
> Twistedhed wrote:
> >
> > I hear only two countries are in favor of actually dropping it all
> > together. The remaining majority favor a modification. Keepin' my
> > fingers crossed for CW's retention.
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> > ARRL Member
> > FISTS Member
> > _
> > You, me, and a plethora of radio brethren interested in preserving the
> > integrity it's mere existence brings to the HF band via hammie radio. It
> > is not perfect, but it is definitely a weeding process. To do away with
> > it would further dilute what is already partially contaminated.
>
>
> And I think code could go suck water from a camel's backside.
>
> Those that want to use CW, have my blessing. Just don't force
> us to learn something we'll never use. They should make the
> test essay or fill-in-the-blank, rather then multiple-guess.
>
> Imagine, a VE would actually have to grade a test, then compare answers.
> Make them work for their "reimbursement".

2902. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-19 23:39:08 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF2499C.40EDCAE3@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 69049
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Why don't we just give you a license and a callsign because you feel
> derpived and think you deserve it?

Hey, Pal, I took my test. It was free at the VEC up the street. It
came with a free HT donated by an ex-ham.

Total cost: 1 hour of time to be on the air. Took one week
from thought to ticket.

Here's another kick in your seat, I only got 4 wrong and I DIDN'T study one bit.
Us technical types don't need study guides when we've been in radio since 1977.

I'm glad you passed your code test. Does that make you special?

2903. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 00:00:39 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bctj6cct1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69081

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:jfrIa.422$Vx2.123351@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bcliq7qtb1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > OK, I'll buy that, but did you _try_ to get on the 'net (not just
> > ATT) as if your life depended on it? (And how long were you without
phone
> > service? If you've got a phone, you can access the 'net. It might burn
up
> > your credit card to do it, but "expensive" doesn't equal "impossible".)
> > Anyway, the loss of a node like that isn't supposed to effect the 'net
> > itself. I used to lurk a _lot_ on some of the *.abuse* groups, and one
> > subject I remember being debated is, what would happen if you
> _effectively_
> > UDP'd a major ISP? (Done properly, which was what the discussion was
> about,
> > this effectively nukes that system, it's effectively non-existent as far
> as
> > the internet is concerned.)
>
> If your local lines (phone, DSP, whatever) are down, then you can't get
out
> of your own area to bypass the damage no matter how much you are willing
to
> pay.

No kidding - you'll note that I _asked_ that. No, you probably
didn't notice. Here, you quoted me asking it just above there:

>> "And how long were you without phone service?"

Kinda relevant to the point, huh? Might be why I asked it, huh? How
it is that you failed to observe it is something I suspect will remain
shrouded in mystery, however.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.490 / Virus Database: 289 - Release Date: 6/16/2003

2904. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 00:12:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619201236.23617.00000792@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 69050

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Hams are not allowed to participate in non-radio activities. That's the
>> compromise.
>
>I don't know where you gained your knowledge of amateur radio, Vipul,
>but that's one strange outlook you've developed.

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays

>This is true of any activity put on by any organization of any type. I
>belong to an amateur musical group. When I go to the scheduled rehearsals
>and concerts, I must play my instrument. EVERY group acts this way. If you
>participate in a group, the group defines what is allowed in the activity.

For example, the DXpedition was in May. You had to pay <alot> extra to park near there, so I parked elsewhere and took the bus from there. Then, I got a ride from the host to the on-site shack. After, I got there I saw that most of the others paid the extra fee to park there.

The Hams operated radios all day, and all night. Eating was allowed. Every Ham ate <a lot>. Otherwise, there were no other activities. I did go on a few drives in another Ham's car with some other Hams and did some walks. One of the trips was just to pick up more food. Most of the other Hams did not even do that. Besides that, the event was at the shack.

Since it was a vacation spot. I wanted to do some vacation stuff. But, Hams do not like to do that. They had to operate all day and through the night. Since I did not have a car there, I was stuck there.

It wasn't a required part of the event. The individual Hams chose not to do anything else.

2905. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 00:23:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619202324.12501.00000294@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 69051

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hglrvmm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 16 Jun 2003 10:07:39 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Note that back in those days the Q&A pools were much smaller. In fact,
>>I have read that there were only 2 or 3 versions of each written test,
>>and that the reason FCC required a 30 day wait before retesting was to
>>prevent recognition of the fact that there were so few versions.
>
> There were five different "series" for each element,

Ah. So for the ~ 50 question General test, there were at most ~250 questions. Which were secret.

> and the 30-day
> waiting period was to give the applicant an opportunity to repent
> for his wayardness, to do some more and better quality studying, and
> to avoid waves and waves of applicants at each session.

bwaahaahaa!

I recall that for the first three years of the Novice and Tech, those exams were given at the FCC office unless you lived the required distance away. In 1954 FCC made all Novices and Techs "by mail". I think the reason was to slow down the hordes of applicants...
>
>>I think there are several reasons Bash got away with what he did:
>>
>>1) It would have been embarrassing to the FCC to actually admit that
>>they only had a few different tests for each level of license.
>
> That was not the problem.

OK, but those of us on the outside thought there were at least dozens of exams of each type.

>>2) Bash did not act alone - he had lots of help from those who gave
>>him the information. Prosecuting all of those people would have been
>>difficult.
>
> Especailly when the attorney who would have had to do the work was
> an "avoid hard work at all costs" person. We went head to head on
> that issue.

been there.....
>

>>3) Bash never had access to the actual test materials. There were
>>warnings about those taking tests divulging their contents, but the
>>rules were vague about someone asking testees about the test. It could
>>be argued that Bash did not violate any rules or laws, but that those
>>who gave him info were the real criminals.
>
> See my response to (2) above.

Understood. Of course the person who knowingly accepts and pays for stolen
property cannot defend himself by saying somebody else stole it....
>
>>4) (This may be the biggest one): FCC was considering getting out of
>>the testing business anyway, so there was no point in prosecuting
>>someone for what would no longer be a violation.
>
> Not exactly. The HQ people - who didn't give or grade any tests
> anyhow - were looking for ways for their staff to do less work,
> and this was a golden opportunity which eventually ended in
> privitization (the VE program).

OK

> As I said before, those of us who
> actually ran the sessions and gave the tests and cared about doing it
> right were not in favor of the open book method.

Nor were most of us on the outside, but it wasn't up to us.

>>All of this is kind of academic now, because FCC isn't about to go
>>back to private, secret tests.
>
> Unfortunately.
>
thanks for the straight info, Phil

73 de Jim, N2EY

WWHD

2906. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 00:36:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bctkrofeg1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yes it does. You see I've also done the test thing. In front of the FCC. Theory and all. One shot....if failed...come back in another 30 days to try again.

There is no comparison to what I did to what you did. Again... the answer is YES.

Dan/W4NTI

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message news:3EF2499C.40EDCAE3@yahoo.slam...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > Why don't we just give you a license and a callsign because you feel
> > derpived and think you deserve it?
>
> Hey, Pal, I took my test. It was free at the VEC up the street. It
> came with a free HT donated by an ex-ham.
>
> Total cost: 1 hour of time to be on the air. Took one week
> from thought to ticket.
>
> Here's another kick in your seat, I only got 4 wrong and I DIDN'T study one bit.
> Us technical types don't need study guides when we've been in radio since 1977.
>
> I'm glad you passed your code test. Does that make you special?

2907. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 00:45:22 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF25922.F36A4C12@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 69053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Yes it does. You see I've also done the test thing. In front of the FCC.
> Theory and all. One shot....if failed...come back in another 30 days to
> try again.
>
> There is no comparison to what I did to what you did. Again... the answer
> is YES.

So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.

Now we know the rest of the story...

2908. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 01:04:57 UTC
From: Upton O'Good <markmywords.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <42294N697@web2news.com>
Source record: 69054
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott #69!!! wrote:
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>> Yes it does. You see I've also done the test thing. In
>> front of the FCC.
>> Theory and all. One shot....if failed...come back in
>> another 30 days to
>> try again.
>>
>> There is no comparison to what I did to what you did.
>> Again... the answer
>> is YES.
>
> So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.
>
> Now we know the rest of the story...

Chill out Snott. You took a multiple choice test and now you think your
Hiram Percy Maxim, LOL....

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

2909. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 01:14:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bctnbe$392$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69055

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030618202333.23307.00000759@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <bcoap8$k9b$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.hglr4ml.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >> On Sun, 15 Jun 2003 23:43:22 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
> >>
> >> >Bash was the equivalent of say someone looking at his older brother's
> >> >high school algebra tests when studying for his own algebra test. Or
> >> >the frat house's library of previous year's tests at some college.
> >>
> >> Bash was the equivalent of someone breaking into the school and
> >> rummaging through the teacher's desk until he found the questions
> >> and answers to the algebra exam.
> >
> >Bunk...it wasn't equal to any "breakin" at all. It was no
> >different than a student telling another student what one or more
> >questions were on the latest history test.
>
> It's "no different" only if the teacher and the school had made it clear
that
> students taking the test were NOT to discuss the actual test with others.

The government can't put a gag order on people.
Schools can't either to a large extent...unless they
are private institutions. You can argue on an ethical/moral
basis, but even a school wouldn't have a case against
students discussing a test and/or specific test quetions.

> >> Those exams were not public information, and the examinees were not
> >> authorized to carry the information out od the exam room
> >
> >which they didn't other than in their memory.
>
> True - and divulging said information was against the rules.

The rules were bogus...that's the point. Unenforcable.

> As I recall the
> old exams, when someone signed the 610 as part of applying for the
license,
> they agreed to abide by ALL of the rules and instructions involving the
exams.

Yet the FCC never pursued Bash at all. Why? In my opinion
because the courts wouldn't give a conviction.

> >> or to tell
> >> him what the questions and answers were.
> >
> >In other words, a "gag order" was in place...but the rules never
> >said that.
> >
> The instructions on the exams I saw said it. 1967, K3NYT's house, Keystone
> Avenue in Upper Darby.
>
> >> It is the equivakent of stolen material.
> >
> >Yet no one, including the FCC ever embarked on any prosecution against
> >Bash.
>
> It was the FCC's job, and they didn't do it. Phil was there, literally,
he's
> told the story.

He gave his opinion. He "claims" the FCC agent that had the
responsibilityy was lazy. I claim they knew darn well they
had no case. We'll never know for sure.

> >> We went through this before - do we need to resurrect the dispute
> >> again?
> >
> >Only if you keep raising the old arguments/opinions while
> >ignoring the other perspective.
>
> What's the other perspective, Bill? That it's OK to violate the exam rules
and
> procedures?

The rules were bogus....that's the point.

> How about this scenario:
>
> Back in those days, all Novice and Tech exams were done "by mail", using a
> single volunteer examiner. Would it have been OK for a volunteer examiner
to
> make copies of the exams he/she proctored?

Making copies is in NO way equivalent to an individual memorizing
one or more questions and passing them on to Bash.

> How about distributing those copies
> to prospective hams as "study guides"?

Once again, apples and oranges.

> Why or why not?

At this point, what difference does it make?
The arguments are at best academic and more
likly a useless waste of time. Phil and I agree
to disagree and that's the end of it for me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2910. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 01:28:07 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf4orsqh5d7m5a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69056

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030619183729.15462.00000911@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
> writes:

> Maybe the compromise will be to keep S25.5 but allow countries to bypass
it for
> ham licenses with no privileges below 136 kHz.....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

You left out the decimal point. No privileges below 1.36kHz.

Larry KC8EPO

2911. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 01:34:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619213400.08691.00000715@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 69057

>So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.

What new Hams, dont you mean CBplussers?

2912. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 01:38:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bAtIa.441$Vx2.141107@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69058

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030619201236.23617.00000792@mb-m10.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Hams are not allowed to participate in non-radio activities. That's the
> >> compromise.
> >
> >I don't know where you gained your knowledge of amateur radio, Vipul,
> >but that's one strange outlook you've developed.
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays
>
> >This is true of any activity put on by any organization of any type. I
> >belong to an amateur musical group. When I go to the scheduled
rehearsals
> >and concerts, I must play my instrument. EVERY group acts this way. If
you
> >participate in a group, the group defines what is allowed in the
activity.
>
> For example, the DXpedition was in May. You had to pay <alot> extra to
park
> near there, so I parked elsewhere and took the bus from there. Then, I got
a
> ride from the host to the on-site shack. After, I got there I saw that
most of
> the others paid the extra fee to park there.
>
> The Hams operated radios all day, and all night. Eating was allowed. Every
Ham
> ate <a lot>. Otherwise, there were no other activities. I did go on a few
> drives in another Ham's car with some other Hams and did some walks. One
of the
> trips was just to pick up more food. Most of the other Hams did not even
do
> that. Besides that, the event was at the shack.
>
> Since it was a vacation spot. I wanted to do some vacation stuff. But,
Hams do
> not like to do that. They had to operate all day and through the night.
Since I
> did not have a car there, I was stuck there.
>
> It wasn't a required part of the event. The individual Hams chose not to

do
> anything else.
>

And who's fault was it that you did not have access to your car?? Yours and yours alone. The point of the DXpedition was to operate from an exotic locale. If the hams chose to participate exclusively in the activity that was the main point of the DXpedition there is nothing wrong with that. You had no reason to expect anything else.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2913. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 01:50:43 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bctp9r$2ud$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69083

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030619213400.08691.00000715@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.
>
> What new Hams, dont you mean CBplussers?

Huh. This thread pretty much makes Vipul's point.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.490 / Virus Database: 289 - Release Date: 6/16/2003

2914. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 02:04:41 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF26BB9.29BBA6D0@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 69059

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.
>
> What new Hams, dont you mean CBplussers?

Call them what you will. Us newbies call you old farts for a reason,
your thoughts smell.

2915. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 02:16:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF26EA2.6070401@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69060

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> heh heh heh....I was going to say something sarcastic _ _ _ oh, what the
> hell:
> I am darned used to being easily IDed, Mike ;)

I think I know what ya mean, Kim.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2916. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 02:23:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030619222335.24390.00000701@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 69061

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgn3hyw.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 12 Jun 2003 09:42:18 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>>On the other hand, use of Morse/CW by radio amateurs continues all
>>over the world. Participation by hams in contests is increasing, as
>>evidenced by more logs being received - but only for CW contests.
>
> Actually, as Dan pointed out, maritime radiotelegraph operation
> using Morse ("CW" for short) is still used in some parts of the
> world for routine messaging, but not for maritime distress and
> safety purposes. There's no problem as long as the operator holds
> the proper class of commercial license, the equipment meets the
> standards of the ITU and the licensing Administration, and the
> operator finds someone to communicate with - which will not include
> commercial coast stations nor the USCG (and its equivalent) in the
> major maritime countries of the world. Nothing prevents shipping
> companies, even in the US, from establishing private coast stations
> to communicate with their vessels by CW in the same manner as most
> shipping companies have private coast stations for voice communications
> ("company frequencies") on HF SSB.

Speaking of which, check this out (forwarded from several reflectors:

begin quote

COAST STATIONS NMC, KPH AND KFS WILL RETURN TO
THE AIR USING MORSE CODE

For the first time since 12 July 1999 listeners around the world will have the opportunity to hear three historic US coast stations on the air using Morse code.

On July 1st, Coast Guard Communications Area Master Station Pacific (CAMSPAC), Pt Reyes will retire the historic "Sparks" from the Telecommunications Specialist Enlisted Rating Badge, as the Coast Guard restructures its work force replacing that specialty with two others, the Operations Specialist and the Information Technology Specialist.

As a special part of the ceremony surrounding this change NMC will return to the air using Morse code (CW) and possibly radioteletype (RTTY). These services, once the mainstays of Coast Guard communications, have been retired for several years but will be reinstated for this ceremony.

At present the frequencies known to be authorized for NMC are 8574kc and 500kc with the possible addition of 488kc. Additional HF frequencies may be authorized by the time of the event. Those wishing the latest information about NMC frequencies and times of operation should write directly to TCCM Loren R. O'Banion at LObanion@d11.uscg.mil .

The public is invited to visit NMC to participate in this event. The unit's Receiver Site, located at 17000 Sir Francis Drake Blvd on the Pt Reyes National Seashore will be open to the public between the hours of 9am and 3pm. Persons wishing to attend must RSVP to (415) 669-2004.

KPH will activate its HF and MF transmitters to participate in this historic event and to give listeners the opportunity to hear three US coast stations on the air - possibly for the last time. KFS will also return to the air on a single frequency.

KPH will transmit on 6477.5, 8642.0, 12808.5 and17016.5 on HF and on 500 and 426kc on MF. KFS will transmit on 17026.0kc. These frequencies have been made available through the generous cooperation of Globe Wireless, the current owner of the KPH and KFS licenses.

KPH and KFS operators will listen for calls from ships on 6276.0, 8368.0, 12552.0 and 16736.0 on HF and 500kc on MF.

Reception reports for NMC may be sent to:

USCG CAMSPAC Pt. Reyes
ATTN: LCCT O'Banian
1700 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. , POB 560
Point Reyes Station, CA 94956-0560
USA

Reception reports for KPH and KFS may be sent to:

Ms. DA Stoops
P.O. Box 381
Bolinas CA 94924-0381
USA

end quote

How about that!
>
> Interesting to see if the Philippines is a signatory on the Safety
> Of Life At Sea (SOLAS) Convention which requires GMDSS capability on
> vessels (over 300 gross tons) registered by its signatory members.
>
> Also interesting to see if the USCG still has the authority to
> prevent a foreign-flag vessel which is required to have GMDSS
> equipment to sail from a US port if that vessel is not so equipped
> and has a valid and current Safety Certificate. They used to have
> that authority when MF CW was the required safety system.

>
> Jeff ??
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2917. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 02:35:43 UTC
From: "Amanda B. Reckonwith" <ile@helo.com>
Message-ID: <O4OcnR9J6spq72-jXTWJjg@comcast.com>
Source record: 69062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message
news:3EF2499C.40EDCAE3@yahoo.slam...

> Here's another kick in your seat, I only got 4 wrong and I DIDN'T study
one bit.
> Us technical types don't need study guides when we've been in radio since
1977.

Scott, the entry level test is a joke. If you have been in radio that long
you should pass it .

2918. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 02:37:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF27353.8B3B6B7A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69063
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott #69!!!" wrote:
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > Yes it does. You see I've also done the test thing. In front of the FCC.
> > Theory and all. One shot....if failed...come back in another 30 days to
> > try again.
> >
> > There is no comparison to what I did to what you did. Again... the answer
> > is YES.
>
> So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.
>
> Now we know the rest of the story...

You don't strike me as the kind of fellow looking for a welcome. A newcomer looking for a welcome doesn't walk into a room full of guys with a great deal of experience and say, "Here's another kick in your seat, I only got 4 wrong and I DIDN'T study one bit. Us technical types don't need study guides when we've been in radio since 1977.I'm glad you passed your code test. Does that make you special?"

Dave K8MN

2919. Re: Dick Bash

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 03:55:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcu0jhqfd0@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 69064

N2EY wrote:

> t for the first three years of the Novice and Tech, those exams
> were given at the FCC office unless you lived the required distance away. In
> 1954 FCC made all Novices and Techs "by mail". I think the reason was to slow
> down the hordes of applicants...

It might be worth noting that some Techs got their tickets via testing at the FCC office even after that change to mail order only. That would be when one went to take the General test and flunked the 13wpm code test, but passed enough to get 5wpm, and then passed the General written.
Seems like our old buddy Carl Stevenson must fit that category since he claims to have gotten his Tech at an FCC office post-1954.

2920. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 03:57:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgqw1a7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69065

On Mon, 16 Jun 2003 13:55:38 -0400, Robert wrote:

>> > Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and consider
>> >public _opinion_?
>>
>> First question: No.
>
> No requirement to hold public hearings? At all?

NONE.

All Commission meetings are open to the public as observers, but
there is no requirement that all matters be discused at an open
meeting. Any proceeding can be a "paper" proceeding with no public
presence, but the results must be made public. That's what a
"Memorandum Opinion and Order" or "Approval by Circulation" is all
about.

The Commission can hold a public hearing at its own discretion,
where specific folks are invited to give testimony on the record,
but that's usually just for show because the "Five Wise Ones"
usually have their minds made up before that time as was very
apparent in the broadcast ownership circus earlier this month.
Matters which are under consideration by the staff under delegated
authority never have open meetings, relying instead on the paper
record.

I'm not even going to get into what the staff thinks about these
"dog and pony" shows.

>> Second Question: The Commission is required to receive and consider
>> whomever's opinion
>
> Yes, that's what I said.
>
>>during the comment and reply comment periods but
>> is not required to go with "popular opinion"
>
> Well, that's not what I said. I said what you said: "Consider".
>Hell, you quoted me: "(...) and consider public _opinion_?"
>
> And then YOU say: "The Commission is required to receive and
>consider whomever's opinion"
>
> Looks like hams are taking argument to new heights of absurdity.

If you keep truncating my statements you can prove anything.....

Bottom line - they are required to receive input from the public on the record but only during the publicly-announced comment and reply comment phases. At their discretion, they can put late-filed or ex-parte comments in the record.

They are required to "consider" the input - which can be as simple as looking at it and saying "that's nice...." and then putting it aside.

They are not required to go along with anyone's input, be it "public" or "popular" opinion, as long as the decision covers why they didn't. It can be arbitrary in the usual sense of the word ("we think that it's better this way") but cannot be "arbitrary and capricious", a legal term of art which means that they didn't offer to receive public input and "consider" same as explained above.

The one exception to the "public input" rule is if the action removes a burden. Then, there is no requirement for same, it can be done by immediate order. Example is when the amateur operators were no longer required to keep a detailed logbook.

Do you understand it now?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2921. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 03:57:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgquun6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 19 Jun 2003 14:38:49 GMT, Angelo Campanella wrote:

>You give the FCC bureauheads credit for more intelligence than they have.
>Consider that it is a 10 (20?)kHz wide band of space. Put appropriate RF
>anywhere, and only in, that band. Let the FCC fret as to why they can't
>understand some of the chirps, sputs and duck talk that they hear when they
>monitor it.

Go that route (unmonitorable content or noncompliance with the specs
set down) and see how fast the band/channel is taken away, especially
by the primary "owner" who didn't want us there in the first place.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2922. Re: The new (U.S.) 60M band

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 03:57:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgr73q9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69067
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 19 Jun 2003 00:21:31 -0400, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>Are those parts of Part 97 specifically listed as not applicable or is that
>just certain people "reading into it" to serve their own agenda?

Hey, you got "the word" and its history here for free but you are
certainly free to pay -your- attorney $150/hour to research it in
Pike and Fischer or Berry-Best if you disagree.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2923. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 03:57:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgr6v38.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69068

On 19 Jun 2003 07:12:53 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>OK Say you are on a small privately owned vessel, i.e. not compulsory
>equipped and no INMARSAT (not mine, but a friend I have in mind, I don't
>have a boat). God forbid he needs to call Mayday, 2.182 at sea and 156.800
>inland, or 2.1875/156.525? He probably already knows the answer, but I
>don't and I am curious.

2182 or Channel 16 are voice distress channels monitored by speaker
watch.

2187.5 and Channel 70 are digital signal channels monitored by
auto-alarm receivers used to alert watchstanders that there is
a distress call coming shortly on 2182 or Channel 16.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2924. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 04:57:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgrbl1c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69069

On 19 Jun 2003 14:20:46 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>> How many Techs (or anybody else, for that matter) know the entire
>> phonetic alphabet?

>I know it - learned it 35+ years ago, as a Novice.

All the Techs on our ARES/RACES daily net check-in do because we
check in with standard ITU phonetics.

>> Too many people grew up on a diet of 1-Adam 12, etc. and have been
>> overexposed to the excreble result of the telecom union and "Frank, Adam,
>> Baker, heck, lets just make it up as we go' phonetic alphabet.

>If someone doesn't intend to operate 'phone, why require that they
>learn the phonetic alphabet? And which one is THE correct one?

There are (at least) three "standard" phonetic alphabets:

ICAO/ITU/lots of others: Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta....
APCO (US Public Safety): Adam, Boy, Charles, David....
The Ma Bell's Operators: America, Boston, Chicago, Denver.....

The first two I learned decades ago from using them. The third is
a dim memory (I dated a Long Lines operator in the dim past....)

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2925. Fwd: Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 04:57:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgrbyxe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69070

On 20 Jun 2003 02:23:35 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>COAST STATIONS NMC, KPH AND KFS WILL RETURN TO
> THE AIR USING MORSE CODE
>
>For the first time since 12 July 1999 listeners around the world will
>have the opportunity to hear three historic US coast stations on the
>air using Morse code.
>
>On July 1st, Coast Guard Communications Area Master Station Pacific
>(CAMSPAC), Pt Reyes will retire the historic "Sparks" from the
>Telecommunications Specialist Enlisted Rating Badge, as the Coast
>Guard restructures its work force replacing that specialty with two
>others, the Operations Specialist and the Information Technology
>Specialist.

.....

>How about that!

WAY TO GO!!!

TNX ES 73 DE K2ASP

2926. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 05:16:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620011650.17796.00000941@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 69072

In article <bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>That brings up a completely different point of contention for me! Chat
>programs or other programs (using PC's on the air) is where we have
>definitely fallen behind as a communications field/hobby.
>
>There are so many services that have dwarfed amateur radio at this point, in
>regards to digital technology that makes us look like we are in the stone
>ages. PSK31 is nice, but through a variety of reasons it is primarily only
>used on HF. It could be utilized on 6 meters where there is some equipment
>out there for ssb/cw. Technically speaking, it could also be used on FM, as
>discussed in an article in QST (in a 2000 or 2001 edition, I will look for
>it again....) for 2 meters or 70cm. There was a experiment done in this
>article where it showed promise on FM for locally based communications.
>
>As far as packet, that has fallen so far behind, that it is a serious shame.
>Most of the programs are old, crappy DOS based programs, (am unaware of any
>Windows based programs) and with incredibly slow transmission speeds and
>limited file sharing capability, I am surprised it hasn't died out
>completely.
>
>Other modes of digital communcations, which are in the most basic sense,
>chat/contact/QSO related, are fine for jsut that, but overall we have fallen
>behind the mark. Currently there are some cities fairly close to me that
>have wide-area-internet-service that covers a 20-30 mile radius with speeds
>of over 20kps, (considering most dialups get 2kps-6kps)
>or more and the person can be almost anywhere with that radius and connect.
>I am not saying we should provide internet access, for those that want to
>read into that, but can you imagine working a disaster situation, where you
>have say for instance a dozen different operators able to send digital pics
>or even streaming video (to a point) possibly even simultaneous to net
>control or EOC's? Current packet speeds are not worth bothering for regular
>use, and limited message capability is another issue.
>
>Look at what is commonly used with most law enforcement MDT's, which
>basically were spawned in part from ham radio packet radio. The are not
>perfect yet, but the capabilities are phenomenal compared to existing packet
>capabilities.
>
>I know this is a little different than the intention of the thread, but I
>think we really need to look at our digital capabilities and see what we
>could do, work on getting those limitations that we have lifted and
>designing new and better ways that may make us the envy of other services,

>and making the technology so good that it may be emulated as other things
>amateur radio have been in the past such as cellphone technology, mobile
>data communicators as well as quite a few other technologies the general
>public now enjoys thanks to ham radio.

2927. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 05:16:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620011651.17796.00000942@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 69071

In article <3EF1D1E1.4000300@att.net>, Angelo Campanella <a.campanella@att.net>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
>> the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
>> whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.
>
>
> I have out a lot of thought into this (speech intelligibility vs audio
>frequencies). So much so that I limit the low frequency audio in all my
>household devices such as TV and radio audio. The brain requires little or no
>
>audio below about 300 Hz. That is where the voice fundamental is located
>(100=basso, 300=soprano). The vowels and consonant are all at 500 and above.
>The
>energy up to 10 kHz is "useful", but not mandatory.
>
>
>> What does the Bell standards say?
>
>
> Ma Bell determined generations ago that up less than 2,000 is bad, to
2500Hz
>is
>vital, 3000 is nice, and beyond 3000 as not price effective (but sure sounds
>pretty). On the low end, "Naturalness" ("nice") required 200. I say that the
>audio below 500 is not worth the bandwidth it devours.
>
> An article by Kryter in the 1950's declared that if you wanted to do
speech
>with
>the absolute MINIMUM band, a 500Hz wide band from 750-1250 Hz was
>appropriate.
>If you decided at devote 1 kHz of spectrum to the task, then two bands, one
>from
>250-750 and one from 1250 to 1750 would do. If three 500 Hz bands, then add a
>
>third 500 as from 2250 to 2750.
>
>
>> What is the expected cutoff of most if not all TX baseband
>> filters?

>
>
> Probably the Ma Bell band of 200-3000. The only change I suggest is
that we
>raise
>the bottom to 500Hz.
>
> It is reasonable to apply a 1400 Hz wide 2nd IF or post-IF filter and
slide
>it
>around the audio spectrum. I suspect that centering it at 1200+-200 Hz will
>give
>the best result.
>
> At one point in the 1960's (I was K3IQU then), I had built a crystal
lattice
>SSB
>filter with its two resonant peaks 1 kHz apart, using it according to
>Kryter's
>500&1500 rue to some success. Today, I would probably place the same two
>peaks
>at 700&1700 Hz.
>
> Angelo Campanella W8EDR

2928. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 05:22:22 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A0DF2E91F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69073

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >
>> >
>> >> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I
>> >> can't call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call
>> >> listening down most of the DX never listen where I can transmit.
>> >> Yes, I only use phone, but I think you probably guessed that
>> >> already.
>> >
>> > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
>> > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would
>> > have nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting
>> > pounded by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the
>> > usual weak signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful
>> > about what they ask for because they might get it.
>> >
>> > w3rv
>>
>> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
>> They will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to
>> call them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do that
>> below 7100.
>
> So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even 7300?
> Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more space which
> could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100. Beyond that I
> don't know why you have such a big problem with working split in the
> first place. The dx phone contesters routinely work dozens upon dozens
> dx stations inside 48 hours of operating time. I sure have my piles of
> 40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto 75M.
>
> w3rv
>

Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the other
station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't tell them.

Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are Ws on it is truly warped.

2929. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 05:27:27 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A0ECED103Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69074

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030619082307.02197.00000770@mb-m12.aol.com:

> In article <Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>>news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:
>>
>>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>> news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>>
>>>
>>>> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I
>>>> can't call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call
>>>> listening down most of the DX never listen where I can transmit.
>>>> Yes, I only use phone, but I think you probably guessed that
>>>> already.
>>>
>>> From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
>>> scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would
>>> have nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting
>>> pounded by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the
>>> usual weak signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about
>>> what they ask for because they might get it.
>>>
>>> w3rv
>>
>>Nonsense.
>
> Not nonsense at all, Alun, it's what would happen.
>
>>You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
>
> You missed a key point. W3RV wrote:
>
> "In a scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody.."
>

They won't be able to. Even if the 'Novice' subband is 're-farmed' we
won't get to Tx phone in any of the existing R1 phone subband. The
scenario of 'everyone can transceive with everybody' doesn't occur in the
WRC 2003 proposals, and it isn't even in my proposal in the (much) earlier
thread of giving R2 US hams the R3 US phone subband.

>>They
>>will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to call
>>them on frequency.
>
> That's not the scenario W3RV is describing. If they can go below 7150
> and you can't, then everybody can't transceive with everybody.
>
>>As opposed to now, when they can only do that below 7100.
>
> Main point is that if all regions have 7000-7200 or 7000-7300, there
> will be lots of places where you can work 'phone DX non-split - if
> that's what the DX wants to do. If the US phone band stops at 7150, the
> DX will still be able to operate split from outside the US phone band,
> or transceive completley outside the US phone band, without moving
> below 7100 or even 7050.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

2930. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 05:36:02 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <45f271b664db4d9bb910e766a72cc769@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 69075

In article <3EF06EA9.2E842A33@earthlink.net>
Dave the ASSHOLE Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
>
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
> > >radio in general."
> > >
> > >As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.
> >
> > . I still haven't done any general insulting. I've done SATIRE on
> > . some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
> > . crackpots in this groupie fest.
>
> Sure, Len. You're simply engaging in civil debate by hurling SATIRE.
> Your conveniently snipped SATIRE has been seen by all. We're now aware
> that your own militant, crackpot one-sided, my-view-is-the-only view is
> the only one you consider.

Pot kettle black, ASSHOLE...

> > . Tell us, oh Glorious Ham Leader, is "rectum breath" NOT an
> > . insult? :-)
>
> I'd certainly have felt insulted if called "rectum breath", Len.

Too bad it's an apt description. Tip: Next ARES meeting... use mouthwash, Shitbreath.

> Do you consider any of the many names you've called Steve to be
> insulting? I'm not insulted by your use of the term "Glorious Ham
> Leader" though. I figure that its use by you is simply more evidence
> that you don't know much about amateur radio.

Says the guy who doesn't know a fucking thing about wearing clean and non-wrinkled
clothes....

> > . Of course it isn't if uttered by an extra. The old Double Standard
> > . at work!
>
> Why no, Leonard. Here, I'll show you.
>
> Steve, please stop insulting Leonard. He's only here to engage in civil

> debate over the morse test and for the imposition of a minimum age in
> amateur radio licensing.

Shut the FUCK up, Nazi-wannabe.

> > . Go back to reading your AARP bulletin, old man.
>
> ...and you may resume reading the consumer information provided on the
> side of your box of prunes, even older man.
>
> Dave K8MN

Follow your own advice, Fuckstick.
Oh, and asshole, the remailers are chosen at random, so when new ones pop up and others go down, there's always a remailer to use, you fucking ignoramus.

2931. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 05:44:27 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A011B156294elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69076

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in
news:vf4orsqh5d7m5a@corp.supernews.com:

>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030619183729.15462.00000911@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> In article <vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
>> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>
>> Maybe the compromise will be to keep S25.5 but allow countries to
>> bypass it for ham licenses with no privileges below 136 kHz.....
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> You left out the decimal point. No privileges below 1.36kHz.
>
> Larry KC8EPO
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

I think that you will find that the 'mod' (modify) proposals do make CW testing no longer compulsory. What they do that the 'sup' (supress) proposals don't is either add a laundry list of requirements of what should be tested in the theory tests and/or specifically say that code testing is optional, instead of just deleting (surpressing) any mention of it.

I think that what we will most likely end up with is a version of s25 derived by reconciling the various 'mod' proposals. It will incorporate (I'm guessing) ITU-R 1544, which is the laundry list of theory requirements. Since it was already written by the ITU, it would be hard to imagine it not making it's way into s25! It may say code testing is optional, or it may no longer mention it, one or the other. Hours will probably be wasted debating that point, whem the effect is the same either way.

I am reasonably sure that when the dust settles we will have specific theory testing requirements at the international level for the first time, and it will be optional for member states to run code tests. We may know the answer this time next week, or perhaps the week after.

2932. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 05:55:12 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <d9193a1bf8d7ebeb35925ab40d455c05@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 69077

In article <3EF1397E.E6F6382C@earthlink.net>
Dicksucking Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
>
>
> Anonymous wrote:
> >
> > Hey High-el, are you really going to...
>
> Why no, Roger. What I'm really going to do is forward your latest to
> Chief Stenger in Glen Dale with a copy to the county prosecutor as I've
> been doing with all of your vile, stalker-type postings.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...you really ARE quite the Nazi and a whining PUSSY to boot.

Do try and at least iron your clothes and use some REAL deodorant, instead of that cheap cologne samples your hog wife rips off from work...and DO make sure that grey bad combover is stuck down with tons of hairspray you balding fat fuck. So far, you and your ilk have tried to repeal the freedom of speech rights of others, I'll just have to let the stalking and threats you made come out also. Maybe you can give Fatass Chief a better blowjob so his corrupt force can fuck up yet again.

> I've already
> had this particular anonymous remailer block your postings to this group
> as I've done with all the other anonymous remailers you've used. That's
> why you continually have to seek out new ones.

Not very efficent, since new remailers pop up every day you ignorant fat fuck.

> Looks like the area sociopath has run out of his meds again.

Looks like the Cameron PEDOPHILE has bribed those to keep a lid on his activities.

> Is your latest just another written manifestation of your Coprolalia,
> Roger?

No, but it sure an apt description of you ASSHOLE.
[restored}
are you really going to get that bulldog-faced yeasty-cunt Finn wife a scraper so she can use the doughy cuntyeast that has been in her diseased cunt for over a year to make you some bread for breakfast?

Maybe you can get a two for one special on that fatass tub of lard Terry for her anniversary of marrying her pimp. She could always use something like that scraper.

And did you really enjoy going to hear that shitty band or were you just excited because afterwards you could troll giving blowjobs behind the Wheeling Civic Center?
[end restore]

> Dave K8MN, ASSHOLE

Have fun proving who posted this FUCKHEAD.

2933. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 06:00:01 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20030620060001.18964.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 69078

In article <3ef214e4@snipnews.snip.net>
"51629A" <allforemus1@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> Remember Dave, <much asskissing from High-el's gay lover]

So, how DO you 51629A, get that malformed head of yours up FATASS High-el's ass and still breathe?

2934. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 10:30:01 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcunn8$f80$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

> You don't strike me as the kind of fellow looking for a welcome.

A welcoming kind of crowd wouldn't start threads titled "Typical
no-code brain fart".

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2935. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 10:42:54 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcuofafno1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69084

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote

> Bottom line - they are required to receive input from the public
> on the record but only during the publicly-announced comment and
> reply comment phases. At their discretion, they can put late-filed
> or ex-parte comments in the record.
>
> They are required to "consider" the input - which can be as
> simple as looking at it and saying "that's nice...." and then
> putting it aside.

> Do you understand it now?

I apparently understood it just fine - they're required to recieve
and consider input from the public, pretty much what I said.
And yeah, your "argument" here when you're saying exactly what I
said, re-worded to be loop-hole free, is absurd.

Let me put it another way: I AGREE WITH YOU 100%.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2936. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 10:46:06 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcuorqfnv1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69085

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote

> There are (at least) three "standard" phonetic alphabets:

Only one of which is concievably appropriate for the sort of
international use a ham operator is permitted to conduct, no?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2937. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 11:42:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306200342.6f696758@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69087

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A0DF2E91F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:

> >> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
> >> They will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to
> >> call them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do that
> >> below 7100.
> >
> > So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even 7300?
> > Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more space which
> > could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100. Beyond that I
> > don't know why you have such a big problem with working split in the
> > first place. The dx phone contesters routinely work dozens upon dozens
> > dx stations inside 48 hours of operating time. I sure have my piles of
> > 40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto 75M.
> >
> > w3rv
> >
>
> Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the other
> station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't tell them.

Humbug. Between the contests I've called any number of ssb dx stations
on their freqs with cw and asked them to listen up. And they did in
most instances. A particularly memorable example was a VP8 who came
back with "I can't copy the CW but I'm listening on 7215" (or whatever
it was). They know exactly what's going on.

> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are Ws on
> it is truly warped.

I'll put it this way: I *much* prefer trying to copy some weak piece
of 40M ssb exotica split when he's down below where the stateside
Athritis nets are allowed to trash the band. And/or when he isn't
buried under a screaming pileup on his freq and nobody can hear him.

w3rv

2938. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 11:45:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306200345.6d560179@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69088

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306180943.53208fc9@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com>...
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >
> > > Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> > > call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most
> > > of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use phone, but I
> > > think you probably guessed that already.
> >
> > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> > nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> > by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> > signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> > ask for because they might get it.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Like having to beam across Japan to work Europe from Guam. I would
> have to work hundreds of JA's hoping the band didn't close before I
> got thru them all.
>
> Or I would call Europe only, and the JA's were very respectful and
> polite. No problems. When I would slip and leave Europe out of the
> CQ, there the JAs were again. Again, no problem.
>
> If only the Yanks were as well behaved, your premonition of DX having
> to hide...

Exactly my point. Thankew.

w3rv

2939. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 11:53:24 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf5tga6rant131@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69089

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgqw1a7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 16 Jun 2003 13:55:38 -0400, Robert wrote:
>
> >> > Aren't they required by law to hold public hearings and
consider
> >> >public _opinion_?
>
> NONE.
>
> All Commission meetings are open to the public as observers, but
> there is no requirement that all matters be discused at an open
> meeting. Any proceeding can be a "paper" proceeding with no public
> presence, but the results must be made public. That's what a
> "Memorandum Opinion and Order" or "Approval by Circulation" is all
> about.
>
> The Commission can hold a public hearing at its own discretion,
> where specific folks are invited to give testimony on the record,
> but that's usually just for show because the "Five Wise Ones"
> usually have their minds made up before that time as was very
> apparent in the broadcast ownership circus earlier this month.
> Matters which are under consideration by the staff under delegated
> authority never have open meetings, relying instead on the paper
> record.

Some FCC documents are given DA numbers. Are all DA numbered
documents, decision by staff?

Larry

2940. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 12:45:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcuvqt$pm9$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69090

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgrbl1c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 19 Jun 2003 14:20:46 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
> >> How many Techs (or anybody else, for that matter) know the entire
> >> phonetic alphabet?
>
> >I know it - learned it 35+ years ago, as a Novice.
>
> All the Techs on our ARES/RACES daily net check-in do because we
> check in with standard ITU phonetics.
>
> >> Too many people grew up on a diet of 1-Adam 12, etc. and have been
> >> overexposed to the excreble result of the telecom union and "Frank,
Adam,
> >> Baker, heck, lets just make it up as we go' phonetic alphabet.
>
> >If someone doesn't intend to operate 'phone, why require that they
> >learn the phonetic alphabet? And which one is THE correct one?
>
> There are (at least) three "standard" phonetic alphabets:
>
> ICAO/ITU/lots of others: Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta....
> APCO (US Public Safety): Adam, Boy, Charles, David....
> The Ma Bell's Operators: America, Boston, Chicago, Denver.....
>
> The first two I learned decades ago from using them. The third is
> a dim memory (I dated a Long Lines operator in the dim past....)
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Interesting...the MaBell operator one. I can tell you that by the mid-70s
that MaBell phonetic wasn't being taught or used anymore. I was a
supervicor
in a Long Lines overseas operator office (32 A of A in NYC) from 74 to 75.

The ICAO/ITU one was used in the military when I was in the Navy
during 66-70.

Cheers
Bill K2UNK

2941. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 12:50:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306200450.4d4153d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69091
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> That brings up a completely different point of contention for me! Chat
> programs or other programs (using PC's on the air) is where we have
> definitely fallen behind as a communications field/hobby.

I think there is an answer to all of it. The general ham population is simply not going bother with modes and technolgies which are simply reguritations of what they can get with a $15/month dialup connection. Ham radio will survive by being able to do what the Internet cannot do. However this is a swamp with no end because it involves personal preferences and perceptions which in turn makes ham radio unique amongst the radio services. Comparisons with what the other services are doing with advanced technologies therefore are generally moot when it comes to ham radio.

It's a people "problem" and we all know that far-end technocrats historically do not fare particularly well in this field. Been there, done it and I quit beating my brains out long ago.

> As far as packet, that has fallen so far behind, that it is a serious shame.
> Most of the programs are old, crappy DOS based programs, (am unaware of any
> Windows based programs)

Most packet activity today is concentrated in the 2M spots networks and the software is integrated into the Windoze computer logging programs. Look up Writelog and DX4WIN for examples.

> and with incredibly slow transmission speeds and
> limited file sharing capability, I am surprised it hasn't died out
> completely.

It's far from dead but it has "degenerated" into a boring-as-hell but quite useful utility mode for HF dxers and contesters of all flavors.

Nobody in these groups swaps files around on the air, why would they when they can do that on the Internet orders of magnitude faster?

The 2M spots nets are however currently threatened by the more recently available Telnet spots systems. But using a Telnet node involves hanging online for the duration of the contest, typically for 48 hours at a crack. Plus there are still bogus spot filtering problems, etc. Many are not willing to do Telnet so they continue to tune a neighborhood 2M spots node. In this local region we have about 250 regular spots net users and about eight 2M nodes.

>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX

w3rv

2942. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 12:52:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcv08f$3f1$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69092

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bcuorqfnv1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote
>
> > There are (at least) three "standard" phonetic alphabets:
>
> Only one of which is concievably appropriate for the sort of
> international use a ham operator is permitted to conduct, no?

Depends on what you mean by "appropriate". If you
mean the FCC, because it had the ITU one as a set of test
questions, wants hams to use that one, then I guess you could
say it is the appropriate one.

If it is simply a matter of better understanding, any one would
do as long as the words were recognizable.

Would you find my call sign any more or less difficult
to understand if I said: Kingdom two unckle nancy kingdon
instead of
Kilo two uniform november kilo?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2943. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 13:12:36 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A05DAC7794Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69093

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0306200342.6f696758@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93A0DF2E91F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
>
>
>> >> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
>> >> They will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able
>> >> to call them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do
>> >> that below 7100.
>> >
>> > So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even
>> > 7300? Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more space
>> > which could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100. Beyond
>> > that I don't know why you have such a big problem with working split
>> > in the first place. The dx phone contesters routinely work dozens
>> > upon dozens dx stations inside 48 hours of operating time. I sure
>> > have my piles of 40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto 75M.
>> >
>> > w3rv
>> >
>>
>> Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the
>> other station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't
>> tell them.
>
> Humbug. Between the contests I've called any number of ssb dx stations
> on their freqs with cw and asked them to listen up. And they did in
> most instances. A particularly memorable example was a VP8 who came
> back with "I can't copy the CW but I'm listening on 7215" (or whatever
> it was). They know exactly what's going on.
>

1 - I don't have a key!!!!

2 - In the immediate future, comprehension of CW by the DX is going to get
a lot worse

3 - It's just plain ridiculous to have to do that

>
>> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are
>> Ws on it is truly warped.

>
> I'll put it this way: I *much* prefer trying to copy some weak piece
> of 40M ssb exotica split when he's down below where the stateside
> Athritis nets are allowed to trash the band. And/or when he isn't
> buried under a screaming pileup on his freq and nobody can hear him.
>
> w3rv
>
I'll admit that is an advantage, but it balances the one's you can't work
because of this problem - and stop pretending there's no problem!

2944. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 13:22:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306200522.4800a91b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69094

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bcsne3$l30$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> scribbled:
>
> *yawn*
>
> They sure grow 'em stupid wherever it is you're from.

Geez Bobby-Poo, I expected better of you. Can't stand the heat so ya
got outta the kitchen didja? Whats the matter Bobby-Poo, too retarded
to even figger out where I'm from?

Whatta zero.

w3rv

2945. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 13:24:05 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A05F9F25994elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69095

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:bcv08f$3f1$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net:

>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bcuorqfnv1@nd.eastky.net...
>>
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote
>>
>> > There are (at least) three "standard" phonetic alphabets:
>>
>> Only one of which is concievably appropriate for the sort of
>> international use a ham operator is permitted to conduct, no?
>
> Depends on what you mean by "appropriate". If you
> mean the FCC, because it had the ITU one as a set of test
> questions, wants hams to use that one, then I guess you could
> say it is the appropriate one.
>
> If it is simply a matter of better understanding, any one would
> do as long as the words were recognizable.
>
> Would you find my call sign any more or less difficult
> to understand if I said: Kingdom two unckle nancy kingdon
> instead of
> Kilo two uniform november kilo?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

No, but to someone whose first language is not English the ITU phonetic
alphabet is often more understandable. In fact, not long ago I had a QSO
with an Italian who spoke barely any English (and I can't say much more
than hello and goodbye in Italian), but we had a valid exchange because we
could say 59 and say our callsigns in international phonetics. Now, Italy
isn't rare (although getting a QSL card out of them is another matter),
but if it had been rare DX who couldn't speak English it would still work.
I don't always use standard phonetics, I think that some of the words are
too long in a pile-up, but I always alternate with the standard phonetics.

2946. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 13:33:27 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcv2evjgj1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69201

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bcv08f$3f1$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bcuorqfnv1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote
> >
> > > There are (at least) three "standard" phonetic alphabets:
> >
> > Only one of which is concievably appropriate for the sort of
> > international use a ham operator is permitted to conduct, no?
>
> Depends on what you mean by "appropriate".

I think "international" is really the operative term...

>If you
> mean the FCC, because it had the ITU one as a set of test
> questions, wants hams to use that one, then I guess you could
> say it is the appropriate one.

No. If the FCC used APCO or something else other than ITU, I'd
consider it inappropriate due to the international nature of the ARS, and my
opinion would be to dump it in favor of ITU.

> If it is simply a matter of better understanding, any one would
> do as long as the words were recognizable.

This is/was being hashed around in here somewhere...;)

> Would you find my call sign any more or less difficult
> to understand if I said: Kingdom two unckle nancy kingdon
> instead of
> Kilo two uniform november kilo?

Me? No, I'd just be annoyed and probably quit talking to you as soon
as I could do it politely - I'd also form an unfavorable opinion regarding
your skill level. (Fair or not, accurate or not, that's the way it is).
Anyway...
What _I_ can understand is NOT the question, though. Could an
operator overseas, for whom english is a second language, and who's probably
learned the ITU alphabet, understand it? English has spelling pecularities
that aren't obvious to "us" (assuming we're both native speakers of the
tongue) and so a word/sound combination that makes sense to you (and me) can
very easily leave somebody else baffled.

So, if we just "make up" an alphabet as we go, it's going to lead to problems and plain old sloppiness, especially if you just toss in the spoken letter once in a while. "Double-U"....uhm, did he mean Whiskey or Uniform Uniform? Not the same thing, I know, but the same 'neck of the woods', imo.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2947. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 13:39:54 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcv2rafql0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 69096

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A0DF2E91F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> > news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
>
>
> > >> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
> > >> They will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to
> > >> call them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do that
> > >> below 7100.
> > >
> > > So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even 7300?
> > > Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more space which
> > > could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100. Beyond that I
> > > don't know why you have such a big problem with working split in the
> > > first place. The dx phone contesters routinely work dozens upon dozens
> > > dx stations inside 48 hours of operating time. I sure have my piles of
> > > 40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto 75M.
> > >
> > > w3rv
> > >
> >
> > Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the other
> > station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't tell them.
>
> Humbug. Between the contests I've called any number of ssb dx stations
> on their freqs with cw and asked them to listen up. And they did in
> most instances. A particularly memorable example was a VP8 who came
> back with "I can't copy the CW but I'm listening on 7215" (or whatever
> it was). They know exactly what's going on.
>
>
> > Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are Ws on
> > it is truly warped.
>
> I'll put it this way: I *much* prefer trying to copy some weak piece
> of 40M ssb exotica split when he's down below where the stateside
> Athritis nets are allowed to trash the band. And/or when he isn't
> buried under a screaming pileup on his freq and nobody can hear him.

Seems that Alun is quite unfamiliar with the subject matter.

2948. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 13:41:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bcv2tcfql1@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 69097

Brian Kelly wrote:

> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306180943.53208fc9@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com>...
> > > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > >
> > >
> > > > Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> > > > call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most
> > > > of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use phone, but I
> > > > think you probably guessed that already.
> > >
> > > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> > > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> > > nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> > > by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> > > signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> > > ask for because they might get it.
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Like having to beam across Japan to work Europe from Guam. I would
> > have to work hundreds of JA's hoping the band didn't close before I
> > got thru them all.
> >
> > Or I would call Europe only, and the JA's were very respectful and
> > polite. No problems. When I would slip and leave Europe out of the
> > CQ, there the JAs were again. Again, no problem.
> >
> > If only the Yanks were as well behaved, your premonition of DX having
> > to hide...
>
> Exactly my point. Thankew.

Should we go into the reasons why so many Yanks are not well behaved?

2949. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 13:47:54 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcv3h7jne1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69204

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306200522.4800a91b@posting.google.com...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:<bcsne3$l30$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> scribbled:
> >
> > *yawn*
> >
> > They sure grow 'em stupid wherever it is you're from.
>
> Geez Bobby-Poo,

Wow - I'm left breathless by your level of wittiness.

>I expected better of you.

As far as you're concerned, I'm one of those useless no-coders, so
your "expectations" are meaningless, not only to me but probably most of the
world.

>Can't stand the heat so ya
> got outta the kitchen didja?

Oh, I'm right here, half-wit. Get a handle on that whole "on-off"
switch thing yet?

> Whats the matter Bobby-Poo, too retarded
> to even figger out where I'm from?

If I _cared_, I'd just plug your callsign into the database and
cross-reference that with your NNTP posting host......but why should I waste
my time? Any knowledge about a mindless bigot like you that I accumulate is
simply wasting valuable brain space that could be put to far better use.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2950. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 14:43:20 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A06D0F995D5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69098

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bcv2rafql0@208.206.142.69:

>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns93A0DF2E91F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> > news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
>>
>>
>> > >> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing
>> > >> it. They will still be able to operate below 7150 without me
>> > >> being able to call them on frequency. As opposed to now, when
>> > >> they can only do that below 7100.
>> > >
>> > > So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even
>> > > 7300? Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more
>> > > space which could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100.
>> > > Beyond that I don't know why you have such a big problem with
>> > > working split in the first place. The dx phone contesters
>> > > routinely work dozens upon dozens dx stations inside 48 hours of
>> > > operating time. I sure have my piles of 40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto
>> > > 75M.
>> > >
>> > > w3rv
>> > >
>> >
>> > Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the
>> > other station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't
>> > tell them.
>>
>> Humbug. Between the contests I've called any number of ssb dx stations
>> on their freqs with cw and asked them to listen up. And they did in
>> most instances. A particularly memorable example was a VP8 who came
>> back with "I can't copy the CW but I'm listening on 7215" (or whatever
>> it was). They know exactly what's going on.
>>
>>
>> > Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are
>> > Ws on it is truly warped.
>>

>> I'll put it this way: I *much* prefer trying to copy some weak piece
>> of 40M ssb exotica split when he's down below where the stateside
>> Athritis nets are allowed to trash the band. And/or when he isn't
>> buried under a screaming pileup on his freq and nobody can hear him.
>
> Seems that Alun is quite unfamiliar with the subject matter.
>
>

You're quite wrong there. I have quite a few split frequency QSOs on 40 in
my log.

2951. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 14:43:51 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A06D264849Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69099

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bcv2tcfql1@208.206.142.69:

>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0306180943.53208fc9@posting.google.com>...
>> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>> > news:<d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com>...
>> > > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > > Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I
>> > > > can't call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call
>> > > > listening down most of the DX never listen where I can transmit.
>> > > > Yes, I only use phone, but I think you probably guessed
>> > > > that already.
>> > >
>> > > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
>> > > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would
>> > > have nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without
>> > > getting pounded by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly
>> > > given the usual weak signals on 40. This could be a case of being
>> > > careful about what they ask for because they might get it.
>> > >
>> > > w3rv
>> >
>> > Like having to beam across Japan to work Europe from Guam. I would
>> > have to work hundreds of JA's hoping the band didn't close before I
>> > got thru them all.
>> >
>> > Or I would call Europe only, and the JA's were very respectful and
>> > polite. No problems. When I would slip and leave Europe out of the
>> > CQ, there the JAs were again. Again, no problem.
>> >
>> > If only the Yanks were as well behaved, your premonition of DX
>> > having to hide...
>>
>> Exactly my point. Thankew.
>
> Should we go into the reasons why so many Yanks are not well behaved?

>
>

Please do

2952. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 14:52:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF31FB2.2050001@psu.edu>
Source record: 69100

Robert wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>Hey Robert! Do you make a habit of searching really hard for something
>>to argue about? No kidding that I can search out and find out who you
>>are? Sheesh, I'm getting an education here.
>>
>>Fact is, you are posting anonymously.
>
>
> Do you work this hard at being wrong all the time?

Lots of us post here under our names. If not we have our names in our posts. You do neither, you aren't Robert Bake, and you don't put your whole name in your posts. it's all about transparency. No one here has to look up my name to see if I'm real or not - though no doubt many do.

>>If I wanted to find out who you
>>were, I would have to work at it. And since your not being libelous, I'm
>>not going to.
>
>
> Well, if I wanted to find out who "Mike Coslo" is, I'd have to work
> at that, too, and just as hard.

Uh-huh. go to arrl.org or QRZ.com, using my callsign provided. Lots of info about me in just a click. I decided to look you up, as a comparison and it took a bit longer.

But discussing things with you is like trying to wrestle with eels. We get all over the place and don't accomplish much. So be it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2953. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 15:02:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF3220A.7000705@psu.edu>
Source record: 69101

Robert wrote:
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> scribbled:
>
> *yawn*
>
> They sure grow 'em stupid wherever it is you're from.

Awwp, you just can't play nice can ya?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2954. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 15:08:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF32367.3020409@psu.edu>
Source record: 69102
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hank Oredson wrote:
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
>
>>That brings up a completely different point of contention for me! Chat
>>programs or other programs (using PC's on the air) is where we have
>>definitely fallen behind as a communications field/hobby.
>
>
>
> We run chat over NET/ROM here, and could run any of the
> tcp/ip based chats as well ... but there is near zero interest.
>
> 90% of the users are "stuck" in the 1984 world ... they use some
> VT100 emulator program to read and send messages at 1200 baud.

There can be more reasons than that. I'm not operating from a twenty year old perspective, and I have that same amount of interest in those chats.

> The other 10% use 9600 or 19200 links, run IP as well as AX.25,
> and are starting to use 13 cm links (811b) that support both IP
> and AX.25. The big question is how to convince that first 90% that
> faster links make more interesting applications possible :-)

There you have it. The keyword is interesting. If something interesting comes around, people will go to it. We shouldn't have a blind spot regarding our favorite portion of the hobby.

- mike KB3EIA -

2955. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 15:15:31 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcv8e9lnm1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69202

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EF31FB2.2050001@psu.edu...
> Robert wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> >
> >
> >>Hey Robert! Do you make a habit of searching really hard for something
> >>to argue about? No kidding that I can search out and find out who you
> >>are? Sheesh, I'm getting an education here.
> >>
> >>Fact is, you are posting anonymously.
> >
> >
> > Do you work this hard at being wrong all the time?
>
>
> Lots of us post here under our names. If not we have our names in our
> posts. You do neither, you aren't Robert Bake, and you don't put your
> whole name in your posts. it's all about transparency. No one here has
> to look up my name to see if I'm real or not

Of course they do - you can type _anything_ in that box.

> - though no doubt many do.

That's a sure sign of being just a bit obsessed and paranoid.

>
> >>If I wanted to find out who you
> >>were, I would have to work at it. And since your not being libelous, I'm
> >>not going to.
> >
> >
> > Well, if I wanted to find out who "Mike Coslo" is, I'd have to
work
> > at that, too, and just as hard.
>
>
> Uh-huh. go to arrl.org or QRZ.com, using my callsign provided. Lots of
> info about me in just a click.

So what? Mike (if that _is_ your real name) I don't CARE. (And
there's a valid argument to be made about making life easy for loons - I'm
not going to make it, but you've got ZERO business judging somebody using a
valid e-mail and their real name.)

> I decided to look you up, as a comparison
> and it took a bit longer.

Ah, well. You're showing early symptoms there.

> But discussing things with you is like trying to wrestle with eels.

Rrrright - I'm only in two discussions - one regarding the telephone system and ISP's in which it was EVERYBODY ELSE who was off chasing non-existent rabbits, and a rather pleasant chat about testing. Everything else is just allowing fools to demonstrate just how mind-numbingly stupid they are.

> We
> get all over the place and don't accomplish much. So be it.

Well, when the Dickies and the Brians come out of the gate with playground slurs, you're not going to get much focus.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2956. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 15:20:55 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcv8odlnv1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69203

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EF3220A.7000705@psu.edu...
> Robert wrote:
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> scribbled:
> >
> > *yawn*
> >
> > They sure grow 'em stupid wherever it is you're from.
>
>
> Awwp, you just can't play nice can ya?

The first uncivil exchange here was Dick:

"I don't think that Robert has all his wires hooked up....."

Rapidly followed by the unicellular organism Brian Kelly:

"Was prolly not here before desktop computers happened. Sheltered
existence. Needs to spend a long weekend in the deep woods without a
keyboard, matches or a UPS."

I didn't insult ANYBODY in my original post in this thread, I asked
questions and made observations.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2957. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 15:46:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcva72hni1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69103
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Another ASSumption Scott 69. I welcome new hams. I don't consider you a ham ... yet. You ain't paid any dues.

Don't like that? Get over it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message news:3EF25922.F36A4C12@yahoo.slam...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > Yes it does. You see I've also done the test thing. In front of the FCC.
> > Theory and all. One shot....if failed...come back in another 30 days to
> > try again.
> >
> > There is no comparison to what I did to what you did. Again... the answer
> > is YES.
>
>
> So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.
>
> Now we know the rest of the story...

2958. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 15:48:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bcva9u$vp0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69104

Hey everyone look here....Another ANDY. Damn and I thought the mold was broken. Lets get him Bruce.

Dan/W4NTI

"Scott #69!!!" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam> wrote in message news:3EF26BB9.29BBA6D0@yahoo.slam...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >So you are the type that unwelcomes new hams to the fraternity.
> >
> > What new Hams, dont you mean CBplussers?
>
> Call them what you will. Us newbies call you old farts for a reason,
> your thoughts smell.

2959. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 16:11:35 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EF33237.516D0FD2@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 69105

HAHAHAHAHA! You fragile dood!

2960. Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 16:12:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306200812.250451be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69106

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bctejb$ue1$1@nd.eastky.net>...

–

(Huge snip to save space)

> > I've got a list of operating skills you might like. Want me to repost
> > it?
>
> Sure, or e-mail it.

All right, then. This is a repost from a couple of years back.

Here's a list of desireable radio operator skills for hams.

Operator Skills

1) The skill to speak clearly, concisely and distinctly, at a steady rate, level and tone.

2) The skill to listen carefully and understand a transmission under both good and poor conditions.

3) The skill to judge radio conditions on a given frequency and how they are changing.

4) The skill to determine the mode of a received signal by ear or other means.

5) The skill to properly tune in a signal for best reception.

6) The skill to tune up and operate transmitters so as to maximize effectiveness and minimize interference.

7) The skill to correctly judge the radio conditions over a given path and adjust transmissions for best results.

8) The skill to correctly judge the skills of other operators and adjust transmissions for best results.

9) The skill to communicate effectively in less than optimum settings (heat, cold, lack of sleep, etc.)

10) The skill to communicate effectively under less than optimum radio conditions.

11) The skill to communicate effectively with less than optimum equipment.

12) The skill to use the standard phonetic alphabet smoothly and effectively, and judge when its use is needed.

13) The skill to use appropriate abbreviations and prosigns, and judge when they are needed.

14) The skill to write down received transmissions legibly and neatly so that others can easily read them.

15) The skill to write clear, coherent formal messages in standard form.

16) The skill to type, error free, at a rate that makes best use of the transmission mode.

17) The skill to deal with hostile and/or illegally operated stations.

18) The skill to do several things at once while on the air.

19) The skill to have situational awareness in all operating situations.

20) The skill to project a welcoming, friendly and helpful attitude on the air.

Howzat?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2961. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 16:21:53 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcvcb1$n4d$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69208

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> Howzat?

You were right - I do like it. Are you the author?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2962. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 16:48:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306200848.77467c5f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69107

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A011B156294elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in
> news:vf4orsqh5d7m5a@corp.supernews.com:

> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030619183729.15462.00000911@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >> In article <vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
> >> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:

> >> Maybe the compromise will be to keep S25.5 but allow countries to
> >> bypass it for ham licenses with no privileges below 136 kHz.....
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > You left out the decimal point. No privileges below 1.36kHz.
> >
> > Larry KC8EPO
> >
HAW! That's a good one, Larry!

> I think that you will find that the 'mod' (modify) proposals do make CW
> testing no longer compulsory. What they do that the 'sup' (supress)
> proposals don't is either add a laundry list of requirements of what
> should be tested in the theory tests and/or specifically say that code
> testing is optional, instead of just deleting (surpressing) any mention of
> it.

Interesting.

It's my understanding that the written tests in some other countries
are more involved than in the USA. Some would say "much more
involved". I dunno how Americans, the FCC, or other US agencies will
take to having the written test requirements dictated to them by
treaty. For many years, they have just been "whatever the country
deems appropriate and necessary", which can mean anything from EE
level down to a couple of simple questions.

Why they would propose spelling out code testing as something
noncompulsory is a mystery. They might as well say that a soldering
test is noncompulsory.
>
> I think that what we will most likely end up with is a version of s25
> derived by reconciling the various 'mod' proposals. It will incorporate
> (I'm guessing) ITU-R 1544, which is the laundry list of theory
> requirements. Since it was already written by the ITU, it would be hard to

> imagine it not making it's way into s25!

The difference is compulsory vs. recommended.

> It may say code testing is
> optional, or it may no longer mention it, one or the other.

Or it may somehow stay alive if some sort of deal is struck. Ya never
know until the fat lady sings.

> Hours will
> probably be wasted debating that point, whem the effect is the same either
> way.
>
Probably.
> I am reasonably sure that when the dust settles we will have specific
> theory testing requirements at the international level for the first time,

Will be REALLY interesting to see what FCC does if those requirements
aren't met by the current written tests.

> and it will be optional for member states to run code tests. We may know
> the answer this time next week, or perhaps the week after.

The conference closes July 1, right?

Then there's the matter of ratification by the USA.

btw, any news on the 40 meter situation?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2963. Re: Rants Fizzle...Jimmie's Going Down For The Long Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 17:00:48 UTC
From: "A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com>
Message-ID: <10e86c4d0cdd7e2970aedbde1b8619d9@melontraffickers.com>
Source record: 69108

In article <3EF1D064.C4BEF9A6@earthlink.net>
FATASS Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined

>
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <c2356669.0306180810.41867465@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (radio god N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030618000456.17796.00000918@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <3EEFD952.6695B14D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >But on June 10, Len Anderson wrote: "I've not "hurled insults at amateur
> > >> >radio in general."
> > >> >
> > >> >As Len reminds us, he is only here for civil debate.
> > >>
> > >> . I still haven't done any general insulting.
> > >
> > >Just lots and lots of specific insulting.
> >
> > . At specific individuals who claim to speak for "all ham radio."
>
> ...then you'll want to direct some of your invectives toward yourself.
..Then you'll wear 5 day old wrinkled clothes to a ham meeting and use cheap cologne to
cover up your horrible body odor.

> > . At specific people who think they are radio gods and every-
> > . thing they opine are the "truth."
>
> ...then you'll want to direct some of your invectives toward yourself.

..then you'll whine to anybody who'll listen...Lackland cub reporter <snicker>

> > . At specific people who like to insult, demean, and denigrate
> > . all those who do not think as they do.
>
> ...then you'll want to direct some of your invectives toward yourself.

Then you'll go put the feed in the hog trough to feed your family.

> > >> . I've done SATIRE on
> > >> . some of the more militant one-sided my-view-is-the-only-view
> > >> . crackpots in this groupie fest.
> > >
> > >Satire? Nobody else thought it was funny.
> >
> > . Tsk, tsk, tsk...many did. :-)
>
> Maybe I erred on my comments above. Change those to read "toward
> yourselves".

Dumbfuck Dave lost his sense of humor, but then, he never really had one since he was the butt of many jokes during his school years.

>
> > . Nope, that's your own receiving site, all full of exactly one kind
> > . of persona and energy...the ARRL kind...the one where you are
> > . directed to act in a certain way, think in a certain way, even
> > . worship in a certain way.
>
> You've never hurled any insults toward the ARRL or toward those who are
> members, have you?

PKB, ASSHOLE.

> > >oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
> > >way.
> >
> > . Yes, Jimmie. Only YOU and other radio gods are "involved with
> > . amateur radio in a meaningful way," trying vainly to keep it the
> > . way YOU want it regardless of anyone else's desires.
>
> - Why, Foggy, you aren't involved in amateur radio any ANY way.
> - That hasn't stopped you from trying to mold it into what YOU
> - want regardless of the desires of those who are actually radio
> - amateurs. What is any of this to you?
>
> Dave K8MN

Why FATASS, you've went to a ARES meeting solely to harass another ham, but that hasn't stopped you from making other posts anonymously about other hams, eh, DUMBASS?

2964. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:09:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620140939.08048.00000753@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69109

>Subject: Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/18/03 8:51 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EF06EA9.2E842A33@earthlink.net>

>> . Go back to reading your AARP bulletin, old man.
>
>...and you may resume reading the consumer information provided on the
>side of your box of prunes, even older man.

WHAMMMMMMM ! ! !

Nail struck squarely on head.

Nice shot, Dave !

73

Steve, K4CAP

2965. Crisis communications - the internet on 9/11

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:19:52 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcvj7u$pt8$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69207

See:

http://books.nap.edu/books/0309087023/html/1.html#pagetop

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2966. Re: Rants Fizzle...Jimmie's Going Down For The Long Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:23:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620142348.08048.00000754@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69110

>Subject: Rants Fizzle...Jimmie's Going Down For The Long Count...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/18/03 11:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030619002809.25052.00000669@mb-m11.aol.com>

>>Just lots and lots of specific insulting.
>
>. At specific individuals who claim to speak for "all ham radio

Uh huh.

I think it's cute how Lennie presumes that those of us who are ACTIVE in Amateur Radio practice should not presume to make comments on it's behalf, yet HE presumes to do just that WITHOUT the benefit of being a part of that which he would presume to regulate.

More evidence supporting my assertion that he's a PUTZ.

>At specific people who think they are radio gods and every-
>. thing they opine are the "truth."

I dare say someone who has PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE in Amateur Radio is a bit closer to it than someone who isn't.

>At specific people who like to insult, demean, and denigrate
>. all those who do not think as they do

You mean like people who call others jackbooted thugs, Nazis, elitists, etc etc etc, Lennie?

Oooooooops! That would BE Lennie!

>>Satire? Nobody else thought it was funny.
>
>. Tsk, tsk, tsk...many did.

Vipul? Brian Burke? Whoa......I am impressed.

>A problem with the self-righteous is that they cannot see such
>. humor. They think it is humiliation of their sacred opinions.

You mean like the laughter heard when I call you Putz, Your Scumminess, Licenseless One, etc etc etc...?!?!

>>When someone satirized or parodied you, Len, you got really upset.
>>Double standard...
>
>. Nope. I just return the favor.

Leonard H Anderson publishes yet another boldfaced LIE.

See: Jim Miccolis

>What's wrong with being a member of AARP, Jimmie?

In YOUR case, Oh Spiteful Putz, AARP stand for Anti-Amateur Radio Putz.
For everyone else, it's not a problem.

>>Here's a tip, Len: Try being positive in your postings here, instead
>>of negative.
>
>. Now now, PCTA breath, remember you aren't speaking for anyone
>. but yourself.

Wrong. I think he was rather eloquent and speaks for me too.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk, I meet all EPA and OHSA standards.

Even landfills and waste-dumps do that, Lennie...Still does not mean they
are any more pleasant to be around.

>>You never talk about how much FUN amateur radio is, how great a lot of
>>hams are as people, how many accomplishments hams have made...
>
>. Tsk, tsk...you haven't been to Google? You will find I DID say
>. that amateur radio is indeed a fun hobby. You are wrong, Jimmie.

Yeah...in the same context as a bigot says "A lot of my best friends are
...[ethnic group of your choice]..."

>I've never mentioned Al Walston, W6MJN, the best man at my
>. wedding? Or Jim Hall, KD6JG, the best manager I ever had?
>. Or Gene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, who was assigned to the same
>. Army radio station I was assigned to at the same time?

If you used MY call like that in defense of your lying, ranting and
dishonesty, you'd never darken my door again, rear-area radio clerk war buddy
or not.....

>Who can argue with a radio god?

You obviously can......

>>oh wait - you're Not Involved with amateur radio in any meaningful
>>way.
>
>. Yes, Jimmie. Only YOU and other radio gods are "involved with
>. amateur radio in a meaningful way," trying vainly to keep it the
>. way YOU want it regardless of anyone else's desires

Such as YOUR desires, Scummy One...?!?!

BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

Steve, K4CAP

2967. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:37:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620143746.08048.00000755@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69111

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/18/03 10:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030618234144.15932.00000666@mb-m29.aol.com>

>>Take Lennie and Brain for
>>example.
>
>You just make personal attacks to those that disagree with you.

Wrongo, Most Unenlightened One.

>>Talking, regardless of the content of the conversation, IS "socializing".
>
>Its fulfillment of <Ham> dharma (duty). Further support of the belief is done
>through contests, where one "works" the <required> bands. Morse code is
>another
>favorable point. One does disservice by operating for any other goals- for
>example 10-10 numbers.

I musta missed the part where Vippy was appointed the Decider Of What's
Favorable And What's Not In Amateur Radio. Anyone got a URL for that
one...?!?!

>>However, I don't think one has to give up
>>>everything else for the Ham activities. There was no need for the
>>compromise.
>
>Hams are not allowed to participate in non-radio activities. That's the
>compromise.

Oh? Says who? Does this mean I have to resign from the USHGA and the US
Air Force Auxiliary?

>Its an unwritten set of traditions.

It's a troll of Lennie-illian proportions.

>Its a "requirement" since most Hams don't deviate from it.

Most Amateurs I know are involved in numerous activities outside of
Amateur Radio.

>Neither is any participant allowed to deviate from it - Its
>how the events are organized.

I reiterate my previous question.

>Once you are at the event, you have no choice but
>to do what's scheduled at that event.

Who in the Blue Blazes goes to ANY event organized for ANY purpose just for the purpose of DEVIATING from what was "scheduled"???

What a FREAKIN' IDIOT... ! ! ! ! !

>Disclaimer: I don't mean ALL Hams or Ham-radio activity is anti-social - just
>most.

Oh..Gee whiz...I feel SOOOOOOOOO much better.....Kinda like the guys on the rifle detail who each think THEY had the blank round.

>The example you gave is close to what I mean about anti-social activity. Most
>Hams aren't "cool".

And how is it that in two years as an Amateur Radio licensee you've had the opportunity to meet enough hams to make that assertion?

Just when I start to get the feeling that maybe you're an OK guy afterall, Vipul, you make yet another idiotic post, rife with really stupid assertions and unfounded rhetoric.

Sheeeesh.

Steve, K4CAP

2968. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:47:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620144754.08048.00000756@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69112

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/19/03 7:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030619201236.23617.00000792@mb-m10.aol.com>
>
>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
>>> Hams are not allowed to participate in non-radio activities. That's the
>>> compromise.
>>
>>I don't know where you gained your knowledge of amateur radio, Vipul,
>>but that's one strange outlook you've developed.
>
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays
>
>>This is true of any activity put on by any organization of any type. I
>>belong to an amateur musical group. When I go to the scheduled rehearsals
>>and concerts, I must play my instrument. EVERY group acts this way. If you
>>participate in a group, the group defines what is allowed in the activity.
>
>For example, the DXpedition was in May. You had to pay <alot> extra to park
>near there, so I parked elsewhere and took the bus from there. Then, I got a
>ride from the host to the on-site shack. After, I got there I saw that most
>of
>the others paid the extra fee to park there.

So instead of paying the extra "X" dollars to park, you left your car out
of touch, rode on public transportation that DIDN'T take you to exactly where
you wanted to go, and probably spent and extra hour or two to save that
(probable) $2.00.

>The Hams operated radios all day, and all night. Eating was allowed. Every
>Ham
>ate.

Thank God for that...I can see the next-of-kin suing the contest sponsor
for neglect because Johnny died of malnourishment.

>Otherwise, there were no other activities.

Ham RADIO operators spending a weekend operating radios....Geeeeee...What a
bummer, huh? (Sheesh what an IDIOT)

> I did go on a few
>drives in another Ham's car with some other Hams and did some walks. One of
>the

>trips was just to pick up more food.

Hmmmmm.....Vippy just qualified for the USMC MOS 1369...

>Most of the other Hams did not even do
>that. Besides that, the event was at the shack.

Geeeeee...MORE bummers...A ham radio activity taking place at "the
shack"....How DARE they operate radios from a radio shack!

>Since it was a vacation spot. I wanted to do some vacation stuff. But, Hams
>do
>not like to do that. They had to operate all day and through the night. Since
>I
>did not have a car there, I was stuck there.

Wellllllll....WHO was the IDIOT who told you to park across town and ride
a bus, Vippy?

>It wasn't a required part of the event. The individual Hams chose not to do
>anything else.

Well shame on them for not consulting you about side trips to Disneyland,
Mr. Clueless.

Here's a head's up, Vippy....The shoe horn I am mailing you today is not
to help you INSERT something, but to help you get it OUT.

Try not to poke yourself in the eye, OK...?!?!

Steve, K4CAP

2969. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:51:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620145141.08048.00000757@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69113

>Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/16/03 10:09 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bckmif$fm3$1@nd.eastky.net>

>> Why do you post anonymously?
>
> For somebody who seems to know a little bit about the net, you don't
>know anything about anonymous posting. Do you know how to look at headers,
>check e-mail, look up my NNTP posting host? Give it a try, "Mike".

Just put your name at the end of the post along with your callsign and
quit being a troll, "Robert".

Steve, K4CAP

2970. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:52:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306201052.7f88df28@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69114

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcv2tcfql1@208.206.142.69>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306180943.53208fc9@posting.google.com>...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > > Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> > > > > call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most
> > > > > of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use phone, but I
> > > > > think you probably guessed that already.
> > > >
> > > > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> > > > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> > > > nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> > > > by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> > > > signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> > > > ask for because they might get it.
> > > >
> > > > w3rv
> > >
> > > Like having to beam across Japan to work Europe from Guam. I would
> > > have to work hundreds of JA's hoping the band didn't close before I
> > > got thru them all.
> > >
> > > Or I would call Europe only, and the JA's were very respectful and
> > > polite. No problems. When I would slip and leave Europe out of the
> > > CQ, there the JAs were again. Again, no problem.
> > >
> > > If only the Yanks were as well behaved, your premonition of DX having
> > > to hide...
> >
> > Exactly my point. Thankew.
>
> Should we go into the reasons why so many Yanks are not well behaved?

No doubt because they can't xcv with the DX right?

Hee. Sorry.

w3rv

2971. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:54:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620145443.08048.00000758@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69115

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/16/03 9:59 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bcklvkfdi1@nd.eastky.net>

>Dick, I qualified in submarines, spent nearly 10 years in the Navy,
>and worked with a little communications outfit at MacDill AFB you've never
>heard of.

That figures....Going down with seamen. Why am I not surprised?

>I've done things and been places that would leave you confused
>about whether to shit or go blind, and then you'd fart and close one eye.

Yep...talks like one too. No couth...no class....If ya can't out think
them, cuss them!

Steve, K4CAP

2972. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 18:59:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620145919.08048.00000759@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69116

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/20/03 12:16 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030620011651.17796.00000942@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>In article <3EF1D1E1.4000300@att.net>, Angelo Campanella
><a.campanella@att.net>
>writes:

Snipped repost...

I suppose there was a purpose behind Lennie completely reposting an item
and then not taking the opportunity to make one of his witless swipes at
Amateur Radio.

Steve, K4CAP

2973. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:02:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620150209.08048.00000760@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 69117

>Subject: Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/20/03 12:16 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030620011650.17796.00000941@mb-m15.aol.com>

>In article <bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
><kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

SNIP

Hmmmmmmmmm....twice in one day. Guess the Radio Professional has run out
of meaningful things to say so he just hits "reply" and let's us guess...?!?!

Steve, K4CAP

2974. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:40:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF36320.6050506@psu.edu>
Source record: 69118

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
>>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>>Date: 6/16/03 10:09 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <bckmif$fm3$1@nd.eastky.net>
>
>
>>>Why do you post anonymously?
>>
>> For somebody who seems to know a little bit about the net, you don't
>>know anything about anonymous posting. Do you know how to look at headers,
>>check e-mail, look up my NNTP posting host? Give it a try, "Mike".
>
>
> Just put your name at the end of the post along with your callsign and
> quit being a troll, "Robert".
>
> Steve, K4CAP

BINGO!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2975. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:41:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620154100.18497.00000819@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69122

In article <bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>That brings up a completely different point of contention for me! Chat
>programs or other programs (using PC's on the air) is where we have
>definitely fallen behind as a communications field/hobby.

There's always this newsgroup-chatroom dominated by a few
extremely regulars. :-)

>There are so many services that have dwarfed amateur radio at this point, in
>regards to digital technology that makes us look like we are in the stone
>ages.

The sages of this chatroom, er, newsgroup, will have everyone
believe that hams all over the world are using OOK CW right
now, therefore everyone licensed "must" be proficient in that
mode...ergo the code test is an absolute "must." :-)

>PSK31 is nice, but through a variety of reasons it is primarily only
>used on HF.

It was devised by Peter Martinez, G3PLX, a long-time innovator
in amateur radio and early proponent of direct-conversion
receivers and the Gingell polyphase network (circa 1974).
It is just one form out of many for written communications via
a very narrow bandwidth not requiring morse code skill.

A problem with the entrenched narrowbanders in hamdom is that
PSK31 invokes some information coding theory which seems
alien to those narrowbanders. They don't understand it, don't
want to understand it, it isn't "natural" and therefore it must be
downplayed and even denigrated since it is not like their own
superb skill at morsemanship.

There could be a lot more experimentation at digital voice on HF
except it, too, involves information coding theory and the narrow-
banders seem to think a thousand-dollar PC is "necessary" to
decode/encode digital voice. Such isn't necessary but the
narrowbanders will seize any opportunity to downplay anything
they feel is alien to the established order.

Digital voice IS being used on HF right now, both by governments
and SW broadcasters (three years on trials so far) and it DOES
work. Governments, particularly militaries, have used it longer on
HF to VHF, but few amateurs know what the signals sound like
so they simply cast it out. Their receivers can't demodulate the

signals so they dismiss it as just some kind of noise.

>It could be utilized on 6 meters where there is some equipment
>out there for ssb/cw. Technically speaking, it could also be used on FM, as
>discussed in an article in QST (in a 2000 or 2001 edition, I will look for
>it again....) for 2 meters or 70cm. There was a experiment done in this
>article where it showed promise on FM for locally based communications.

For local communications there is no need to go to the
narrowbandedness that is the main feature of PSK31.
Rather ordinary speech bandwidths can carry high rates of
data...the Plain Old Telephone System does just fine with
2400 BPS plus and that can translate to 2400 WPM text
rate no problem...or 1200 WPM with heavy forward error
detection/correction. That's far faster than the fastest
electromechanical teleprinter ever did.

>As far as packet, that has fallen so far behind, that it is a serious shame.
>Most of the programs are old, crappy DOS based programs, (am unaware of any
>Windows based programs) and with incredibly slow transmission speeds and
>limited file sharing capability, I am surprised it hasn't died out
>completely.

There's insufficient paradigm adjustment in amateur radio packet.
Most everyone involved seems content with the old ways before
the Internet and modeling on the BBSs for "up to date" methods.

Those not directly involved with packet have the entrenched idea
that PCs are again a "must" for operation. It isn't an absolute. The
PC can reduce the hardware to a bare minimum...and also enable
a lot of different modes and methods of communication. At 2400
BPS throughput, an old Commodore C64 can handle everything as
a "PC" to interface a keyboard, printer, and display. That or an
Apple][can do it and include some FEC. Or it could be hard-
wired or done with a Microchip PIC plus some added chips.

It's an equal mistake (compared to entrenched narrowbanders) to
use the Internet as some kind of model in determining what is
needed. It might be better to see what the early BBSs did and
how they were organized.

>Other modes of digital communcations, which are in the most basic sense,
>chat/contact/QSO related, are fine for jsut that, but overall we have fallen
>behind the mark. Currently there are some cities fairly close to me that
>have wide-area-internet-service that covers a 20-30 mile radius with speeds
>of over 20kps, (considering most dialups get 2kps-6kps)
>or more and the person can be almost anywhere with that radius and connect.
>I am not saying we should provide internet access, for those that want to
>read into that, but can you imagine working a disaster situation, where you
>have say for instance a dozen different operators able to send digital pics
>or even streaming video (to a point) possibly even simultaneous to net
>control or EOC's? Current packet speeds are not worth bothering for regular

>use, and limited message capability is another issue.

That's rather beyond the entrenched narrowband thinking again.
:-)

It's been a couple years since the first announcement of an HT accessory to take images and transmit JPG format images as well as display them. It didn't seem to meet with any ham market success...yet the cellular phones with picture capability are currently a rage with the general public. Entrenched thinking in amateur radio seems to be ears-only communications. ATV and slow-scan imagining never got to any big thing in hamdom.

>Look at what is commonly used with most law enforcement MDT's, which
>basically were spawned in part from ham radio packet radio. The are not
>perfect yet, but the capabilities are phenomenal compared to existing packet
>capabilities.

Sorry, Ryan, but law enforcement Mobile Data Terminals were modeled more on the military equivalents than any "ham radio packet." Those MDTs are really slow-speed things and work at speech bandwidths...which turns out to be quite fast in getting small quantities of data (wants-warrants, short IDs, etc.). Without the base station coupling to a computer network, the MDT becomes a coffee cup table in a black-and-white. Those MDTs could be modified relatively easily to interface directly with other MDTs, sort of one-on-one comm links similar to EKG direct transmissions to a hospital from an EMT wagon (which work in speech bandwidths).

>I know this is a little different than the intention of the thread, but I
>think we really need to look at our digital capabilities and see what we
>could do, work on getting those limitations that we have lifted and
>designing new and better ways that may make us the envy of other services,
>and making the technology so good that it may be emulated as other things
>amateur radio have been in the past such as cellphone technology, mobile
>data communicators as well as quite a few other technologies the general
>public now enjoys thanks to ham radio.

Ryan, I've been in the electronics industry for a long time. I really don't think that the general public "enjoys" anything it has now "thanks to ham radio" in the last half century. All of today's communications technologies got there through a lot of independent invention and innovation by the industry and by governments.

Cellular telephony would be nothing without a lot of independent work on achieving solid-state transistors to work at microwaves, general information theory to allow both cell switching, digitized voice, digital data compression, and the integrated circuit SoC (System on a Chip), power management that allows long time operation on a single charge.

Mobile Data Terminals are portable versions of solid-state computer terminals adapted for vehicular power and working over speech bandwidths. They now use some FEC and data compression which came about after the first computer terminals were made. In the US such MDTs trace their ancestry to the military TACFIRE and early comm terminals. The networking has its ancestry in the first BBS netting and, before that, the TTY tape relay systems of government and commerce.

2976. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:41:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620154101.18497.00000820@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69120

In article <3EF1D1E1.4000300@att.net>, Angelo Campanella <a.campanella@att.net>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> I personally like the top-end headroom that 1.5 gives, because
>> the voice can and does have components between 2.8 and 3 kHz
>> whereas very little is found below 200 Hz.
>
> I have out a lot of thought into this (speech intelligibility vs audio
>frequencies). So much so that I limit the low frequency audio in all my
>household devices such as TV and radio audio. The brain requires little or no
>audio below about 300 Hz. That is where the voice fundamental is located
>(100=basso, 300=soprano). The vowels and consonant are all at 500 and above.
>The energy up to 10 kHz is "useful", but not mandatory.

Some time about 1960 at the Ramo-Wooldridge Metrology Lab,
lunchtime talk turned to a minimum speech bandwidth. Having
two variable lowpass-highpass filters in for calibration allowed
setting up a 36 db per octave slope away from set cutoff frequency.
Five of us said a standard sentence each into a tape recorder and
we played that back through the filters at various cutoff settings,
then determined if the recorded sentences were clear enough for
understanding. All the five speakers were male and Lab Manager
Ed Dodds, W6AFU, was the one who brought up the subject.

Minimum useable bandwidth was determined as 500 to 1500 Hz.
Individual voices were recognizeable although they had a "hollow"
quality. Sibillants were still heard even if the upper end of the
bandwidth was down to 1.5 KHz.

As far as a rather limited, spur-of-the-moment test went, the
maleness of voices seemed more due to a modulation of
higher tones than requiring an actual low frequency cutoff
further down in the speech spectrum. [we also had a scope on
the filter output, slow time base]

>> What does the Bell standards say?
>
> Ma Bell determined generations ago that up less than 2,000 is bad, to
2500Hz is
>vital, 3000 is nice, and beyond 3000 as not price effective (but sure sounds
>pretty). On the low end, "Naturalness" ("nice") required 200. I say that the
>audio below 500 is not worth the bandwidth it devours.

Telephone standards for speech bandwidth were determined for
lots of different reasons, including "natuaralness" (to please the
customer) with the upper end determined by the need to have
equalization of longlines at the limit of central office to
subscriber loop.

>An article by Kryter in the 1950's declared that if you wanted to do speech
with
>the absolute MINIMUM band, a 500Hz wide band from 750-1250 Hz was
>appropriate.
>If you decided at devote 1 kHz of spectrum to the task, then two bands, one
from
>250-750 and one from 1250 to 1750 would do. If three 500 Hz bands, then add a
>third 500 as from 2250 to 2750.

I recall a number of different experimenters of the 1950s on
speech bandwidths, including a lot of vocoder projects. At
that time in amateur radio, hams were just picking up on SSB.
It was of several such tests and articles that sparked the
lunchtime conversation.

2977. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:41:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620154102.18497.00000821@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69119

In article <bcv2tcfql1@208.206.142.69>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> > If only the Yanks were as well behaved, your premonition of DX having
>> > to hide...
>>
>> Exactly my point. Thankew.
>
> Should we go into the reasons why so many Yanks are not well behaved?

Anyone can read your postings and understand... :-)

2978. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:41:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620154103.18497.00000822@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69121

In article <bcuvqt$pm9$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgrbl1c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On 19 Jun 2003 14:20:46 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >> How many Techs (or anybody else, for that matter) know the entire
>> >> phonetic alphabet?
>>
>> >I know it - learned it 35+ years ago, as a Novice.
>>
>> All the Techs on our ARES/RACES daily net check-in do because we
>> check in with standard ITU phonetics.
>>
>> >> Too many people grew up on a diet of 1-Adam 12, etc. and have been
>> >> overexposed to the excreble result of the telecom union and "Frank,
>Adam,
>> >> Baker, heck, lets just make it up as we go' phonetic alphabet.
>>
>> >If someone doesn't intend to operate 'phone, why require that they
>> >learn the phonetic alphabet? And which one is THE correct one?
>>
>> There are (at least) three "standard" phonetic alphabets:
>>
>> ICAO/ITU/lots of others: Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta....
>> APCO (US Public Safety): Adam, Boy, Charles, David....
>> The Ma Bell's Operators: America, Boston, Chicago, Denver.....
>>
>> The first two I learned decades ago from using them. The third is
>> a dim memory (I dated a Long Lines operator in the dim past....)
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>Interesting...the MaBell operator one. I can tell you that by the mid-70s
>that MaBell phonetic wasn't being taught or used anymore. I was a
>supervicor
>in a Long Lines overseas operator office (32 A of A in NYC) from 74 to 75.
>
>The ICAO/ITU one was used in the military when I was in the Navy
>during 66-70.

It was first known as the "NATO Phonetic Alphabet" when it came
into being in the US military in 1955. The International Civil
Aviation Organization (ICAO) adopted it shortly thereafter since
the ICAO standardized spoken Air Traffic Control language as

English.

1955 was 48 years ago. :-)

2979. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:41:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF36384.20903@psu.edu>
Source record: 69123

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/20/03 12:16 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030620011651.17796.00000942@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <3EF1D1E1.4000300@att.net>, Angelo Campanella
>><a.campanella@att.net>
>>writes:
>
>
> Snipped repost...
>
> I suppose there was a purpose behind Lennie completely reposting an item
> and then not taking the opportunity to make one of his witless swipes at
> Amateur Radio.

You have to admit, it was better than most of his posts 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2980. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 19:59:20 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcvp2b$sk9$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69205

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030620145141.08048.00000757@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
> >Date: 6/16/03 10:09 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bckmif$fm3$1@nd.eastky.net>
>
> >> Why do you post anonymously?
> >
> > For somebody who seems to know a little bit about the net, you
don't
> >know anything about anonymous posting. Do you know how to look at
headers,
> >check e-mail, look up my NNTP posting host? Give it a try, "Mike".
>
> Just put your name at the end of the post along with your callsign
and
> quit being a troll, "Robert".

I have to make my home address available on the internet to satisfy
you? Think again.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2981. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 20:29:06 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bcvqqltai1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69206

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030620145443.08048.00000758@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....
> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
> >Date: 6/16/03 9:59 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bcklvkfdi1@nd.eastky.net>
>
> >Dick, I qualified in submarines, spent nearly 10 years in the Navy,
> >and worked with a little communications outfit at MacDill AFB you've
never
> >heard of.
>
> That figures....Going down with seamen. Why am I not surprised?

A gay-flame - says a lot more about you than it does about me.
What's your beef with the military, anyway? 4F due to terminal cranio-rectal
defilade?

> >I've done things and been places that would leave you confused
> >about whether to shit or go blind, and then you'd fart and close one eye.
>
> Yep...talks like one too. No couth...no class....If ya can't out
think
> them, cuss them!

"Out-think"? He'd have to be engaged in something resembling thought
for me to worry about out-doing him at it.
He's dishing it out - if he can't take it, oh well.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2982. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 20:51:33 UTC
From: "Dr. John" <frellyou@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <pss6fv4amoqj0cp5egm2kv6rhl9hq1spi5@4ax.com>
Source record: 69124
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 20 Jun 2003 05:50:46 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) belch-spoke these words:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
>> That brings up a completely different point of contention for me! Chat
>> programs or other programs (using PC's on the air) is where we have
>> definitely fallen behind as a communications field/hobby.
>
>I think there is an answer to all of it. The general ham population is
>simply not going bother with modes and technolgies which are simply
>reguritations of what they can get with a $15/month dialup
>connection. Ham radio will survive by being able to do what the
>Internet cannot do. However this is a swamp with no end because it
>involves personal preferences and perceptions which in turn makes ham
>radio unique amongst the radio services. Comparisons with what the
>other services are doing with advanced technologies therefore are
>generally moot when it comes to ham radio.

Good luck getting practically totally reliable VoIP on dialup. I tried. I failed.

John

2983. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 21:39:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <maLIa.649$Vx2.278559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69125
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dr. John" <frellyou@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:pss6fv4amoqj0cp5egm2kv6rhl9hq1spi5@4ax.com...
> On 20 Jun 2003 05:50:46 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) belch-spoke
these words:
>
> Good luck getting practically totally reliable VoIP on dialup. I tried. I
failed.
>
> John

Might possibly be that particular ISP. I subscribe to two different ones,
both dialup. On one of them I can almost never get a hookup. Something in
their firewall system interferes. On the other one I can always get a
practical, reliable hookup. The odd thing is that the one that works is the
"busier" system.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2984. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 21:48:18 UTC
From: 51629A <allforemus1@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ef3812a@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 69126

"lcs Mixmaster Remailer" <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu> wrote in message
news:20030620060001.18964.qmail@nym.alias.net...
> In article <3ef214e4@snipnews.snip.net>
> "51629A" <allforemus1@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > Remember Dave, <much asskissing from High-el's gay lover]
>
> So, how DO you 51629A, get that malformed
> head of yours up FATASS High-el's ass and still breathe?

Not at all W.W. Such activity is old-hat. But to show U what a nice
guy I am here ae some links for you. Please note that
this is *very* heavy reading, you will likely need a minimum
of a MS to comprehend it, but, I hink you should find it amusing!

Enjoy!

A sampling:
http://www.unf.edu/classes/freshmancore/halsall/rabelais-goose.htm

The COMPLETE work!
http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Olympus/6868/gargant/gaxx002.html

FAQ http://www.historyguide.org/intellect/rabelais.html

2985. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 21:55:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CpLIa.654$Vx2.280216@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69127

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bcv08f$3f1$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
>
> Depends on what you mean by "appropriate". If you
> mean the FCC, because it had the ITU one as a set of test
> questions, wants hams to use that one, then I guess you could
> say it is the appropriate one.
>
> If it is simply a matter of better understanding, any one would
> do as long as the words were recognizable.
>
> Would you find my call sign any more or less difficult
> to understand if I said: Kingdom two unckle nancy kingdon
> instead of
> Kilo two uniform november kilo?
>

It would be more difficult in the first case than in the second. The ITU "standard" phonetic alphabet words were selected on the basis that they were, in general, relatively easy to pronounce for most people regardless of their native tongue and relatively easy to understand even when mispronounced. They didn't succeed 100% but they didn't do a bad job either.

In addition, if we all use and are accustomed to the same phonetics, our brains will respond automatically rather than having to take the split second to translate the unusual phonetic.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2986. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:22:23 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf72blrp5mpp6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69128

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0306200848.77467c5f@posting.google.com...
> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A011B156294elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > "lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in
> > news:vf4orsqh5d7m5a@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030619183729.15462.00000911@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > >> In article <vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
> > >> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:

> > I think that you will find that the 'mod' (modify) proposals do make CW
> > testing no longer compulsory. What they do that the 'sup' (supress)
> > proposals don't is either add a laundry list of requirements of what
> > should be tested in the theory tests and/or specifically say that code
> > testing is optional, instead of just deleting (surpressing) any mention
of
> > it.

> Interesting.

> It's my understanding that the written tests in some other countries
> are more involved than in the USA. Some would say "much more
> involved". I dunno how Americans, the FCC, or other US agencies will
> take to having the written test requirements dictated to them by
> treaty. For many years, they have just been "whatever the country
> deems appropriate and necessary", which can mean anything from EE
> level down to a couple of simple questions.
>
> Why they would propose spelling out code testing as something
> noncompulsory is a mystery. They might as well say that a soldering
> test is noncompulsory.

Yep!

> > I think that what we will most likely end up with is a version of s25
> > derived by reconciling the various 'mod' proposals. It will incorporate
> > (I'm guessing) ITU-R 1544, which is the laundry list of theory
> > requirements. Since it was already written by the ITU, it would be hard
to
> > imagine it not making it's way into s25!
>
> The difference is compulsory vs. recommended.

From the IARU web site:

"Agenda item 1.7.1 (Article 25): The proposals relating to 1.7.1 were introduced in Working Group 4C and referred to Sub-Working Group 4C3 for discussion and possible decision. On Friday afternoon the proposals were introduced in 4C3, along with the information paper containing the views of the IARU."

"The USA withdrew its proposals on 1.7.1 in favor of the Inter-American Proposals, which is favorable for us because the IAPs include incorporation by reference of Recommendation ITU-R M.1544 whereas the USA proposals did not."

"The other differences between the various proposals under 1.7.1 were identified, but no effort as yet has been made to resolve them."

> > It may say code testing is optional, or it may no longer mention it,
> > one or the other.
>
> Or it may somehow stay alive if some sort of deal is struck. Ya never
> know until the fat lady sings.

The house light a dimming, an she about to sing.

> > Hours will probably be wasted debating that point,
> > when the effect is the same either way.

> Probably.

> > I am reasonably sure that when the dust settles we will have specific
> > theory testing requirements at the international level for the first
time,

> Will be REALLY interesting to see what FCC does if those requirements
> aren't met by the current written tests.

I would expect the current VEC written exams to met the M1544 recommendation if it becomes a manatory incorporation by reference. At most the FCC might need to renact 47 CFR 97.503(c) with a new topic list. The USA position opposes the mandatory incorporation by reference of M1544.

> > and it will be optional for member states to run code tests. We may know
> > the answer this time next week, or perhaps the week after.
>
> The conference closes July 1, right?

The conference end July 4.

> Then there's the matter of ratification by the USA.
>
> btw, any news on the 40 meter situation?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Larry KC8EPO

2987. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:24:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgsej3i.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69129

On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 07:53:24 -0400, lk wrote:

>Some FCC documents are given DA numbers. Are all DA numbered
>documents, decision by staff?

DA = Delegated Authority.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2988. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:24:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgsew4j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69130

On 20 Jun 2003 09:12:53 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>Here's a list of desireable radio operator skills for hams.
>
(Twenty GOOD skills listed)

Add to that - the skill of knowing what the FCC Rules allow that
operator's class of license to do and not to do without having to
look it up.

Just like the Driver License......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2989. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:24:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgsi0xk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69131

On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 08:45:17 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> ICAO/ITU/lots of others: Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta....
>> APCO (US Public Safety): Adam, Boy, Charles, David....
>> The Ma Bell's Operators: America, Boston, Chicago, Denver.....
>>
>> The first two I learned decades ago from using them. The third is
>> a dim memory (I dated a Long Lines operator in the dim past....)
>

>Interesting...the MaBell operator one. I can tell you that by the
>mid-70s that MaBell phonetic wasn't being taught or used anymore.

My exposure to that was in the late 50s......it's listed somewhere
but I can't put my hands on it.

>The ICAO/ITU one was used in the military when I was in the Navy
>during 66-70.

That one I was exposed to when I started hamming in the early 50s.

And then there was the WW-II era "military" phonetics:

Able, Baker, Charlie, Dog, Easy, Fox ....

And finally, the ARRL had its own (found in the 1965 "Radio
Amateur's Handbook") which was a mish-mash of several others:

Adam, Baker, Charlie, David, Edward, Frank.......

> I was a supervicor in a Long Lines overseas operator office (32 A of
> A in NYC) from 74 to 75.

"This is a test transmission for circuit adjustment purposes from a
radio station of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.
This statsion is located near New York City."

How well I remember that as a SWL in NYC in the early 50s, and again
when we would set up the HF circuits from Tel Aviv to NY in the
mid-60s. I even got to talk on the order wire to one of the NY
techs once from Rishpun (the transmitting station north of TA) when
they were having some problem. It was a double-hop path, as I
remember it. We preferred the path from TA to Paris and then on
TAT-4 to NY for reliability. All gone now, replaced by satellites
and underseas cable in the Med and the Atlantic.

Olde Farte Memories.......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2990. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:29:44 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <05p6fvo2e9sau49dcurd16md4l1vin0ipp@4ax.com>
Source record: 69183

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 01:50:15 +0200, Fritz Wuehler
<fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:

>
>Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
>CW will be abolished.

Not exactly. The requirement for testing Morse proficiency as a
prerequisite to getting a license might be abolished, but the use of
the mode on the air will not be abolished, and those who enjoy using
it will be free to continue to do so...which is as it should be.

>The dream will become reality and old farts CW
>coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
>mass on the HF bands.

I hope not, since this would require (1) operating another mode in a
part of the bands currently reserved for CW and data, and (2) hams
deliberately interfering with other stations - both of which were
still considered very bad form last time I checked.

>In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
>half of ham operators that are technicians. Think
>that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
>that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.

If you mean the abolishment of the testing requirement, yes, I think
it will open the door to more hams getting licenses that grant HF
privileges. If you mean the abolishment of the mode, that's not going
to happen anytime soon, nor should it.

>The new challenge will be probably to get a
>DXCC with digital modes like PSK31 in QRP
>mode,

...which anyone with the appropriate license is free to pursue now...

>although silly hams will continue their
>pollution of the bands with kW amplifiers to
>smash other stations (see the ads on the net of
>hams selling a 2 kW amp to buy a 5kW one,
>etc ...).

You seem to have a fetish about stations smashing each other. Perhaps
you picked the wrong hobby. This is radio, not demolition derby.

>Most of hams have a bad antenna system. 2 kW
>are not necessary to make a QSO. You can get

>a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
>your antenna acts like a resistor.

This is truer than many people realize. However, not everyone lives where it is possible for them to erect an ideal antenna system - so we make do with what we're able to put up.

>Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
>reports. 56 is sufficient considering the QRN.

You should listen to the Century Club nets some time. There are routinely successful contacts made with signal reports of 2/2. Furthermore, the difference between 5/9(+60dB) and 5/6 is a lot less than the difference between 100 watts PEP and 1500 watts PEP.

>Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
>and peace and love for all !

Ah! Finally, something we agree on.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

2991. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:29:47 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <rcu6fvsi0220ovvf5ksaiaoibfredbgm99@4ax.com>
Source record: 69184

On 21 Jun 2003 20:42:56 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>In the US such MDTs trace their ancestry to the
>> military TACFIRE and early comm terminals.
>
> And of course this was some blackhat program YOU were involved in, no
>doubt..?!?!

TACFIRE (AN/GSG-10) was a system composed of computers and remote devices linked by digital communications using both radio and wire commo equipment, which automated field artillery command and control functions. It was replaced by IFSAS (Initial Fire Support Automated System, not to be confused with Martec's explosion analysis software by the same acronym) beginning in 1994.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

2992. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:32:17 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <8r27fvgv9321pe6r73nvqf1r2lidj9mei0@4ax.com>
Source record: 69185

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 01:50:15 +0200, Fritz Wuehler
<fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:

>
>Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
>CW will be abolished.

Not exactly. The requirement for testing Morse proficiency as a
prerequisite to getting a license might be abolished, but the use of
the mode on the air will not be abolished, and those who enjoy using
it will be free to continue to do so...which is as it should be.

>The dream will become reality and old farts CW
>coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
>mass on the HF bands.

I hope not, since this would require (1) operating another mode in a
part of the bands currently reserved for CW and data, and (2) hams
deliberately interfering with other stations - both of which were
still considered very bad form last time I checked.

>In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
>half of ham operators that are technicians. Think
>that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
>that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.

If you mean the abolishment of the testing requirement, yes, I think
it will open the door to more hams getting licenses that grant HF
privileges. If you mean the abolishment of the mode, that's not going
to happen anytime soon, nor should it.

>The new challenge will be probably to get a
>DXCC with digital modes like PSK31 in QRP
>mode,

...which anyone with the appropriate license is free to pursue now...

>although silly hams will continue their
>pollution of the bands with kW amplifiers to
>smash other stations (see the ads on the net of
>hams selling a 2 kW amp to buy a 5kW one,
>etc ...).

You seem to have a fetish about stations smashing each other. Perhaps
you picked the wrong hobby. This is radio, not demolition derby.

>Most of hams have a bad antenna system. 2 kW
>are not necessary to make a QSO. You can get

>a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
>your antenna acts like a resistor.

This is truer than many people realize. However, not everyone lives where it is possible for them to erect an ideal antenna system - so we make do with what we're able to put up.

>Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
>reports. 56 is sufficient considering the QRN.

You should listen to the Century Club nets some time. There are routinely successful contacts made with signal reports of 2/2. Furthermore, the difference between 5/9(+60dB) and 5/6 is a lot less than the difference between 100 watts PEP and 1500 watts PEP.

>Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
>and peace and love for all !

Ah! Finally, something we agree on.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

2993. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:32:19 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <gq27fvgcv8qt2squ9vli7tbulvbq7s25g9@4ax.com>
Source record: 69186

On 21 Jun 2003 20:42:56 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>In the US such MDTs trace their ancestry to the
>> military TACFIRE and early comm terminals.
>
> And of course this was some blackhat program YOU were involved in, no
>doubt..?!?!

TACFIRE (AN/GSG-10) was a system composed of computers and remote devices linked by digital communications using both radio and wire commo equipment, which automated field artillery command and control functions. It was replaced by IFSAS (Initial Fire Support Automated System, not to be confused with Martec's explosion analysis software by the same acronym) beginning in 1994.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

2994. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:33:30 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <it27fvch1441amfgfi0890gboe40br1ad6@4ax.com>
Source record: 69187

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 01:50:15 +0200, Fritz Wuehler
<fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:

>
>Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
>CW will be abolished.

Not exactly. The requirement for testing Morse proficiency as a
prerequisite to getting a license might be abolished, but the use of
the mode on the air will not be abolished, and those who enjoy using
it will be free to continue to do so...which is as it should be.

>The dream will become reality and old farts CW
>coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
>mass on the HF bands.

I hope not, since this would require (1) operating another mode in a
part of the bands currently reserved for CW and data, and (2) hams
deliberately interfering with other stations - both of which were
still considered very bad form last time I checked.

>In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
>half of ham operators that are technicians. Think
>that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
>that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.

If you mean the abolishment of the testing requirement, yes, I think
it will open the door to more hams getting licenses that grant HF
privileges. If you mean the abolishment of the mode, that's not going
to happen anytime soon, nor should it.

>The new challenge will be probably to get a
>DXCC with digital modes like PSK31 in QRP
>mode,

...which anyone with the appropriate license is free to pursue now...

>although silly hams will continue their
>pollution of the bands with kW amplifiers to
>smash other stations (see the ads on the net of
>hams selling a 2 kW amp to buy a 5kW one,
>etc ...).

You seem to have a fetish about stations smashing each other. Perhaps
you picked the wrong hobby. This is radio, not demolition derby.

>Most of hams have a bad antenna system. 2 kW
>are not necessary to make a QSO. You can get

>a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
>your antenna acts like a resistor.

This is truer than many people realize. However, not everyone lives where it is possible for them to erect an ideal antenna system - so we make do with what we're able to put up.

>Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
>reports. 56 is sufficient considering the QRN.

You should listen to the Century Club nets some time. There are routinely successful contacts made with signal reports of 2/2. Furthermore, the difference between 5/9(+60dB) and 5/6 is a lot less than the difference between 100 watts PEP and 1500 watts PEP.

>Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
>and peace and love for all !

Ah! Finally, something we agree on.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

2995. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:33:32 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <0t27fvg5i89eaeggacf1fc07p5boi9aljn@4ax.com>
Source record: 69188

On 21 Jun 2003 20:42:56 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>In the US such MDTs trace their ancestry to the
>> military TACFIRE and early comm terminals.
>
> And of course this was some blackhat program YOU were involved in, no
>doubt..?!?!

TACFIRE (AN/GSG-10) was a system composed of computers and remote devices linked by digital communications using both radio and wire commo equipment, which automated field artillery command and control functions. It was replaced by IFSAS (Initial Fire Support Automated System, not to be confused with Martec's explosion analysis software by the same acronym) beginning in 1994.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

2996. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 22:45:09 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bd02p9$g2$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69209

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgsew4j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 20 Jun 2003 09:12:53 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Here's a list of desireable radio operator skills for hams.
> >
> (Twenty GOOD skills listed)
>
> Add to that - the skill of knowing what the FCC Rules allow that
> operator's class of license to do and not to do without having to
> look it up.

Well, there's only going to be room for "x" number of questions.....

> Just like the Driver License......

Well, an ordinary driver's license leaves plenty of room for "on the
job" type training and learning.
If your saying some things should be "reflexive", I agree - we'll
probably differ on what some of those things _are_, and, to run with your
analogy, differ on what the tests should be for a learner's permit, a
driver's license, a CDL, etc.

But to put a different spin on your point, a skilled operator should
have the sense (and should be trained) to look up something if he's not sure
about it. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I suspect that out-of-band ops are
the sort of thing that get under people's skin, no?
Then, which is more desirable: ask a handful of questions on the
subject, leaving the testee feeling he has a grasp of what's going on (which
apparently some number of them don't), OR teach them that there's some
things Thou Shalt Double-Check Or Else. Which is better? My training tends
towards the latter.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

2997. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 23:31:56 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620193156.11559.00000729@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 69132

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> So instead of paying the extra "X" dollars to park, you left your car out
>of touch, rode on public transportation that DIDN'T take you to exactly where
>you wanted to go, and probably spent and extra hour or two to save that
>(probable) $2.00.

It was around $60 more, not $2.00.

> Every
>>Ham
>>ate.
>
> Thank God for that...I can see the next-of-kin suing the contest sponsor
>for neglect because Johnny died of malnourishment.

I meant every Ham ate alot. And it was not healthy food. I know that because my
urine was a dark brown color after eating the food.

>Ham RADIO operators spending a weekend operating radios....Geeeeee...What a
>bummer, huh?

I expected to operate radios, even wanted to. I did not expect that it would be
entire days and nights.

>> I did go on a few
>>drives in another Ham's car with some other Hams and did some walks. One of
>>the
>>trips was just to pick up more food.
>
> Hmmmmm.....Vippy just qualified for the USMC MOS 1369...

Actually, the drives were an enjoyable break.

>Wellllllll....WHO was the IDIOT who told you to park across town and ride
>a bus, Vippy?

Actually, I didn't know you could take your car until after I got there. The
event invitation told me to park first, then take the bus there. Even if I
knew, I probably would not have taken my car since they charge alot more for
it. However, <most of the> others did take their cars.

> Well shame on them for not consulting you about side trips to
>Disneyland,
>Mr. Clueless.
>

Well, if someone had consulted me, I could have clued them in.

>>Once you are at the event, you have no choice but
>>to do what's scheduled at that event.
>
> Who in the Blue Blazes goes to ANY event organized for ANY purpose just
>for
>the purpose of DEVIATING from what was "scheduled"???

I do that at East facing ritual ceremonies and <some> Ham radio events.

2998. 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 23:50:15 UTC
From: Fritz Wuehler <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org>
Message-ID: <81760f5e6ac310e843eeeea74938e7cd@remailer.frell.eu.org>
Source record: 69133

Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
CW will be abolished.
The dream will become reality and old farts CW
coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
mass on the HF bands.
In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
half of ham operators that are technicians. Think
that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.
The new challenge will be probably to get a
DXCC with digital modes like PSK31 in QRP
mode, although silly hams will continue their
pollution of the bands with kW amplifiers to
smash other stations (see the ads on the net of
hams selling a 2 kW amp to buy a 5kW one,
etc ...).
Most of hams have a bad antenna system. 2 kW
are not necessary to make a QSO. You can get
a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
your antenna acts like a resistor.
Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
reports. 56 is sufficient considering the QRN.
So, please stop using kW amplifiers (you generate
splatters, harmonics, etc ... on the bands) and use
digital modes with low RF power. Remember that
HF bands are international and that you must
SHARE them with hams of other countries.

Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
and peace and love for all !

2999. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-20 23:53:26 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0306201553.2ba2ad49@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69134

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0306171714.64de1603@posting.google.com>...
> "FannyFarmer" <ffarm50c5e3@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3eef9c02@snipnews.snip.net>...
> > "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:5f4fe4c2.0306171236.556a686d@posting.google.com...
> >
> > > This group has GOT to be violating Yahoo's Terms of Service. If Yahoo
> > > and the FCC get enough complaints, this menace can be shut down before
> > > it has the chance to get going.
> >
> > Why is this group a "menace"?
> > I too can think of many yahoo
> > groups and sites that are on the
> > razor's edge of legality, however this
> > is the INTERNET and last I
> > checked you can discuss anything.
>
> BS. Conspiracy is against the law - even on the Internet.
>
> > If you don't like it - DON'T GO THERE!
>
> So - if I hear/see two guys planning to rob a bank, I shouldn't call
> the cops?
>
> > There is a "wastewater treatment plant" about 3
> > miles West of me. On warm days like we are
> > having now it stinks of....well...of shi+.
> > Do I go there and park my car outside the gates
> > and complain about the smell? No! I just AVOID
> > the place.
>
> Quit changing the subject. We were talking about ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES,
> not legal wastewater treatment plants.
>
> > The SAME principal holds true for net sites and Yahoo Groups.
>
> Legal ones yes. Illegal ones, no.
>
> Given your slant on things, Yahoo should allow the "Bankrobber's of
> America Group", or the "Terrorist's Bombmaking Tips Group".
>
> This group has been in existance for only a few weeks now... but now
> that the light of day is being placed on it, I don't expect it to last

> more than a few more weeks.
>
> - Stewart

Aaron is that you????

3000. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 00:06:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd07fd$57h$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69135

Remember what happened to Da Fader Land Fritz? He had a similar idea.
Good luck.

Dan/W4NTI

"Fritz Wuehler" <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote in message
news:81760f5e6ac310e843eeeea74938e7cd@remailer.frell.eu.org...
>
> Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
> CW will be abolished.
> The dream will become reality and old farts CW
> coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
> mass on the HF bands.
> In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
> half of ham operators that are technicians. Think
> that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
> that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.
> The new challenge will be probably to get a
> DXCC with digital modes like PSK31 in QRP
> mode, although silly hams will continue their
> pollution of the bands with kW amplifiers to
> smash other stations (see the ads on the net of
> hams selling a 2 kW amp to buy a 5kW one,
> etc ...).
> Most of hams have a bad antenna system. 2 kW
> are not necessary to make a QSO. You can get
> a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
> your antenna acts like a resistor.
> Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
> reports. 56 is sufficient considering the QRN.
> So, please stop using kW amplifiers (you generate
> splatters, harmonics, etc ... on the bands) and use
> digital modes with low RF power. Remember that
> HF bands are international and that you must
> SHARE them with hams of other countries.
>
> Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
> and peace and love for all !
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>

3001. READ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 00:19:25 UTC
From: Todd Daugherty <toddaug@consolidated.net>
Message-ID: <3ef3a5bb$1_5@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 69136

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&ncid=1293&e=1&u=/nm/20030620/tc_nm/telecoms_pushtotalk_dc&sid=95573419

This need's to be read.....I think Nextel is full of it.....PTT and Push To Talk has been around a long time. I have some old ham radio manuals that talk about PTT.

Todd N9OGL

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3002. Re: READ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 00:33:42 UTC
From: Todd Daugherty <toddaug@consolidated.net>
Message-ID: <3ef3a913$1_5@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 69137

NEW YORK (Reuters) - Nextel Communications Inc. (Nasdaq:NXTL <http://us.rd.yahoo.com/dailynews/finance/nm/tc_nm/storytext/*http://finance.yahoo.com/q?s=nxtl&d=t> - news <http://us.rd.yahoo.com/dailynews/biz/nm/tc_nm/storytext/*http://biz.yahoo.com/n/n/nxtl.html>) said on Friday it would use trademark law to stop emerging rivals of its 10-year-old walkie-talkie service from using the term "push-to-talk" to describe their products. But lawyers said Nextel, the No. 5 U.S. wireless telephone company and so far the only one to offer a feature on a phone that allows customers to talk at the push of a button, could face an uphill battle to protect the term.

"You can't use trademark law to remove words from the dictionary and prevent their ordinary use," said Steven Bauer, a partner in the intellectual property group at Boston law firm Testa, Hurwitz & Thibeault.

"They may have been the first ones to call it push-to-talk but being the first one to call it that doesn't mean you're the only one who can call it that," said Bauer who argued that the phrase was too generic to be a strong trademark.

Nextel, which also uses the brand name Direct Connect to describe the service, said in a statement on Friday the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office had approved registration of Push to Talk and its abbreviated form PTT as trademarks.

"It makes smart and strategic sense to protect a name that refers to a brand," said Nextel spokesperson Audrey Schaefer.

If another company used the term push-to-talk Nextel would "notify the organization that Nextel owns the rights to that label," Schaefer said.

Nextel's service has been a huge hit among small work groups such as technicians, construction workers and salesmen in the field who rely on the push-to-talk feature to ask colleagues for answers to quick questions. Such walkie-talkie interactions are a convenient alternative to having to dial a number on a phone.

A spokesperson for Verizon Wireless (NYSE:VZ <http://us.rd.yahoo.com/dailynews/finance/nm/tc_nm/storytext/*http://finance.yahoo.com/q?s=vz&d=t> - news <http://us.rd.yahoo.com/dailynews/biz/nm/tc_nm/storytext/*http://biz.yahoo.com/n/v/vz.html>), the No. 1 U.S. phone company, said Nextel's move would not interfere with its plans to soon launch a competitive service.

"Nothing that Nextel said today is going to delay our plans," said Andrea Linskey. "We'll have a walkie-talkie type feature on our network later this year."

Verizon could launch its rival service as early as next month, industry sources said.

Schaefer said its Push-to-Talk trademark was registered on the supplemental trademark list, which means that it is much easier to contest and its PTT trademark was approved for the principal trademark list, which offers more protection.

"The whole reason (a name) is on the supplemental list is because the suspicion is it may be the industry standard way to describe the function or may become the way," Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich attorney Jeffrey Blumenfeld.

As subscriber growth slowed in the U.S. market, wireless service providers began looking at push to talk and other new ways to attract customers and encourage them to spend money.

Nextel's walkie-talkie service attracted attention among competitors because it wins the company high-value customers in areas including construction, transportation and government.

Another rival Sprint PCS has said it would launch walkie-talkie services later this year, while AT&T Wireless (NYSE:AWE <http://us.rd.yahoo.com/dailynews/finance/nm/tc_nm/storytext/*http://finance.yahoo.com/q?s=awe&d=t> - news <http://us.rd.yahoo.com/dailynews/biz/nm/tc_nm/storytext/*http://biz.yahoo.com/n/a/awe.html>) said recently it could begin testing walkie-talkie technology as early as this year.

Todd Daugherty N9OGL

"Todd Daugherty" <toddaug@consolidated.net> wrote in message news:3ef3a5bb$1_5@corp.newsgroups.com...
>
http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&ncid=1293&e=1&u=/nm/20030620/tc_
> nm/telecoms_pushtotalk_dc&sid=95573419
>
> This need's to be read.....I think Nextel is full of it.....PTT and Push
> To Talk has been around a long time. I have some old ham radio manuals that
> talk about PTT.
>
> Todd N9OGL
>
>
>
>
>

>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> ------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3003. Tech Exam Pool in Text File?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 00:35:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bd09bu$r89@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 69138

Does anyone happen to know of a place where the Technician exam question pool can be downloaded? I am helping a blind friend of mine get "back into" ham radio. He let his license expire and I was telling him about all the new rules, etc., and he wants to get back into it. It's just not very easy for him to take practice exams, etc., on the internet, so I told him I'd try to find the text file for download.

Thanks in advance!

Kim W5TIT

3004. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 00:52:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF3ABA7.A256844C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69139

Len Over 21 wrote:

" ".

Obviously another of Len's carefully laid traps.

Dave K8MN

3005. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 00:54:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF3AC33.B250714@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69140

Len Over 21 wrote:

" ".
" ", he added.

Looks like another accident in the Anderson home comm center.

Dave K8MN

3006. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 00:57:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF3ACEA.2EBC60FD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69141

```
Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> >> news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I
> >> >> can't call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call
> >> >> listening down most of the DX never listen where I can transmit.
> >> >> Yes, I only use phone, but I think you probably guessed that
> >> >> already.
> >> >
> >> > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> >> > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would
> >> > have nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting
> >> > pounded by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the
> >> > usual weak signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful
> >> > about what they ask for because they might get it.
> >> >
> >> > w3rv
> >>
> >> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
> >> They will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able to
> >> call them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do that
> >> below 7100.
> >
> > So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even 7300?
> > Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more space which
> > could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100. Beyond that I
> > don't know why you have such a big problem with working split in the
> > first place. The dx phone contesters routinely work dozens upon dozens
> > dx stations inside 48 hours of operating time. I sure have my piles of
> > 40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto 75M.
> >
> > w3rv
> >
```

>
> Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the other
> station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't tell them.

Forty meter Phone DXers in the U.S. listen down the band for foreign stations. Foreign stations listen up the band for U.S. stations. The system has been working nicely for decades, thank you.

> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are Ws on
> it is truly warped.

Howzat? If the realigned band is opened to U.S. ops, there'll be no DX refuge.

Dave K8MN

3007. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 01:10:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF3B012.B713216D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> > You don't strike me as the kind of fellow looking for a welcome.
>
> A welcoming kind of crowd wouldn't start threads titled "Typical
> no-code brain fart".

A crowd didn't start the thread and a crowd won't do the welcoming.

Dave K8MN

3008. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 01:11:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620211119.27396.00000977@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 69142

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 6/20/03 2:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EF36384.20903@psu.edu>

>You have to admit, it was better than most of his posts 8^)

I didn't think of it that way! You're right!

Steve, K4CAP

3009. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 01:19:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620211905.27396.00000978@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 69144

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/20/03 6:31 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030620193156.11559.00000729@mb-m13.aol.com>

>It was around $60 more, not $2.00.

I've never seen ANY place that charged that much for parking, even in Beverly Hills, CA. I think that's a bit of farce on YOUR part.

WHERE was this place where parking is alleged to be $60, Vippy?

>> Thank God for that...I can see the next-of-kin suing the contest
>sponsor
>>for neglect because Johnny died of malnourishment.
>
>I meant every Ham ate alot. And it was not healthy food. I know that because
>my
>urine was a dark brown color after eating the food.

Uh huh. THAT means you probably were not DRINKING a sufficient amount of fluids, Vippy. It will do that even if you are eating "healthy" foods.

>>Ham RADIO operators spending a weekend operating radios....Geeeeee...What a
>>bummer, huh?
>
>I expected to operate radios, even wanted to. I did not expect that it would
>be
>entire days and nights.

Then you weren't paying attention to the details of the operation. That's YOUR fault.

And assuming you are over 18, no one was required to act as tour director for you. Get off your own lazy but and go sight seeing if you want to. But then like your wanting to put antennas up but not help take them down, you can't be depended upon when you're needed.

>> Well shame on them for not consulting you about side trips to
>>Disneyland,
>>Mr. Clueless.
>>
>
>Well, if someone had consulted me, I could have clued them in.

If you ahd the gonads to ASK you wouldn't be WHINING about it now.

>> Who in the Blue Blazes goes to ANY event organized for ANY purpose just
>>for
>>the purpose of DEVIATING from what was "scheduled"???
>
>I do that at East facing ritual ceremonies and <some> Ham radio events.

Right.

Steve, K4CAP

3010. Re: 5mhz operation approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 01:22:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620212259.27396.00000979@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 69145

>Subject: Re: 5mhz operation approved
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/20/03 7:54 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EF3AC33.B250714@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>" ".
>" ", he added.
>
>Looks like another accident in the Anderson home comm center.

OH Noooooooooooo, Dave! HE is an electronics PROFESSIONAL! He performs to
a degree of exactness that we "amateurs" could only envy and HOPE to aspire to
!

(uh.....yeeeah...Right.)

Steve, K4CAP

3011. Re: Tech Exam Pool in Text File?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 01:25:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bd0c4n$pr5@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 69146

Never mind...I found one!

Kim W5TIT
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message news:bd09bu$r89@library2.airnews.net...
Does anyone happen to know of a place where the Technician exam question pool can be downloaded? I am helping a blind friend of mine get "back into" ham radio. He let his license expire and I was telling him about all the new rules, etc., and he wants to get back into it. It's just not very easy for him to take practice exams, etc., on the internet, so I told him I'd try to find the text file for download.

Thanks in advance!

Kim W5TIT

3012. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 01:25:35 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bd0c61$474$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69211
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EF3B012.B713216D@earthlink.net...
> Robert wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
> >
> > > You don't strike me as the kind of fellow looking for a welcome.
> >
> > A welcoming kind of crowd wouldn't start threads titled "Typical
> > no-code brain fart".
>
> A crowd didn't start the thread and a crowd won't do the welcoming.

The semantic difference twixt "crowd" and "room full of guys" is one
that, fortunately, escapes me.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

3013. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 01:37:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF3B71A.6010708@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69147

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
>
>>So instead of paying the extra "X" dollars to park, you left your car out
>>of touch, rode on public transportation that DIDN'T take you to exactly where
>>you wanted to go, and probably spent and extra hour or two to save that
>>(probable) $2.00.
>
>
> It was around $60 more, not $2.00.
>
>
>>Every
>>
>>>Ham
>>>ate.
>>
>> Thank God for that...I can see the next-of-kin suing the contest sponsor
>>for neglect because Johnny died of malnourishment.
>
>
> I meant every Ham ate alot. And it was not healthy food. I know that because my
> urine was a dark brown color after eating the food.

Dude! Are you sure you weren't sick? This doesn't sound like just a
batch of food to me. Better go get that checked.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3014. Re: READ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:13:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgsz3gm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69148

On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 19:33:42 -0500, Todd Daugherty quoted:

> [Nextel] said on Friday it would use trademark law to stop
> emerging rivals of its 10-year-old walkie-talkie service from using
> the term "push-to-talk" to describe their products.

> "Nothing that Nextel said today is going to delay our plans," said
> [Verizon spolesperson] Andrea Linskey. "We'll have a walkie-talkie
> type feature on our network later this year."

> Nextel's walkie-talkie service attracted attention among competitors
> because it wins the company high-value customers in areas including
> construction, transportation and government.

> Another rival Sprint PCS has said it would launch walkie-talkie
> services later this year, while AT&T Wireless ... said recently it
> could begin testing walkie-talkie technology as early as this year.

Don't these fools (not you, Todd) know that "walkie-talkie" is in
fact a registered trademark of Motorola, Inc. and that The Big Emm's
legal staff is quite adamant that they will protect it. They were
successful in getting it dropped from the draft text of the
Electronic Communication Privacy Act in 1985 after it was brought
to their attention.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3015. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:15:20 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A0E260FB10Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69149

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:3EF3ACEA.2EBC60FD@earthlink.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns939ED0D3CC647elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> >> news:d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com:
>> >>
>> >> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >> Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I
>> >> >> can't call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call
>> >> >> listening down most of the DX never listen where I can transmit.
>> >> >> Yes, I only use phone, but I think you probably guessed that
>> >> >> already.
>> >> >
>> >> > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
>> >> > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would
>> >> > have nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without
>> >> > getting pounded by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly
>> >> > given the usual weak signals on 40. This could be a case of being
>> >> > careful about what they ask for because they might get it.
>> >> >
>> >> > w3rv
>> >>
>> >> Nonsense. You obviously didn't think this through before typing it.
>> >> They will still be able to operate below 7150 without me being able
>> >> to call them on frequency. As opposed to now, when they can only do
>> >> that below 7100.
>> >
>> > So what do they gain by being able to run ssb up to 7200 or even
>> > 7300? Besides logs full of Yank contacts. A lousy 50 kHz. more space
>> > which could go away when we get to operate ssb down to 7100. Beyond
>> > that I don't know why you have such a big problem with working split
>> > in the first place. The dx phone contesters routinely work dozens
>> > upon dozens dx stations inside 48 hours of operating time. I sure
>> > have my piles of 40m ssb dxcc cards. Ditto 75M.

>> >
>> > w3rv
>> >
>>
>> Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the
>> other station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't
>> tell them.
>
> Forty meter Phone DXers in the U.S. listen down the band for foreign
> stations. Foreign stations listen up the band for U.S. stations. The
> system has been working nicely for decades, thank you.
>
>> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are
>> Ws on it is truly warped.
>
> Howzat? If the realigned band is opened to U.S. ops, there'll be no DX
> refuge.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

As I explained, that isn't so. We can only use phone down to 7150 in the US, and no-one expects it to go lower than 7100 if the Novice subband is 're-farmed' The phone subband in other countries goes down to at least 7050, and even down to 7030 in some cases. If you are expecting any of that spectrum to be reallocated to CW in other countries, dream on.

3016. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:23:13 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A0E3B6D94A0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69150

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0306200848.77467c5f@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93A011B156294elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in
>> news:vf4orsqh5d7m5a@corp.supernews.com:
>
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030619183729.15462.00000911@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> >> In article <vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
>> >> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>
>> >> Maybe the compromise will be to keep S25.5 but allow countries to
>> >> bypass it for ham licenses with no privileges below 136 kHz.....
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> > You left out the decimal point. No privileges below 1.36kHz.
>> >
>> > Larry KC8EPO
>> >
> HAW! That's a good one, Larry!
>
>> I think that you will find that the 'mod' (modify) proposals do make
>> CW testing no longer compulsory. What they do that the 'sup' (supress)
>> proposals don't is either add a laundry list of requirements of what
>> should be tested in the theory tests and/or specifically say that code
>> testing is optional, instead of just deleting (surpressing) any
>> mention of it.
>
> Interesting.
>
> It's my understanding that the written tests in some other countries
> are more involved than in the USA. Some would say "much more
> involved". I dunno how Americans, the FCC, or other US agencies will
> take to having the written test requirements dictated to them by
> treaty. For many years, they have just been "whatever the country
> deems appropriate and necessary", which can mean anything from EE
> level down to a couple of simple questions.

I don't think they are talking about the level so much as the syllabus

>
> Why they would propose spelling out code testing as something

> noncompulsory is a mystery. They might as well say that a soldering
> test is noncompulsory.

I agree, but I have heard that's in some of the 'mod' proposals

>>
>> I think that what we will most likely end up with is a version of s25
>> derived by reconciling the various 'mod' proposals. It will
>> incorporate (I'm guessing) ITU-R 1544, which is the laundry list of
>> theory requirements. Since it was already written by the ITU, it would
>> be hard to imagine it not making it's way into s25!
>
> The difference is compulsory vs. recommended.
>
>> It may say code testing is
>> optional, or it may no longer mention it, one or the other.
>
> Or it may somehow stay alive if some sort of deal is struck. Ya never
> know until the fat lady sings.
>
>> Hours will
>> probably be wasted debating that point, whem the effect is the same
>> either way.
>>
> Probably.
>> I am reasonably sure that when the dust settles we will have specific
>> theory testing requirements at the international level for the first
>> time,
>
> Will be REALLY interesting to see what FCC does if those requirements
> aren't met by the current written tests.
>

If there are some subjects that aren't covered, then I imagine they will
add them

>> and it will be optional for member states to run code tests. We may
>> know the answer this time next week, or perhaps the week after.
>
> The conference closes July 1, right?
>
> Then there's the matter of ratification by the USA.
>

Anything from a month to a year, apparently

> btw, any news on the 40 meter situation?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Nothing more so far

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3017. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:23:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620222325.03929.00000402@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 69152

In article <vf72blrp5mpp6b@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>From the IARU web site:
>
>"Agenda item 1.7.1 (Article 25): The proposals relating to 1.7.1 were
>introduced in Working Group 4C and referred to Sub-Working Group 4C3
>for discussion and possible decision. On Friday afternoon the proposals
>were introduced in 4C3, along with the information paper containing the
>views of the IARU."
>
>"The USA withdrew its proposals on 1.7.1 in favor of the Inter-American
>Proposals, which is favorable for us because the IAPs include
>incorporation by reference of Recommendation ITU-R M.1544 whereas
>the USA proposals did not."
>
>"The other differences between the various proposals under 1.7.1 were
>identified, but no effort as yet has been made to resolve them."

Thanks, Larry. Good info.
>
>> > It may say code testing is optional, or it may no longer mention it,
>> > one or the other.
>>
>> Or it may somehow stay alive if some sort of deal is struck. Ya never
>> know until the fat lady sings.
>
>The house light a dimming, an she about to sing.

"Oh sweet mystery of life, at last I've found you!!!"
>
>> > Hours will probably be wasted debating that point,
>> > when the effect is the same either way.
>
>> Probably.
>
>> > I am reasonably sure that when the dust settles we will have specific
>> > theory testing requirements at the international level for the first
>time,
>
>> Will be REALLY interesting to see what FCC does if those requirements
>> aren't met by the current written tests.
>
>I would expect the current VEC written exams to met the M1544 recommendation
>if it becomes a manatory incorporation by reference. At most the FCC

>might need to renact 47 CFR 97.503(c) with a new topic list. The USA
>position opposes the mandatory incorporation by reference of M1544.

This is what I mean by deals and bargaining. The USA might have to accept
mandatory incorporation by reference of M1544 in order to get something else
(like changes in the code test wording) into the treaty.
>
>> > and it will be optional for member states to run code tests. We may know
>> > the answer this time next week, or perhaps the week after.
>>
>> The conference closes July 1, right?
>
>The conference end July 4.

OK - tnx again.
>
>> Then there's the matter of ratification by the USA.

I doubt very much that FCC would take any action until the treaty is ratified.
However, once it is ratified, I would not be surprised if they just dumped
Element 1 under the 'reduction of burden' thingy.

>> btw, any news on the 40 meter situation?

(Guess not)
>
73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3018. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:23:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030620222326.03929.00000403@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 69151

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgsew4j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>>Here's a list of desireable radio operator skills for hams.
>>
> (Twenty GOOD skills listed)
>
> Add to that - the skill of knowing what the FCC Rules allow that
> operator's class of license to do and not to do without having to
> look it up.

How about:

21) The skill to know what the FCC Rules allow in and do not allow without having to look it up.
>
> Just like the Driver License......

Exactly.

Thanks Phil

73 de Jim, N2EY

3019. Re: READ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:40:18 UTC
From: Todd Daugherty <toddaug@consolidated.net>
Message-ID: <3ef3c6c0_5@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 69153

I asked the lawyers of group going against Nextel that if Nextel get's PTT
Patented will ham opreators have to stop using that term. I also informed
him that Ham operators have been using the term PTT for a long time.

Todd N9OGL

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgsz3gm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 19:33:42 -0500, Todd Daugherty quoted:
>
> > [Nextel] said on Friday it would use trademark law to stop
> > emerging rivals of its 10-year-old walkie-talkie service from using
> > the term "push-to-talk" to describe their products.
>
> > "Nothing that Nextel said today is going to delay our plans," said
> > [Verizon spolesperson] Andrea Linskey. "We'll have a walkie-talkie
> > type feature on our network later this year."
>
> > Nextel's walkie-talkie service attracted attention among competitors
> > because it wins the company high-value customers in areas including
> > construction, transportation and government.
>
> > Another rival Sprint PCS has said it would launch walkie-talkie
> > services later this year, while AT&T Wireless ... said recently it
> > could begin testing walkie-talkie technology as early as this year.
>
> Don't these fools (not you, Todd) know that "walkie-talkie" is in
> fact a registered trademark of Motorola, Inc. and that The Big Emm's
> legal staff is quite adamant that they will protect it. They were
> successful in getting it dropped from the draft text of the
> Electronic Communication Privacy Act in 1985 after it was brought
> to their attention.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3020. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:43:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306201843.6c6c3577@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69154

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bckmif$fm3$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> > Why do you post anonymously?
>
> For somebody who seems to know a little bit about the net, you don't
> know anything about anonymous posting. Do you know how to look at headers,
> check e-mail, look up my NNTP posting host? Give it a try, "Mike".

Hey Bobby-Poo ya old deck ape, give my regards to the rest of the
folks on Wiley Hillard Rd.

w3rv

3021. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 02:54:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgt0zto.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69155

On 21 Jun 2003 02:23:25 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>> Or it may somehow stay alive if some sort of deal is struck. Ya never
>>> know until the fat lady sings.
>>
>>The house light a dimming, an she about to sing.
>
>"Oh sweet mystery of life, at last I've found you!!!"

The Yogi Berra Rule applies: "It ain't over 'til it's over and
even then it may not be over."

Don't throw away your Vibroplexers just yet......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3022. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 10:23:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621062339.01315.00000413@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 69156

In article <3EF3ABA7.A256844C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>" ".
>
>
>Obviously another of Len's carefully laid traps.
>
You mean "a fiendishly clever plan"?*

73 de Jim, N2EY

* refers to a recurring line by Baldrick in the various Blackadder series

3023. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 10:49:30 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bd1dg4icf1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69210

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306201843.6c6c3577@posting.google.com...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:<bckmif$fm3$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
> >
> > > Why do you post anonymously?
> >
> > For somebody who seems to know a little bit about the net, you
don't
> > know anything about anonymous posting. Do you know how to look at
headers,
> > check e-mail, look up my NNTP posting host? Give it a try, "Mike".
>
> Hey Bobby-Poo ya old deck ape, give my regards to the rest of the
> folks on Wiley Hillard Rd.

What a collection of rocket scientists I've stumbled across. You
just proved my point Brian. Well done.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

3024. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 11:00:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621070033.00935.00001549@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 69157

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP

> Uh huh. THAT means you probably were not DRINKING a sufficient amount
>of
>fluids, Vippy. It will do that even if you are eating "healthy" foods.

The food was very unhealthy. Large quantity and alot of fat. Also, they relaxed the sanitation like placing spatulas on the dirty table. I'm surprised I didn't get sick, but I felt perfectly fine.

Also, they did not know how to cook. The food would have been alot better if I had prepared it. I got invited to another event where the host is going to. Next time I will help prepare the food.

>Get off your own lazy but and go sight seeing if you want to.

I did, during the day I took a walk and drove with some other Hams. At night I did not have a car. Others did, but did not go anywhere.

>>Well, if someone had consulted me, I could have clued them in.
>
> If you ahd the gonads to ASK you wouldn't be WHINING about it now.

Possibly.

3025. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 11:02:49 UTC
From: Rene <deleterene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bd1e0q$of31q$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69158

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:vf21m58fhu529d@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030618183141.23406.00000249@mb-m27.aol.com...
> > In article <vf0ml2ca5n3s4b@corp.supernews.com>, "lk"
<lklose@net-link.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >The ITU web site list ten proposals for rule S25.5. They are:
> > >
> > >ARB mod (modify)
> > >ASP sup (suppress, delete)
> > >EENA noc (no change)
> > >EUR mod
> > >IAP sup
> > >IND mod
> > >KEN mod
> > >TZA mod
> > >UKR NOC (strongly support no change)
> > >USA sup
> > >
> > >The last proposal (USA) is the United States proposal,
> > >which is to delete S25.5.
> > >
> > omigosh, Larry - ten proposals, of which only three are suppress/delete?
>
> Two are "noc" no change, i.e. S25.5 remains the same.
> Three are "sup" suppress, i.e. S25.5 is deleted.
> It would be interesting to known what was in the five "mod" modifications.
>

I don't have the documents any more (but I'll try to get my hands on them
again), but as I remember it, modding would mean that S25 would be changed
into a rule that states that a local administration can decide whether or
not the morse code is required.

At this time, something like the same applies for the 'above 30 MHz' rule:
local administrations can decide if morse code exam is required for
operating above 30 MHz.

In conclusion: probably the part '30 MHz' in the current S25-sentence will
be skipped.

Rene

3026. Re: Illegal 11m amplifier group pops up on Yahoo...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 11:04:09 UTC
From: Rene <deleterene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bd1e39$mjrjr$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69159

Don't forget that in some countries, 11m amplifiers are perfectly legal!
Maybe not in the US, but yahoo.com is an international site.

Rene

3027. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 12:50:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306210450.44967f6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69160

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A05DAC7794Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0306200342.6f696758@posting.google.com:

> >> Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the
> >> other station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't
> >> tell them.
> >
> > Humbug. Between the contests I've called any number of ssb dx stations
> > on their freqs with cw and asked them to listen up. And they did in
> > most instances. A particularly memorable example was a VP8 who came
> > back with "I can't copy the CW but I'm listening on 7215" (or whatever
> > it was). They know exactly what's going on.
> >
>
> 1 - I don't have a key!!!!

That's like admitting you're a virgin. Maybe worse. But both deficits
are quickly and inexpensively curable.

> 2 - In the immediate future, comprehension of CW by the DX is going to get
> a lot worse

Lotta water has to go over the dam first and none of it is cast in
stone. But actually it doesn't much matter. The VP8 apparently
couldn't copy Morse either but he certainly got the drift.

> 3 - It's just plain ridiculous to have to do that

To each their own but I suspect that if/when you get what you're
asking for you're not going to get what you expected to get.

> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are
> >> Ws on it is truly warped.
> >
> > I'll put it this way: I *much* prefer trying to copy some weak piece
> > of 40M ssb exotica split when he's down below where the stateside
> > Athritis nets are allowed to trash the band. And/or when he isn't
> > buried under a screaming pileup on his freq and nobody can hear him.
> >
> > w3rv
> >
> I'll admit that is an advantage, but it balances the one's you can't work
> because of this problem

I think you're in for a reality check.

- and stop pretending there's no problem!

Has nothing to do with pretending anything, it's obvious that your problem is not a problem for others.

w3rv

3028. Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 13:50:04 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <43193ef4dff3a3553deffd68275f84ef@dizum.com>
Source record: 69161

As it was said by some hams here, digital modes
like PSK31 are few used, especially on 6m.
Why ?
If its true that 90 per cent of packet users use
old VT100 emulators at 1200 bauds, many
DXers are always stuck with CW because they
are old and do not understand how to use a
computer to play PSK31. Its stone age
although PSK31 is 10 dB better than CW.
More, there is a money reason explaining that
PSK31 is not used. It requires a portable computer
(for portable/contest operation) that must have a
sound card, a lot of RAM to use Win9x and
a CD-ROM to install Win9x. Actually, in all
the world (because USA is not the only country
on Earth), surplus lowest priced laptops are
principally 486 based computers with no sound
card, no CD-ROM and 4 or 8 MB RAM,
running DOS and sometimes Win31.
With this equipment, impossible to play PSK31.
All the hams on Earth do not have $1000 to
spend in a modern laptop just to play with PSK31.
Its impossible to add a PCMCIA sound card on
these old laptops because the PCMCIA bus has
NO DMA, so there is no PCMCIA sound blaster
clone card available.
Any cheap PSK31 interface solution ? Tell us ...
There is no acceptable PSK31 program running
under DOS (although waterfall graphics will be
possible also under DOS), and even on Win9X,
the author of WinPSKse is too much lazybones to
allow 640x480 display (same problem with
WSJT, running only in 800x600 mode) and on a
486 laptop, its not possible to run 800x600.
Here are some reasons that explain why PSK31
is not very used especially on 6m. More, there
is no worldwide PSK31 consensus to determine
a DX calling frequency for PSK31 on 6m.

Packet interest had fallen. TAPR was a pioneer
in the years 80s and we all thank TAPR for their
TNC2 project (always used in APRS today) but
the applications of packet-radio were limited to
DX (yes it was possible with level 2) and BBS

traffic. BBS killed packet interest and now Internet has killed BBS, so the packet network is quite desert except some DX clusters and APRS channels but its NOT really ham-radio activities.

Many hams use now ECHOLINK but ECHOLINK is not AUTHORIZED in all countries. Many pirates interface their VHF/UHF ham station to Internet to allow ECHOLINK but it is often forbidden to make a bridge between radio bands and Internet (for security reasons, terrorists could use ECHOLINK to communicate).

Thats the deal. We have modern modes of transmissions like PSK31, but laws speaking always of CW (19th century). Its time like for sea ships, to forbid CW on HF bands in order to oblige the users to get modern equipments.

3029. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 15:11:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd1sfu$ce6$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69162

I have often thought the same way. But I figure it won't happen till Im dead anyway. So I'll enjoy it while I can. And fight it tooth and nail all the way.

Dan/W4NTI

<Evil Ham@USA.com.spam> wrote in message news:o1PIa.57515$Io.5409909@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 01:50:15 +0200, Fritz Wuehler
> <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:
>
> >Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
> >CW will be abolished.
>
> Don't worry BPL will drive all hams off of HF as soon as the CW requirement
> is gone. I think it is too late for ham radio and the removal of the morse
> code requirement is twenty years to late. Kids today are into instant world
> wide communications with NEXTEL, Web cell phones and Computers on the
> Internet.
> Good Luck, because the ham radio community is going to need it. The ARRL
> talking about providing communications during emergencies will not overcome
> the money factor of BPL. Besides if the FCC took away 144 and 222 they
> would generate $10 billion dollars per year in the US economy.
> In 20 years ham radio will have a few channels on HF and the ARRL building
> will be a dusty museum.
> I'm a ham, but I can see the writing on the wall. When I obtained my ticket
> the Personal Computer was just hitting the market and CB was beginning to
> fade. Now we have instant and reliable worldwide communications from a
> wireless device from many locations all over the world. No need for
> propagation or huge towers with 500 watt amplifiers. Ham Radio is *old*
> technology.
>
>
>

3030. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 15:19:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd1sv4$v4e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69163

Did your moma drop you on your head at birth, or did your daddy do it later knowing what he helped to create? A braindead moron.

Dan/W4NTI

"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message news:43193ef4dff3a3553deffd68275f84ef@dizum.com...
>
> As it was said by some hams here, digital modes
> like PSK31 are few used, especially on 6m.
> Why ?
> If its true that 90 per cent of packet users use
> old VT100 emulators at 1200 bauds, many
> DXers are always stuck with CW because they
> are old and do not understand how to use a
> computer to play PSK31. Its stone age
> although PSK31 is 10 dB better than CW.
> More, there is a money reason explaining that
> PSK31 is not used. It requires a portable computer
> (for portable/contest operation) that must have a
> sound card, a lot of RAM to use Win9x and
> a CD-ROM to install Win9x. Actually, in all
> the world (because USA is not the only country
> on Earth), surplus lowest priced laptops are
> principally 486 based computers with no sound
> card, no CD-ROM and 4 or 8 MB RAM,
> running DOS and sometimes Win31.
> With this equipment, impossible to play PSK31.
> All the hams on Earth do not have $1000 to
> spend in a modern laptop just to play with PSK31.
> Its impossible to add a PCMCIA sound card on
> these old laptops because the PCMCIA bus has
> NO DMA, so there is no PCMCIA sound blaster
> clone card available.
> Any cheap PSK31 interface solution ? Tell us ...
> There is no acceptable PSK31 program running
> under DOS (although waterfall graphics will be
> possible also under DOS), and even on Win9X,
> the author of WinPSKse is too much lazybones to
> allow 640x480 display (same problem with
> WSJT, running only in 800x600 mode) and on a
> 486 laptop, its not possible to run 800x600.
> Here are some reasons that explain why PSK31
> is not very used especially on 6m. More, there
> is no worldwide PSK31 consensus to determine

> a DX calling frequency for PSK31 on 6m.
>
> Packet interest had fallen. TAPR was a pioneer
> in the years 80s and we all thank TAPR for their
> TNC2 project (always used in APRS today) but
> the applications of packet-radio were limited to
> DX (yes it was possible with level 2) and BBS
> traffic. BBS killed packet interest and now Internet
> has killed BBS, so the packet network is quite
> desert except some DX clusters and APRS
> channels but its NOT really ham-radio activities.
>
> Many hams use now ECHOLINK but ECHOLINK
> is not AUTHORIZED in all countries. Many pirates
> interface their VHF/UHF ham station to Internet
> to allow ECHOLINK but it is often forbidden to
> make a bridge between radio bands and Internet
> (for security reasons, terrorists could use
> ECHOLINK to communicate).
>
> Thats the deal. We have modern modes of
> transmissions like PSK31, but laws speaking
> always of CW (19th century). Its time like for
> sea ships, to forbid CW on HF bands in order
> to oblige the users to get modern equipments.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3031. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 15:21:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306210721.5efe6f40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69164

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A0E260FB10Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> >
> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are
> >> Ws on it is truly warped.
> >
> > Howzat? If the realigned band is opened to U.S. ops, there'll be no DX
> > refuge.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> As I explained, that isn't so. We can only use phone down to 7150 in the
> US, and no-one expects it to go lower than 7100 if the Novice subband is
> 're-farmed' The phone subband in other countries goes down to at least
> 7050, and even down to 7030 in some cases.

It's my understanding that in some large number of countries phone is
legal all the way down to 7.000. The rest is operating practices.

> If you are expecting any of
> that spectrum to be reallocated to CW in other countries, dream on.

Dave isn't expecting any such thing, cite an example of a "CW
allocation" in the HF bands.

w3rv

3032. GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 15:48:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd1urq$s44$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69165
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.shortwave

==========

==>ARRL URGES INFORMED COMMENTS IN FCC BPL INQUIRY

The ARRL is urging amateurs to file well-thought-out, informed comments when responding to the FCC's Broadband Over Power Line (BPL) Notice of Inquiry (ET Docket 03-104). The FCC published its NOI on May 23. The NOI asks how the FCC should regulate the delivery of broadband services to homes and businesses using electrical wiring to conduct high-speed digital signals. While the FCC has dubbed this technology Broadband over Power Line, it's more commonly known as Power Line Carrier or PLC.

BPL would use building and/or overhead power lines to conduct HF and low-VHF digital signals to network computers. The FCC has expressed its unabashed enthusiasm for BPL, which it views as a competitive Internet access point. Utilities consider BPL as another means to use existing infrastructure to generate additional revenue.

The NOI is not asking if BPL technology should be permitted. Under existing FCC rules, BPL systems may be built and used in the US right now. The FCC is asking how the rules might be changed "to promote and encourage new BPL technology," in the words of the NOI.

Present FCC Part 15 rules say that carrier-current systems--including BPL/PLC--need to meet the general radiated emission limits for unlicensed "intentional emitters." While the rules permit BPL at significant power levels, utilities would prefer that the FCC authorize even higher power levels. BPL systems under development and in field trials use spectrum between 1.7 and 80 MHz, but the NOI also asks whether BPL should operate on other parts of the spectrum as well.

As of mid-June, nearly 1000 comments already had been filed in the proceeding. The ARRL has urged amateurs who comment to outline the important uses they make of Amateur Radio and the impact strong interference from BPL could have at HF and low-VHF amateur frequencies.

Electric utility companies will operate many, if not most, BPL systems. ARRL members who have had experience dealing with power line interference and utilities' responses to complaints also may want to describe those experiences in their comments to the Commission.

Amateurs filing comments to the FCC NOI might want to consider these topics and points:

* Amateur Radio is a valuable resource that must be protected.

* Describe the uses you make of Amateur Radio, especially those with a public service or emergency communication aspect.

* The present FCC Part 15 limits for this technology already can result in substantial interference potential to amateur frequencies.

* BPL systems that radiate on wide swaths of spectrum and occupy entire neighborhoods have greater interference potential than localized systems, such as switching power supplies or electric motors.

* The FCC has promised to protect licensed users of the spectrum. We must hold them to that promise.

For more information, see "Understanding the FCC's Broadband Over Power Line (BPL) Notice of Inquiry" <http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2003/06/19/2/>. An ARRL white paper, "Calculated Impact of PLC on Stations Operating in the Amateur Radio Service" <http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/files/C63NovPLC.pdf> provides technical details. The ARRL's Broadband Over Power Line resource page contains links to worldwide studies and other resources.

The ARRL has initiated an important Spectrum Defense Fund campaign to support activities to educate government officials on the potential threat that BPL poses to Amateur Radio. To find out more, or to support ARRL's efforts in this area, visit the ARRL's secure BPL Web site <https://www.arrl.org/forms/development/donations/bpl/>

The complete NOI is available on the FCC Web site <http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-100A1.doc>.

Comments are due on or before July 7, 2003. Reply comments are due on or before August 6, 2003. Interested parties may submit electronically filed comments via the FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/>. Under ECFS Main Links, click on "Submit a Filing." In the "Proceeding" field, enter "03-104" and complete the required field. Comments may be typed into a form or you may attach a file containing your comments. Comments also may be submitted via e-mail, per instructions on the ECFS page.

3033. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 16:00:04 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20030621160004.15806.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 69166

In article <20030620140939.08048.00000753@mb-m16.aol.com>
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>
>
> >Subject: Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 6/18/03 8:51 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EF06EA9.2E842A33@earthlink.net>
>
> >> . Go back to reading your AARP bulletin, old man.
> >
> >...and you may resume reading the consumer information provided on the
> >side of your box of prunes, even older man.
>
> WHAMMMMMMM ! ! !
>
> Nail struck squarely on head.
>
> Nice shot, Dave !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

Goddamn, you must spend a fourtune on Chap-stick for keeping those chapped lips on
High-el's fatass.

3034. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 16:23:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621122338.08200.00000338@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 69167

In article <d22b54c3.0306210450.44967f6c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<Xns93A05DAC7794Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0306200342.6f696758@posting.google.com:
>
>
>> >> Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if the
>> >> other station doesn't even know that the band is open and you can't
>> >> tell them.
>> >
>> > Humbug. Between the contests I've called any number of ssb dx stations
>> > on their freqs with cw and asked them to listen up. And they did in
>> > most instances. A particularly memorable example was a VP8 who came
>> > back with "I can't copy the CW but I'm listening on 7215" (or whatever
>> > it was). They know exactly what's going on.
>> >
>>
>> 1 - I don't have a key!!!!
>
>That's like admitting you're a virgin. Maybe worse. But both deficits
>are quickly and inexpensively curable.

And if they're done right, both are lots of fun. For most people, anyway. YMMV.

>> 2 - In the immediate future, comprehension of CW by the DX is going to get
>> a lot worse
>
>Lotta water has to go over the dam first and none of it is cast in
>stone. But actually it doesn't much matter. The VP8 apparently
>couldn't copy Morse either but he certainly got the drift.

Bingo. And if he didn't want to work Yanks, he'd just say "I'm working transceive" and be done with it.

>> 3 - It's just plain ridiculous to have to do that
>
>To each their own but I suspect that if/when you get what you're
>asking for you're not going to get what you expected to get.

On bands other than 40, the DX still works split to get away from the mob.

>> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are
>> >> Ws on it is truly warped.

>> >
>> > I'll put it this way: I *much* prefer trying to copy some weak piece
>> > of 40M ssb exotica split when he's down below where the stateside
>> > Athritis nets are allowed to trash the band. And/or when he isn't
>> > buried under a screaming pileup on his freq and nobody can hear him.

>> I'll admit that is an advantage, but it balances the one's you can't work
>> because of this problem

One of the first things even the semi-rare ones do is to work split in order to
FORCE the pack to spread out. And the 'phone folks have to spread out a lot,
unlike CW, where a difference of a few dozen Hz is enough. And the CW folks
with QSK can listen to the dx's freq between letters and words.
>
>I think you're in for a reality check.
>
>> - and stop pretending there's no problem!
>
>Has nothing to do with pretending anything, it's obvious that your
>problem is not a problem for others.
>
Heck. let's define the problem:

Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide exclusive
amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get 7200-7300. What problems
will remain after that happens?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3035. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 17:01:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF48FA5.708@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69168

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3EF3ABA7.A256844C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>" ".
>>
>>
>>Obviously another of Len's carefully laid traps.
>>
>
> You mean "a fiendishly clever plan"?*

> * refers to a recurring line by Baldrick in the various Blackadder series

And he would have gotten away with it too, if it weren't for those
pesky kids!*

* refers to Scooby Doo.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

3036. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 17:34:52 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf95sltdqtqp31@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69169

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgqw1a7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 16 Jun 2003 13:55:38 -0400, Robert wrote:

<sniped>
>
> They [FCC] are not required to go along with anyone's input, be it
> "public" or "popular" opinion, as long as the decision covers why
> they didn't. It can be arbitrary in the usual sense of the word
> ("we think that it's better this way") but cannot be "arbitrary and
> capricious", a legal term of art which means that they didn't offer
> to receive public input and "consider" same as explained above.
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

The federal courts do use the phase "arbitrary and capricious" when
overturning or affirming a FCC decision. This is usually in reference
to 5 USC 706 (see end), which used the phrase "arbitrary OR capricious".
The phase means far more just "receiving and considering public
input". The Commission can not immunize it decisions from judicial
review by merely "receiving and considering public input". See

Arbitrary and capricious. Characterization of a decision or action
taken by an administration agency or inferior court meaning willful
and unreasonable action without consideration or in disregard of
facts or law or without determining principle. Elwood Investors
Co v. Behme, 79 Misc.2d 910, 361 N.Y.S2d 488, 492.
See Rational basis test.

Rational basis test. Under this test, an appellate court will not
second-guess the legislature as to the wisdom or rationality of a
particular statute if there is a rational basis for its enactment, and
if the challenged law bears a reasonable relationship to the
attainment of some legitimate government objective. The same
test may be applied when a court is reviewing a decision of an
administrative body because of the expertise of such body.
It has been said that the protection of the public from unwise or
improvident statute is to be found at the voting polls or by
referendum, not court. Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 134, 24 L.Ed.77.
This test does not apply, of course, if the statute or decision
is unconstitutional.

As a standard of review for statutory enactments challenged on
equal protection grounds, this test requires that classifications
created by a state must be reasonable, not arbitrary, and must rest
on some ground of difference having a fair and substantial relation

to the object of the legislation, so that all persons similarly
circumstanced shall be treated alike.
Aladdin's Castle, Inc. v. City of Mesquite, C.A.Tex., 630 F.2d 1029, 1039.

Orion Communication v. FCC, District of Columbia Circuit, #96-1430,
(12/19/1997)
We reverse a Commission decision granting or denying a broadcast
license only if that decision is "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of
discretion,
or otherwise not in accordance with law. 5 USC 706(2)(A); See
DirectTV, Inc. v. FCC, 110 F3d 816. 826 (D.C. Cir 1997).
The Commission's decisions in this case clearly fail to meet even this
deferential standard. The Commission recognized that it had the
'discretion to maintain [Orion's] existing service upon ... remand ...
in order to avoid disruption of service to the public."
See 11 FCC Rcd 19589 91996). In nonetheless rescinding Orion's
authority to provide such service, the Commission abused its
discretion and acted arbitrarily and capriciously in the following respects:
.....

Larry KC8EPO

~~~~~~
7 USC 706 provides:

5 U.S.C. 706. Scope of review
To the extent necessary to decision and when presented, the
reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law,
interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and
determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an
agency action. The reviewing court shall -

(1) compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and

(2) hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings,
and conclusions found to be -
(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise
not in accordance with law;
(B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;
(C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations,
or short of statutory right;
(D) without observance of procedure required by law;
(E) unsupported by substantial evidence in a case subject
to sections 556 and 557 of this title or otherwise reviewed
on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute; or
(F) unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are
subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court. In making
the foregoing determinations, the court shall review the
whole record or those parts of it cited by a party, and
due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error.
~~~~~~

Definition of arbitrary
1. Determined by chance, whim, or impulse, and not by necessity, reason, or principle: stopped at the first motel we passed, an arbitrary choice; arbitrary division of the group into halves.
2. Based on or subject to individual judgment or preference: The diet imposes overall calorie limits, but daily menus are arbitrary.
3. Established by a court or judge rather than by a specific law or statute: an arbitrary penalty.
4. Not limited by law; despotic: the arbitrary rule of a dictator.

Synonyms: arbitrary, capricious, whimsical. The central meaning shared by these adjectives is "determined by or arising from whim or caprice rather than judgment or reason": an arbitrary decision; a capricious refusal; the butt of whimsical persecution.

3037. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 17:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621133747.08200.00000339@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 69170

In article <CpLIa.654$Vx2.280216@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>It would be more difficult in the first case than in the second. The ITU
>"standard" phonetic alphabet words were selected on the basis that they
>were, in general, relatively easy to pronounce for most people regardless of
>their native tongue and relatively easy to understand even when
>mispronounced. They didn't succeed 100% but they didn't do a bad job
>either.

The "ITU standard phonetic alphabet" is the very same one
adopted by the US military and NATO members in 1955. That
worked well enough for English, French, German, Flemish, Dutch,
Danish, Norwegian languages. The ICAO thought it good enough
to adopt for international civil aviation air traffic control spoken
communications just a year later.

The ITU just picked up on something already tried and proven in
use for years in many languages.

3038. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 17:59:56 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vf97bjqluoqr91@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69171

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgsi0xk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 08:45:17 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

> > I was a supervicor in a Long Lines overseas operator office (32 A of
> > A in NYC) from 74 to 75.
>
> "This is a test transmission for circuit adjustment purposes from a
> radio station of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.
> This statsion is located near New York City."
>
> How well I remember that as a SWL in NYC in the early 50s, and again
> when we would set up the HF circuits from Tel Aviv to NY in the
> mid-60s. I even got to talk on the order wire to one of the NY
> techs once from Rishpun (the transmitting station north of TA) when
> they were having some problem. It was a double-hop path, as I
> remember it. We preferred the path from TA to Paris and then on
> TAT-4 to NY for reliability. All gone now, replaced by satellites
> and underseas cable in the Med and the Atlantic.

Very interesting, you guys should write article about the HF circuits.

Were HF circuits full or half duplex?
How many voice channels?
What kind of antenna did they used?

Larry, KC8EPO

3039. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 18:06:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF49D82.4B4BA96C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69172

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3EF3ABA7.A256844C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >" ".
> >
> >
> >Obviously another of Len's carefully laid traps.
> >
> You mean "a fiendishly clever plan"?*

Yes, M'lord.

Dave K8MN

3040. Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 19:43:36 UTC
From: The Motor City Truck Driver <TheGearGrinderGuy@doubleclutchusa.org>
Message-ID: <38d9fvg9acjd6rpvudohp1himi63fno6pi@4ax.com>
Source record: 69173
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.shortwave

OH SHUT THE HELL UP FOXHOLE DAN, YOU ABOUT THE BIGGEST FUCKING LID IN
THE COUNTRY.... THIS IS WHY YOUR DUMB ASS WAS RAN OFF 3.901, REMEMBER
WHEN YOU CALLED WILKEY'S WIFE (N4MRF) A WHORE... I GOT IT ON TAPE AND
RILEY HEARD IT, YOUR FUCKING DAYS ARE NUMBERED DICKFACE...

LID!

-ME

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 10:48:30 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> was blabbling:

...==
...
...==>ARRL URGES INFORMED COMMENTS IN FCC BPL INQUIRY
...
...The ARRL is urging amateurs to file well-thought-out, informed
comments
...when responding to the FCC's Broadband Over Power Line (BPL) Notice
of
...Inquiry (ET Docket 03-104). The FCC published its NOI on May 23.
The NOI
...asks how the FCC should regulate the delivery of broadband services
to
...homes and businesses using electrical wiring to conduct high-speed
digital
...signals. While the FCC has dubbed this technology Broadband over
Power
...Line, it's more commonly known as Power Line Carrier or PLC.
...
...BPL would use building and/or overhead power lines to conduct HF
and
...low-VHF digital signals to network computers. The FCC has expressed
its
...unabashed enthusiasm for BPL, which it views as a competitive
Internet
...access point. Utilities consider BPL as another means to use
existing
...infrastructure to generate additional revenue.
...
...The NOI is not asking if BPL technology should be permitted. Under
...existing FCC rules, BPL systems may be built and used in the US
right now.
...The FCC is asking how the rules might be changed "to promote and

encourage
...new BPL technology," in the words of the NOI.
...
...Present FCC Part 15 rules say that carrier-current
systems--including
...BPL/PLC--need to meet the general radiated emission limits for
unlicensed
..."intentional emitters." While the rules permit BPL at significant
power
...levels, utilities would prefer that the FCC authorize even higher
power
...levels. BPL systems under development and in field trials use
spectrum
...between 1.7 and 80 MHz, but the NOI also asks whether BPL should
operate
...on other parts of the spectrum as well.
...
...As of mid-June, nearly 1000 comments already had been filed in the
...proceeding. The ARRL has urged amateurs who comment to outline the
...important uses they make of Amateur Radio and the impact strong
...interference from BPL could have at HF and low-VHF amateur
frequencies.
...
...Electric utility companies will operate many, if not most, BPL
systems.
...ARRL members who have had experience dealing with power line
interference
...and utilities' responses to complaints also may want to describe
those
...experiences in their comments to the Commission.
...
...Amateurs filing comments to the FCC NOI might want to consider
these
...topics and points:
...
...* Amateur Radio is a valuable resource that must be protected.
...
...* Describe the uses you make of Amateur Radio, especially those
with a
...public service or emergency communication aspect.
...
...* The present FCC Part 15 limits for this technology already can
result in
...substantial interference potential to amateur frequencies.
...
...* BPL systems that radiate on wide swaths of spectrum and occupy
entire
...neighborhoods have greater interference potential than localized
systems,
...such as switching power supplies or electric motors.

...
...* The FCC has promised to protect licensed users of the spectrum.
We must
...hold them to that promise.
...
...For more information, see "Understanding the FCC's Broadband Over
Power
...Line (BPL) Notice of Inquiry"
...<http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2003/06/19/2/>. An ARRL white
paper,
..."Calculated Impact of PLC on Stations Operating in the Amateur
Radio
...Service"
<http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/files/C63NovPLC.pdf>
...provides technical details. The ARRL's Broadband Over Power Line
resource
...page contains links to worldwide studies and other resources.
...
...The ARRL has initiated an important Spectrum Defense Fund campaign
to
...support activities to educate government officials on the potential
threat
...that BPL poses to Amateur Radio. To find out more, or to support
ARRL's
...efforts in this area, visit the ARRL's secure BPL Web site
...<https://www.arrl.org/forms/development/donations/bpl/>
...
...The complete NOI is available on the FCC Web site
...<http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-100A1.doc>.
...
...Comments are due on or before July 7, 2003. Reply comments are due
on or
...before August 6, 2003. Interested parties may submit electronically
filed
...comments via the FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS)
...<http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/>. Under ECFS Main Links, click on
"Submit a
...Filing." In the "Proceeding" field, enter "03-104" and complete the
...required field. Comments may be typed into a form or you may attach
a file
...containing your comments. Comments also may be submitted via
e-mail, per
...instructions on the ECFS page.
...

3041. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 19:50:26 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <6G2Ja.21$jw7.6@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 69174

Laptops tend to be expensive. Also, the hard drive is slow and there tend not to be a ton of extra goodies on them for a fairly good reason - battery life. As far as the older folks not understanding it, I've helped more people at work with computers than you likely have. The kids try and tell me what I need (the latest and greatest with huge video boards) ... why? To play games. 486 machines are really pretty much obsolete (but certainly can be used for some applications). Recently, I hammered out a quick diagram of motor locations on some machines. Someone asked if I used Visio. No, I've used Visio, but I was using Word for something else and simply drew the diagrams with Word (why fire up another application for something the current application can do well for the desired results?). My machine is fairly simple; I bought it almost 2 years ago and have Office and a bunch of other programs on it. 733 MHz Celron, 20 Gb hard drive, CD and CD recorder and 256 MB of ram. I only paid $254.00 for it (oh, plus $48.00 shipping) and that was in November of 2001. True, portable operation would be best served with a laptop, but what kind of laptop can you buy for that kind of money? I think as you learn you will find there is no *one* answer that fits all applications. You'll find that sometimes hardware can be more efficient than software (and vice-versa). Rethink your position.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3042. Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 20:03:14 UTC
From: ? <Martin@NOSPAM.g1gyc.demon.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bd2frd$ae5$1$8302bc10@news.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 69178
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bd1urq$s44$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> ==
>
> ==>ARRL URGES INFORMED COMMENTS IN FCC BPL INQUIRY
>

Remember that these systems are NOT radio and so are not a protected
service.
If you have an operator trialling a system in your area make as much problem
for
his users as legally possible..... I mean operate your radio !!!
If the system generates noise at HF / VHF then a strong HF / VHF signal will
get
in to the system just as good. If it can be shown that these "Broadband
unscreened"
systems will suffer much data loss then the users will not take them up as a
preferred
option.
If you have access to spectrum analyzer / frequency monitoring equipment
connect it
up and see what you local noise level looks like (capture the data for
future reference).

and do like Dan say's get off your butt and lobby your political leaders.
Make your
voice (and signal) heard.

73 De G1GYC Martin

3043. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 20:06:15 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <XU2Ja.71393$Pc5.3266@fed1read01>
Source record: 69175

I bought my Toshiba Tecra Laptop off of e-bay for $330 and it has the
works - CD-ROM, Floopy, GD Battery, etc.. Great for Ham Radio -- I use
Logger, PSK31, RTTY, MMTY, CW, HamScope, DigiPan, DX Atlas, Contest
Software, RAC Callbook etc.

Speed has not been a problem with its 366 MHz processor

AND -- it is well shielded --- no RF into the rigs like many Desktops.

But I agree with Jim who sed "I think as you learn you will find there is
no *one* answer that
> fits all applications."

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:6G2Ja.21$jw7.6@news01.roc.ny...
> Laptops tend to be expensive. Also, the hard drive is slow and there tend
> not to be a ton of extra goodies on them for a fairly good reason -
battery
> life. As far as the older folks not understanding it, I've helped more
> people at work with computers than you likely have. The kids try and tell
> me what I need (the latest and greatest with huge video boards) ... why?
To
> play games. 486 machines are really pretty much obsolete (but certainly
can
> be used for some applications). Recently, I hammered out a quick diagram
of
> motor locations on some machines. Someone asked if I used Visio. No,
I've
> used Visio, but I was using Word for something else and simply drew the
> diagrams with Word (why fire up another application for something the
> current application can do well for the desired results?). My machine is
> fairly simple; I bought it almost 2 years ago and have Office and a bunch
of
> other programs on it. 733 MHz Celron, 20 Gb hard drive, CD and CD
recorder
> and 256 MB of ram. I only paid $254.00 for it (oh, plus $48.00 shipping)
> and that was in November of 2001. True, portable operation would be best
> served with a laptop, but what kind of laptop can you buy for that kind of
> money? I think as you learn you will find there is no *one* answer that
> fits all applications. You'll find that sometimes hardware can be more
> efficient than software (and vice-versa). Rethink your position.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>

>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>
>

3044. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 20:26:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621162612.12195.00001479@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 69176

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 6/21/03 6:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030621070033.00935.00001549@mb-m18.aol.com>

>The food was very unhealthy. Large quantity and alot of fat. Also, they
>relaxed
>the sanitation like placing spatulas on the dirty table. I'm surprised I
>didn't
>get sick, but I felt perfectly fine

Do you have a degree or certificate as an RD or nutritionist?

>Also, they did not know how to cook. The food would have been alot better if
>I
>had prepared it.

I am sure you are proud of yourself, Vipul. Your posts show it.

>I got invited to another event where the host is going to.
>Next time I will help prepare the food.

If it saves you from the embarrasment of being around radios, sure why
not. You seem to want to go to radio activities and do ANYTHING except operate
radios!

>I did, during the day I took a walk and drove with some other Hams. At night
>I
>did not have a car. Others did, but did not go anywhere.

Then why ae you whining so loud?

>>>Well, if someone had consulted me, I could have clued them in.
>>
>> If you ahd the gonads to ASK you wouldn't be WHINING about it now.
>
>Possibly.

No "possibly" to it.

Steve, K4CAP

3045. Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 20:29:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621162921.12195.00001481@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 69177

>Subject: Re: More Rants Fizzle...Lennie's Going Down For The Count...
>From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu
>Date: 6/21/03 11:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030621160004.15806.qmail@nym.alias.net>

Raving rant deleted. Pretty much expected given the known gene pool
deficiency of the author.

Steve, K4CAP

3046. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 20:42:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621164256.12195.00001482@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 69179

>Subject: Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/20/03 2:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030620154100.18497.00000819@mb-m05.aol.com>

>The sages of this chatroom, er, newsgroup, will have everyone
> believe that hams all over the world are using OOK CW right
> now, therefore everyone licensed "must" be proficient in that
> mode...ergo the code test is an absolute "must."

More insane ranting by an author equally insane.

>A problem with the entrenched narrowbanders...(SNIP)

"Entrenched narrowbanders"...?!?! What do you know about ANY subset of Amatuer Radio, Lennie? You're unlicensed and not a participant, save for this newsgroup, at ANY level.

>There's insufficient paradigm adjustment in amateur radio packet.
> Most everyone involved seems content with the old ways before
> the Internet and modeling on the BBSs for "up to date" methods.

Since you are not an Amateur licensee and NOT active in ANY Amateur Radio origanization or program, How do YOU know who is satisfied with what?

>Those not directly involved with packet have...(SNIP)

And THAT would be you.

>It's been a couple years since the first announcement of an HT
> accessory to take images and transmit JPG format images as
> well as display them. It didn't seem to meet with any ham market
> success...yet the cellular phones with picture capability are
> currently a rage with the general public. Entrenched thinking in
> amateur radio seems to be ears-only communications. ATV and
> slow-scan imagining never got to any big thing in hamdom.

What do you know about what does well in Amateur Radio markets?

>Those MDTs
> could be modified relatively easily to interface directly with other
> MDTs, sort of one-on-one comm links similar to EKG direct
> transmissions to a hospital from an EMT wagon (which work in
> speech bandwidths).

NOW you're an expert on EMS-specific telemetery...?!?!

And BTW, "EMT wagons" don't carry telemetry. ACLS (Paramedic) units do.

>Ryan, I've been in the electronics industry for a long time.

Then it's about time you learned something, isn't it?

>I really
> don't think that the general public "enjoys" anything it has now
> "thanks to ham radio" in the last half century.

Even if it had "Brought To You Courtesy Of Amateur Radio" tatooed on it,
you'd still find a way to disclaim it.

>In the US such MDTs trace their ancestry to the
> military TACFIRE and early comm terminals.

And of course this was some blackhat program YOU were involved in, no
doubt..?!?!

Steve, K4CAP

3047. Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 20:45:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621164508.12195.00001483@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 69180

>Subject: Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL
>From: The Motor City Truck Driver TheGearGrinderGuy@doubleclutchusa.org
>Date: 6/21/03 2:43 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <38d9fvg9acjd6rpvudohp1himi63fno6pi@4ax.com>
>
>OH SHUT THE...(SNIP)

Hey Dan, is this anonymous, cowardly putz a friend of yours?

Steve, K4CAP

3048. Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 21:47:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd2jn1$u57$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.shortwave

"?" <Martin@NOSPAM.g1gyc.demon.co.uk> wrote in message
news:bd2frd$ae5$1$8302bc10@news.demon.co.uk...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bd1urq$s44$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > ==========
> >
> > ==>ARRL URGES INFORMED COMMENTS IN FCC BPL INQUIRY
> >
>
>
> Remember that these systems are NOT radio and so are not a protected
> service.
> If you have an operator trialling a system in your area make as much
problem
> for
> his users as legally possible..... I mean operate your radio !!!
> If the system generates noise at HF / VHF then a strong HF / VHF signal
will
> get
> in to the system just as good. If it can be shown that these "Broadband
> unscreened"
> systems will suffer much data loss then the users will not take them up as
a
> preferred
> option.
> If you have access to spectrum analyzer / frequency monitoring equipment
> connect it
> up and see what you local noise level looks like (capture the data for
> future reference).
>
> and do like Dan say's get off your butt and lobby your political leaders.
> Make your
> voice (and signal) heard.
>
> 73 De G1GYC Martin
>
>

Tell us how it sounds in G land Martin.....I've heard some .wav files of it.
Put up some links if you know any and let the US crown hear whats on the
way.

Dan/W4NTI

3049. Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 21:50:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd2jthceu1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69182

Yeah.....who cares what he says or does. Just like he does on the air I reckon.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030621164508.12195.00001483@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL
> >From: The Motor City Truck Driver TheGearGrinderGuy@doubleclutchusa.org
> >Date: 6/21/03 2:43 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <38d9fvg9acjd6rpvudohp1himi63fno6pi@4ax.com>
> >
> >OH SHUT THE...(SNIP)
>
> Hey Dan, is this anonymous, cowardly putz a friend of yours?
>
> Steve, K4CAP

3050. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 22:33:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF4DD5C.60703@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69189

Since we're all squacking about Echolink, here is my .02 dollars.

Is Echolink High Tech?

Another way of asking the question is: Are Hams being Troglodytes by not using modes like Echolink?

Echolink is the introduction of voice into the Internet. This in itself is not a technology intensive operation. There has been audio chat rooms for many years now. The essential difference between the two is that in the Echolink version of Voip a user can access the system via a wireless interface. Even this might not be so unusual as there are probably part 15 devices that can send the users voice to the soundcard without benefit of wires.

In addition, the user can access Echolink via a microphone hooked into thier soundcard, or even type to another person with the keyboard.

So if a person was looking for a comparison between Echolink and anything else, what would that comparison be?

An internet chat room with audio immediately comes to mind.

So here you have it. It is not high-tech, it can be handled better by eliminating the radio - the weak link in the chain - from the equation, and although there are many who are just in love with chat rooms, there are also many who are not.

So my conclusion is that although there may be a place for this sort of thing in amateur radio, those who find it interesting have no business accusing those who do not like it of being technical Luddites.

.....and now you know.....the rest of the story!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3051. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 22:41:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgugt63.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69190

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 13:34:52 -0400, lk wrote:

>> They [FCC] are not required to go along with anyone's input, be it
>> "public" or "popular" opinion, as long as the decision covers why
>> they didn't. It can be arbitrary in the usual sense of the word
>> ("we think that it's better this way") but cannot be "arbitrary and
>> capricious", a legal term of art which means that they didn't offer
>> to receive public input and "consider" same as explained above.
>> --

>The federal courts do use the phase "arbitrary and capricious" when
>overturning or affirming a FCC decision.

Thank you Mister Wannabee. When will you be admitted to practice
before the Supreme Court of the United States so you can debate
Federal law on an equal basis with those of us who have?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3052. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 22:41:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hguhhm4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69191

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 15:50:04 +0200 (CEST), Nomen Nescio wrote:

>
>If its true that 90 per cent of packet users use
>old VT100 emulators at 1200 bauds,

None of the packet users in my net use VT100-like terminals.

>More, there is a money reason explaining that PSK31 is not used. It
>requires a portable computer (for portable/contest operation) that

Shhhh. don't tell my tower machine that runs PSK31 or it will bug me
to downsize it.

>BBS killed packet interest and now Internet has killed BBS, so the packet
>network is quite desert except some DX clusters and APRS channels but its
>NOT really ham-radio activities.

Don't tell my local packet network that - we have about 35 regulars
who run packet 24/7 as I do, and use it for general chit-chat as
well as for standby communications in connection with ARES/RACES.

>Its time like for sea ships, to forbid CW on HF bands in order
>to oblige the users to get modern equipments.

What makes you think that Morse (CW) is forbidden in maritime ("sea
ships") operation? It's just not used for safety and distress
purposes any more, but it is still permitted for other purposes - if
you can find a shore station that still offers the service.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3053. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 22:41:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgujtx5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69192

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 13:59:56 -0400, lk wrote:

>
>Very interesting, you guys should write article about the HF circuits.

1940s technology at best.... <ggg>
>
>Were HF circuits full or half duplex?

Full duplex. The transmitting and receiving stations were
typically 50 miles or more apart and connected by microwave or
landline with a "central office", usually in the big cities.

>How many voice channels?

Standard international point-to-point radiotelephone was 4 channel
imdependent sideband - A3B, 2 channels upper side band and 2 channels
lower sideband with an order wire channel in the "hole". Busy
paths had more than one circuit. RadioFAX a.k.a. Radiophoto
occupied one voice channel.

Standard international point-to-point radiotelegraph was 4 channel
MUX - A1A, time-division-multiplex, 400 Hz frequency-shift with each
MUX channel running 7-level IRQ code at 75 baud for Telex (a dial-up
teleprinter service) or public telegraph (such as Western Union in
the US). Each of the 4 MUX channels could be further subdivided by TDM
into 4 subchannels, with corresponding lowering of speed.

In the mid-60s, Voice Frequency Telegraph - A7, audio-frequency-shift
keying, 170 Hz shift, 12 channels per voice channel, up to 4 ISB voice
channels per circuit, came into use.

>What kind of antenna did they used?

Typically 17 dB gain rhombics. Transmitters ran between 10-20 KW
and the receiving setup typically was three receivers on three
different antennas in a "space diversity" arrangement to get away
from fading. There were several frequencies which could be used for
each circuit with day, night, and seasonal changes, all coordinated
by the International Frequency Registration Board, an arm of the ITU.

International Point-to-Point stations were a ham's delight to
behold. Antenna farms that wouldn't quit. Rack after rack of
goodies. The RCA receivers of 1939 vintage gave everything that
Collins made 10-20 years later a good run for their money.
Frequently the station would be co-located with a marine public
coast station.

This was all obsoleted by the advent of undersea cables and
satellite circuits. IIRC the last International Point-to-Point
service in the US was one-way AP and UPI press transmissions by
ITT/Press Wireless from San Francisco to South America in the 1970s.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3054. Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 22:46:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621184604.18497.00000846@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69193

The following is dated 20 June 2003 at the website of the Wireless Institute of Australia - WIA Victoria under Morse code watch:

"Code issues bogs down at WRC03"

"The World Radiocommunication Conference in Geneva, has had some firm opposition to the removal of mandatory code tests for amateur licensing.

"The review of ITU RR S25 which requires Morse code proficiency tests for amateur licenses grated priveleges below 30 MHz is being strongly resisted by the former USSR states and the Arab/African group.

"WIA observer at WRC03, Keith Malcolm VK1ZKM reports that the agenda item has gone through the initial stage during which delegates make their detailed presentations on their proposals.

"The chairman of the WRC03 working group handling this item is now considering how best to handle the matter, and has a difficult task ahead of him."

--- end of quote from WIA Victoria

As of this Saturday afternoon, there doesn't seem to be much in the way of news about WRC-03 happenings...not at ARRL, not at the FCC International Bureau, and not at the ITU site (unless one is a TIES member), not from ARN...one has to go around the other side of the globe to Australia. Kudos to the VKs!

Bravo to all those 1x2s in Geneva from ARRL there as "observers" who don't seem to be able to communicate with Newington. :-)

3055. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 23:28:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621192812.16978.00001346@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69194

>Subject: Morse Code Watch
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/21/03 5:46 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030621184604.18497.00000846@mb-m05.aol.com>

>Bravo to all those 1x2s in Geneva from ARRL there as "observers"
> who don't seem to be able to communicate with Newington.

More insulting rhetoric from the cowardly putz who is not only NOT a League member, but not even an Amateur licensee.

Guess they didn't feel compelled to send a message that says "no news yet". The WRC's NOT over yet, and promulgating stories based on half-truths and supposition would be more damaging than good.

Maybe YOU should have gotten an Amateur license, joined the League and promoted yourself as an IARU representitive, Lennie.

Then Dave Sumner and the rest cold have laughed themselves to death.

Steve, K4CAP

3056. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 23:34:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgumf69.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69195

On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 22:41:03 GMT, Phil Kane wrote:

> Standard international point-to-point radiotelephone was 4 channel
> imdependent sideband - A3B, 2 channels upper side band and 2 channels
> lower sideband with an order wire channel in the "hole". Busy
> paths had more than one circuit. RadioFAX a.k.a. Radiophoto
> occupied one voice channel.

Forgot to add that the voice channels used speech inversion for
privacy.

> Standard international point-to-point radiotelegraph was 4 channel
> MUX - A1A, time-division-multiplex, 400 Hz frequency-shift with each

My error - F1B, not A1A.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3057. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 23:43:05 UTC
From: "Dr. John" <frellyou@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <t4r9fv4mhgvhfkchj5hrc2rcdopbt5jl25@4ax.com>
Source record: 69196
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 21:39:30 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> belch-spoke these words:

>
>"Dr. John" <frellyou@privacy.net> wrote in message
>news:pss6fv4amoqj0cp5egm2kv6rhl9hq1spi5@4ax.com...
>> On 20 Jun 2003 05:50:46 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) belch-spoke
>these words:
>>
>> Good luck getting practically totally reliable VoIP on dialup. I tried. I
>failed.
>>
>> John
>
>Might possibly be that particular ISP. I subscribe to two different ones,
>both dialup. On one of them I can almost never get a hookup. Something in
>their firewall system interferes. On the other one I can always get a
>practical, reliable hookup. The odd thing is that the one that works is the
>"busier" system.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Nah, I've been on tons of dialup ISPs. What I meant by reliable was the bandwidth. 56k dialup
download bandwidth, at it's absolute fastest, was 3 kb/sec. So figure the upload was worse than
that. This was with the receive window optimized and the speed verified on DSLreports.com.

Piping through VoIP is troublesome with 3 kb/sec down, and worthless to try with any less, in my
varied ISP experience.

John

3058. Hey Phil...???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-21 23:47:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621194741.04360.00001576@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69197

Phil, can you answer a question for me? I tried this direct e-mail, but it bounced back undeliverable...

Looking through some pending FCC applications I see where the FCC assigned 11 different file numbers to the SAME request from K6YT for a vanity callsign application. I've seen the same thing happen with other applications with no discernible difference between the applications themselves. Wazzup?

Just wondering.

73

Steve, K4CAP

3059. Re: Hey Phil...???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 00:22:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hguoiya.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69198

On 21 Jun 2003 23:47:41 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>Looking through some pending FCC applications I see where the FCC
>assigned 11 different file numbers to the SAME request from K6YT for a
>vanity callsign application. I've seen the same thing happen with
>other applications with no discernible difference between the
>applications themselves. Wazzup?

Dunno - my contact at Gettysburg who was in charge of that section
retired several weeks ago so I don't have a clue.

> Just wondering.

Kinda' hard to get trained help these days.... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3060. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 00:34:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69199

My oh My.....I love it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030621184604.18497.00000846@mb-m05.aol.com...
> The following is dated 20 June 2003 at the website of the Wireless
> Institute of Australia - WIA Victoria under Morse code watch:
>
> "Code issues bogs down at WRC03"
>
> "The World Radiocommunication Conference in Geneva, has had
> some firm opposition to the removal of mandatory code tests for
> amateur licensing.
>
> "The review of ITU RR S25 which requires Morse code proficiency
> tests for amateur licenses grated priveleges below 30 MHz is
> being strongly resisted by the former USSR states and the
> Arab/African group.
>
> "WIA observer at WRC03, Keith Malcolm VK1ZKM reports that the
> agenda item has gone through the initial stage during which
> delegates make their detailed presentations on their proposals.
>
> "The chairman of the WRC03 working group handling this item is
> now considering how best to handle the matter, and has a
> difficult task ahead of him."
>
> --- end of quote from WIA Victoria
>
> As of this Saturday afternoon, there doesn't seem to be much in
> the way of news about WRC-03 happenings...not at ARRL, not
> at the FCC International Bureau, and not at the ITU site (unless
> one is a TIES member), not from ARN...one has to go around the
> other side of the globe to Australia. Kudos to the VKs!
>
> Bravo to all those 1x2s in Geneva from ARRL there as "observers"
> who don't seem to be able to communicate with Newington. :-)

3061. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 00:43:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621204356.18497.00000850@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69200

In article <3EF49D82.4B4BA96C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3EF3ABA7.A256844C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> >" ".
>> >
>> >
>> >Obviously another of Len's carefully laid traps.
>> >
>> You mean "a fiendishly clever plan"?*
>
>Yes, M'lord.
>
I have just one thing to say:

Macbeth!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3062. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 00:57:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF4FF32.7030304@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69301

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:
> On 21 Jun 2003 20:42:56 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

Hey John, you're triple posting here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3063. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 01:15:54 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A1D84BDFB14elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69302

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030621122338.08200.00000338@mb-m25.aol.com:

> In article <d22b54c3.0306210450.44967f6c@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>>Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:<Xns93A05DAC7794Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>>> news:d22b54c3.0306200342.6f696758@posting.google.com:
>>
>>
>>> >> Working split is OK in a contest, but it won't generate QSOs if
>>> >> the other station doesn't even know that the band is open and you
>>> >> can't tell them.
>>> >
>>> > Humbug. Between the contests I've called any number of ssb dx
>>> > stations on their freqs with cw and asked them to listen up. And
>>> > they did in most instances. A particularly memorable example was a
>>> > VP8 who came back with "I can't copy the CW but I'm listening on
>>> > 7215" (or whatever it was). They know exactly what's going on.
>>> >
>>>
>>> 1 - I don't have a key!!!!
>>
>>That's like admitting you're a virgin. Maybe worse. But both deficits
>>are quickly and inexpensively curable.
>
> And if they're done right, both are lots of fun. For most people,
> anyway. YMMV.
>
>>> 2 - In the immediate future, comprehension of CW by the DX is going
>>> to get a lot worse
>>
>>Lotta water has to go over the dam first and none of it is cast in
>>stone. But actually it doesn't much matter. The VP8 apparently couldn't
>>copy Morse either but he certainly got the drift.
>
> Bingo. And if he didn't want to work Yanks, he'd just say "I'm working
> transceive" and be done with it.
>
>>> 3 - It's just plain ridiculous to have to do that
>>
>>To each their own but I suspect that if/when you get what you're asking

>>for you're not going to get what you expected to get.
>
> On bands other than 40, the DX still works split to get away from the
> mob.
>
>>> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there
>>> >> are Ws on it is truly warped.
>>> >
>>> > I'll put it this way: I *much* prefer trying to copy some weak
>>> > piece of 40M ssb exotica split when he's down below where the
>>> > stateside Athritis nets are allowed to trash the band. And/or when
>>> > he isn't buried under a screaming pileup on his freq and nobody can
>>> > hear him.
>
>>> I'll admit that is an advantage, but it balances the one's you can't
>>> work because of this problem
>
> One of the first things even the semi-rare ones do is to work split in
> order to FORCE the pack to spread out. And the 'phone folks have to
> spread out a lot, unlike CW, where a difference of a few dozen Hz is
> enough. And the CW folks with QSK can listen to the dx's freq between
> letters and words.
>>
>>I think you're in for a reality check.
>>
>>> - and stop pretending there's no problem!
>>
>>Has nothing to do with pretending anything, it's obvious that your
>>problem is not a problem for others.
>>
> Heck. let's define the problem:
>
> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide
> exclusive amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get 7200-7300.
> What problems will remain after that happens?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

The only one that I can think of is that the BC stations will fail to QSY.

3064. Re: Hey Phil...???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 02:13:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030621221307.06893.00002448@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 69304

>Subject: Re: Hey Phil...???
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 6/21/03 7:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hguoiya.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>Kinda' hard to get trained help these days.... <ggg>

Don't I know it...!

Thanks for your time!

73

Steve, K4CAP

3065. Re: Liberty Net 3.960

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 02:16:21 UTC
From: Captan Blome roger-roger <44dfrancer@juno.com>
Message-ID: <3ef50f99@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 69303
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Liberty Net is on 3.960

QRM'ers are NOT welcome.

If U want to QRM go to 14.313 with KJI and his fools

"TH" <not@listed.net> wrote in message
news:m78Ja.906$Vx2.459764@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> Opps... fat fingers.... 3960
>
>
> "TH" <not@listed.net> wrote in message
> news:Q58Ja.905$Vx2.459731@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > 5960
> >
> >
>
>

3066. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 02:21:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030621222138.09580.00000932@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 69305

In article <o1PIa.57515$Io.5409909@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, Evil Ham@USA.com.spam writes:

> Don't worry BPL will drive all hams off of HF as soon as the CW requirement >is gone. I think it is too late for ham radio and the removal of the morse >code requirement is twenty years to late. Kids today are into instant world >wide communications with NEXTEL, Web cell phones and Computers on the >Internet.
> Good Luck, because the ham radio community is going to need it. The ARRL >talking about providing communications during emergencies will not overcome >the money factor of BPL. Besides if the FCC took away 144 and 222 they >would generate $10 billion dollars per year in the US economy.
> In 20 years ham radio will have a few channels on HF and the ARRL building >will be a dusty museum.
> I'm a ham, but I can see the writing on the wall. When I obtained my ticket >the Personal Computer was just hitting the market and CB was beginning to >fade. Now we have instant and reliable worldwide communications from a >wireless device from many locations all over the world. No need for >propagation or huge towers with 500 watt amplifiers. Ham Radio is *old* >technology.

For the most part, I agree. I doubt that Amateur Radio will ever lose the 144 MHz band, due to it's large infrastructure of existing repeaters and the fact that it is the most widely utilized VHF band. I also doubt that we will "lose" our HF allocations, but we certainly will be faced with accepting whatever QRM is generated by commercial services like BPL. However, we certainly can look to lose major spectrum in the region above 500 MHz, such as the current challenges at 2.5 GHz.

Ironically, the one mode which is best suited to meet the QRM challenge on HF is good 'ole Morse/CW. However, as we lose CW-capable hams due to our aging/dying ham population, and with the impending end of Morse Code testing requirements, this capability will eventually become a lost art. Thus, the one thing that could preserve ham radio will be voluntarily abandoned by ham radio operators themselves -- all for the purpose of meeting the need to simplify licensing. Talk about your unintended consequences!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3067. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 02:36:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030621223643.09580.00000933@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 69306

Nutz -- I thought this was about a new watch that gives the time in Morse Code!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3068. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 03:03:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB1A94AD.1D112%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69307

"Evil Ham@USA.com.spam" wrote:

> (snip) I'm a ham, but I can see the writing on
> the wall. When I obtained my ticket the Personal
> Computer was just hitting the market and CB was
> beginning to fade. Now we have instant and
> reliable worldwide communications from a wireless
> device from many locations all over the world. No
> need for propagation or huge towers with 500 watt
> amplifiers. Ham Radio is *old* technology.

My involvement with computers since 1981 leads me to an opposite conclusion. I don't see ham radio as old technology and I don't think wireless telephones or internet voice chat poses that great a threat to ham radio (no more than online streaming video poses a threat to television). Radio is a unique technology and will continue to stand on its own. Ham radio will continue to exist right along with the rest of radio.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3069. INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 03:27:03 UTC
From: hamop_62@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <792e029d.0306211927.1e74815@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69308
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares very little about the average ham and even less about its employees. Go read it and see what you think.

3070. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 03:35:58 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vfa93jdndd2uac@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69309

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030621192812.16978.00001346@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >Subject: Morse Code Watch

> Guess they didn't feel compelled to send a message that says "no news
> yet". The WRC's NOT over yet, and promulgating stories based on
half-truths
> and supposition would be more damaging than good.
>
> Steve, K4CAP

You probably right, but the information did come from the
Wireless Institute of Australia.

Here is some web links for news on WRC 2003.

Wireless Institute of Australia - WIA Victoria

http://www.wiavic.org.au/mcw/

http://www.wiavic.org.au/mcw/archive.html

IARU

http://www.iaru.org/iaru-index.html#wrc2003

I guess we need an imbedded RRAP member in Geneva. :-)

Larry KC8EPO

3071. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 03:53:40 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <8L9Ja.54$2L.21@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 69310

Dan, frankly I'm not worried whether they eliminate the code or force us all
to retest at 30 words per minute :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> My oh My......I love it.
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3072. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 05:02:41 UTC
From: fartnoises <1bekno12@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ef53876@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 69311
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"STB" <telegrapher@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:bd37et$6dv$1@news.chatlink.com...
> The sooner the FCC can get us used to being "channelized," the sooner they
> can move forward with further demise of ham radio as we used to know it.
> This band is an insult to hams. The restriction on Morse to me sounds like
> more paranoia by the feds over a mode they no longer understand.

The new 5 Mhz allocation is "channelized" because the
FCC *knows* that, for 98% of the hams to to get on
this band, they will have to "cut diode D-21" or similar
to "open up" their existing japanese-made radio.

This raises a *** VERY INTERESTING ISSUE ***

When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
with this suggestion.

I have measured the spectal purity of several late-model
Icom trancievers, and in 3 out of 5, the transmitted signal
exhibited more spurious harmonics when the "wideband
transmit" was activated (after clipping D-21) than before.

Perhaps this channel-power scheme for 5 mHz was done
more for (by the FCC) reduction of (the) *potential* for
harmonic interference than anything else?

Comments welcome.
>
> " Uncle Peter" <radioconnectionNO@cox.netSPAM> wrote in message
> news:cg_Ia.5752$pH3.2667@news2.east.cox.net...
> > The legalese won't say "USB". It will designate a modulation
> > type. SSB, FM are far too generic.
> >
> > Pete
> >
> > "Tom2000" <tom2000@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:m32qcv87bsds4eglebgcencllqe6tu2b13@4ax.com...
> > > On Thu, 22 May 2003 12:58:11 -0400, Ron Hardin
<rhhardin@mindspring.com>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >Michael Black wrote:

> > > >> It's not how you generate the signal that matters. It's that your
> > > >> FCC has ruled that the only mode that can be used is USB, which
> > > >> means voice, not CW, not RTTY, not AM, not any of the digital
modes.
> > > >
> > > >USB means USB, not voice. You're just using the audio spectrum for
> > > >code, is all.
> > >
> > > Ron, I think I'll have to side with Michael on this one. I haven't
read
> > > the specific FCC regs, but I think that when they say "USB," they
> > > definitely mean "voice."
> > >
> > > Otherwise, there'd be nothing keeping me from using my high-tech rig,
> > > something like a Meissner Signal Shifter driving a 6L6 PA <g>, to send
> > > CW 400 Hz above one of the nominal channel carrier frequencies.
> > >
> > > This is a tricky situation that departs radically from two age-old ham
> > > radio tenets: a) frequencies are always allocated in bands, eg- a
range
> > > of frequencies and b) CW is permissible on *any* frequency, despite
the
> > > nominal allocation. (In later years, this has been modified by the
> > > semi-official bandplan allocations, but I doubt if you'd be put in
jail
> > > for operating CW on 146.52. You might p*ss off a bunch of local hams,
> > > but I doubt if you'd be violating the letter of the law. I might be
> > > wrong, though... that bandplan stuff is being taken very seriously by
> > > the FCC these days, as well it should. After all, it's there to
> > > *prevent* idiots like me from operating CW on 146.52! :-)
> > >
> > > In any case, the 5 MHz band is definitely a new departure for ham
radio.
> > > I believe that anyone contemplating operation on these new channels
> > > needs to read the FCC regs very carefully before attempting to
innovate.
> > > And I hope that there will be absolutely no ambiguity in the FCC regs
> > > governing operation on the 5 MHz band.
> > >
> > > Very 73,
> > >
> > > Tom AB9B

3073. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 05:05:57 UTC
From: fartnoises <1bekno12@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ef5393a@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 69312
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

None of the local bookstores (even Borders!) around here
carry neither 73, or QST in their news stand sections.
It would be nice if this article could be reproduced
online someplace, so more people can read the
allegations.

"Louis C. LeVine" <hamop_62@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:792e029d.0306211927.1e74815@posting.google.com...
> The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice
> about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL
> employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares
> very little about the average ham and even less about its employees.
> Go read it and see what you think.

3074. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 05:45:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306212145.65ef5605@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69313

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030621192812.16978.00001346@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Morse Code Watch
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 6/21/03 5:46 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030621184604.18497.00000846@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
> >Bravo to all those 1x2s in Geneva from ARRL there as "observers"
> > who don't seem to be able to communicate with Newington.
>
> More insulting rhetoric from the cowardly putz who is not only NOT a League
> member, but not even an Amateur licensee.
>
> Guess they didn't feel compelled to send a message that says "no news
> yet". The WRC's NOT over yet, and promulgating stories based on half-truths
> and supposition would be more damaging than good.
>
> Maybe YOU should have gotten an Amateur license, joined the League and
> promoted yourself as an IARU representitive, Lennie.
>
> Then Dave Sumner and the rest cold have laughed themselves to death.
>
> Steve, K4CAP

It's been floating around for a couple days.

- - - - -

Forwarded from the CW reflector, courtesy LU1DZ:

Code issues bogs down at WRC03
The World Radiocommunications Conference in Geneva, has had some firm
opposition to the removal of mandatory code tests for amateur licensing.

The review of ITU RR S25 which requires Morse code proficiency tests for
amateur licences granted privileges below 30MHz is being strongly resisted
by the the former USSR states and the Arab/African group.

WIA observer at WRC03, Keith Malcolm VK1ZKM reports that the agenda item has
gone through the initial stage during which delegates make their detailed
presentations on their proposals.

The chairman of the WRC03 working group handling this item is now
considering how best to handle the matter, and has a difficult task ahead of
him.

20th June

Alberto LU1DZ

- - - - - -

w3rv

3075. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 05:51:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306212151.63a71c83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69314

Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:<43193ef4dff3a3553deffd68275f84ef@dizum.com>...
> As it was said by some hams here, digital modes
> like PSK31 are few used, especially on 6m.
> Why ?

Because there is very little interest in 6M compared with the HF bands
and 2M. You need to stir up more interest in 6M if it's a big deal
for you.

> If its true that 90 per cent of packet users use
> old VT100 emulators at 1200 bauds, many
> DXers are always stuck with CW because they
> are old and do not understand how to use a
> computer to play PSK31.

Hogwash to the core.

I'm older than dirt and I have a big Winbox with six drives, 256 Mb
worth of RAM, a GE Force 4 video card w/64 Mb RAM, 19" high-res flat
NEC monitor, yadda, yadda. And if I choose to do so with my current
equipment I can run CW, SSB, PSK, FM, AM, RTTY and all the others 160M
thru 70 cm. And I'm at the low end as far as the investment in a
contesting/dxing station is concerned.

> Its stone age
> although PSK31 is 10 dB better than CW.

We all know that. PSK is not in competion with CW on any basis,
particularly in "stone age" CW contesting/dxing any more than PSK is
in competition with SSB.

> More, there is a money reason explaining that
> PSK31 is not used. It requires a portable computer
> (for portable/contest operation)

Where did you get that silly notion? Most serious contesters & dxers
use 'puters in tower cases and operate parked on their arses at their
home stations.

> that must have a
> sound card, a lot of RAM to use Win9x and
> a CD-ROM to install Win9x. Actually, in all
> the world (because USA is not the only country
> on Earth), surplus lowest priced laptops are
> principally 486 based computers with no sound
> card, no CD-ROM and 4 or 8 MB RAM,

> running DOS and sometimes Win31.
> With this equipment, impossible to play PSK31.
> All the hams on Earth do not have $1000 to
> spend in a modern laptop just to play with PSK31.
> Its impossible to add a PCMCIA sound card on
> these old laptops because the PCMCIA bus has
> NO DMA, so there is no PCMCIA sound blaster
> clone card available.

99% irrelvant. See above re: tower case station integration and
operation.

> Any cheap PSK31 interface solution ? Tell us ...

Hamscope is one of many.

> There is no acceptable PSK31 program running
> under DOS (although waterfall graphics will be
> possible also under DOS), and even on Win9X,
> the author of WinPSKse is too much lazybones to
> allow 640x480 display (same problem with
> WSJT, running only in 800x600 mode) and on a
> 486 laptop, its not possible to run 800x600.
> Here are some reasons that explain why PSK31
> is not very used especially on 6m. More, there
> is no worldwide PSK31 consensus to determine
> a DX calling frequency for PSK31 on 6m.

DOS died years ago, the rest of us have long since buried it fer
chrissake.

> Packet interest had fallen. TAPR was a pioneer
> in the years 80s and we all thank TAPR for their
> TNC2 project (always used in APRS today) but
> the applications of packet-radio were limited to
> DX (yes it was possible with level 2) and BBS
> traffic. BBS killed packet interest and now Internet
> has killed BBS, so the packet network is quite
> desert except some DX clusters and APRS
> channels but its NOT really ham-radio activities.
> Many hams use now ECHOLINK but ECHOLINK
> is not AUTHORIZED in all countries. Many pirates
> interface their VHF/UHF ham station to Internet
> to allow ECHOLINK but it is often forbidden to
> make a bridge between radio bands and Internet
> (for security reasons, terrorists could use
> ECHOLINK to communicate).

Your point here is . . . ??

> Thats the deal. We have modern modes of
> transmissions like PSK31, but laws speaking
> always of CW (19th century). Its time like for

> sea ships, to forbid CW on HF bands in order
> to oblige the users to get modern equipments.

A good solid 1.02 on the Troll-O-Meter.

w3rv

3076. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 05:56:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622015611.23689.00001233@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69315

>Daylight Time
>Message-id: <8L9Ja.54$2L.21@news01.roc.ny>
>
>Dan, frankly I'm not worried whether they eliminate the code or force us all
>to retest at 30 words per minute

I'm game.

73

Steve, K4CAP

3077. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 06:48:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306212248.12b53ded@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69316

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd1sfu$ce6$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> I have often thought the same way. But I figure it won't happen till Im
> dead anyway. So I'll enjoy it while I can. And fight it tooth and nail all
> the way.

I certainly agree with that!

> Dan/W4NTI
>
> <Evil Ham@USA.com.spam> wrote in message
> news:o1PIa.57515$Io.5409909@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 01:50:15 +0200, Fritz Wuehler
> > <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:
> >
> > >Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
> > >CW will be abolished.
> >
> > Don't worry BPL will drive all hams off of HF as soon as the CW
> requirement
> > is gone. I think it is too late for ham radio and the removal of the morse
> > code requirement is twenty years to late. Kids today are into instant
> world
> > wide communications with NEXTEL, Web cell phones and Computers on the
> > Internet.
> > Good Luck, because the ham radio community is going to need it. The ARRL
> > talking about providing communications during emergencies will not
> overcome
> > the money factor of BPL.

There's another whole dimension to the BPL thing. Gurus within the
power gen biz are saying that the cost of implementing BPL is
astronomical and that it would take ten years after broadscale
implementation to get the first positive ROI on the required
investment. The Achilles heel of BPL lies in the need to install
pricey black boxes across every power transformer in the system to
pass the RF around those xfmrs, i.e., on every pole pig on your
street. Then comes the maintenace . .

Show me an investor with deep enough pockets to fund BPL given this
reality who is also willing to wait ten years for a payback and I'll
show you either a nutcase or the whole scheme was stillborn from the
gitgo.

Who knows what the cable and light pipe guys will have come up with
ten years hence which will drive their stakes even further into BPL?

> Besides if the FCC took away 144 and 222 they
> > would generate $10 billion dollars per year in the US economy.

That's about four hours worth Federal gummint expenditures.

> > In 20 years ham radio will have a few channels on HF and the ARRL
> building
> > will be a dusty museum.
> > I'm a ham, but I can see the writing on the wall. When I obtained my
> ticket
> > the Personal Computer was just hitting the market and CB was beginning to
> > fade.

Newbie.

The same general BS was floated around in the early '50's when Novices
got HF privs with a weenie 5 wpm test. Then came Incentive Licensing.
The sky did not fall on ham radio then either.

> > Now we have instant and reliable worldwide communications from a
> > wireless device from many locations all over the world. No need for
> > propagation or huge towers with 500 watt amplifiers. Ham Radio is *old*
> > technology.

Bah. So are feet, bicyles and oars old tyechnologies. So WHAT?

w3rv

3078. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 07:06:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306212306.1c445f75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69317

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030621222138.09580.00000932@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> Thus, the one thing that could preserve ham radio will be
> voluntarily abandoned by ham radio operators themselves -- all for the
> purpose of meeting the need to simplify licensing. Talk about your
> unintended consequences!

But is it uninteded??

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

3079. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 07:10:00 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bd3ko8paf1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 69318
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"fartnoises" (1bekno12@yahoo.com) writes:
> "STB" <telegrapher@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:bd37et$6dv$1@news.chatlink.com...
>> The sooner the FCC can get us used to being "channelized," the sooner they
>> can move forward with further demise of ham radio as we used to know it.
>> This band is an insult to hams. The restriction on Morse to me sounds like
>> more paranoia by the feds over a mode they no longer understand.
>
> The new 5 Mhz allocation is "channelized" because the
> FCC *knows* that, for 98% of the hams to to get on
> this band, they will have to "cut diode D-21" or similar
> to "open up" their existing japanese-made radio.
>
> This raises a *** VERY INTERESTING ISSUE ***
>
> When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
> with this suggestion.
>
> I have measured the spectal purity of several late-model
> Icom trancievers, and in 3 out of 5, the transmitted signal
> exhibited more spurious harmonics when the "wideband
> transmit" was activated (after clipping D-21) than before.
>
> Perhaps this channel-power scheme for 5 mHz was done
> more for (by the FCC) reduction of (the) *potential* for
> harmonic interference than anything else?
>
Huh?

There is no type acceptance on amateur equipment.

You operate equipment on an amateur band, and it's allowed.
You do have to fulfill certain standards, but that's the
operator's responsibility and has nothing to do with the manufacturer.

If you operate out of band, it likely isn't allowed because the
other service requires that equipment be type accepted. Since amateur
equipment isn't type accepted in the first place, for amateur or
other use, then it will be breaking the rules.

However, the band, or channels, under discussion is an amateur band, albeit with a few specific standards added in. Anything that will fit the standards will work there, and it needs absolutely no type acceptance.

Michael VE2BVW

3080. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 07:21:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF558EF.B4A42128@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69319

Fritz Wuehler wrote:
>
> Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
> CW will be abolished.

...not likely, Fritz.

> The dream will become reality and old farts CW
> coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
> mass on the HF bands.

I see. "Today CW; tomorrow, the world!" or something like that, huh?

> In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
> half of ham operators that are technicians.

I'm sure there are a number of countries which will be disappointed in
not making your "civilized countries" list.

> Think
> that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
> that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.

What is going to turn these guys into instant DXers? How is this
"abolishment" of CW to take place?

> Most of hams have a bad antenna system.

From where do you obtain your facts?

> 2 kW are not necessary to make a QSO.

It might well be if 1.9 KW can't get the job done.

> You can get
> a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
> your antenna acts like a resistor.

There aren't many guys running T2FD's.

> Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
> reports.

If the noise is 59+55 db, it might well be necessary.

> 56 is sufficient considering the QRN.

I don't think you've considered QRN enough. Is it Summer where you are?

> So, please stop using kW amplifiers (you generate
> splatters, harmonics, etc ... on the bands)...

Please explain how KW amplifiers by and of themselves necessarily
produce "splatters" or harmonics.

> and use
> digital modes with low RF power.

My regs permit a variety of modes and a great deal of power.

> Remember that
> HF bands are international and that you must
> SHARE them with hams of other countries.

Not just the "civilized countries"?

> Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
> and peace and love for all !

Far out, man!

Dave K8MN

3081. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 07:26:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF559E8.B22543B3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69320

Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3EF3ACEA.2EBC60FD@earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >>
> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> >> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:

> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there are
> >> Ws on it is truly warped.
> >
> > Howzat? If the realigned band is opened to U.S. ops, there'll be no DX
> > refuge.

> As I explained, that isn't so. We can only use phone down to 7150 in the
> US, and no-one expects it to go lower than 7100 if the Novice subband is
> 're-farmed' The phone subband in other countries goes down to at least
> 7050, and even down to 7030 in some cases.

You have no idea what will be permitted where after any changes are made
at the conference.

> If you are expecting any of
> that spectrum to be reallocated to CW in other countries, dream on.

Reallocated to CW? Where did you get that idea?

Dave K8MN

3082. Re: Echolink : why you don't like it ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 07:47:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF55EF2.16E150A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69321

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <bcsnoe$mt9pv$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

> There's always this newsgroup-chatroom dominated by a few
> extremely regulars. :-)

Why, any such number would have to include you, Leonard :)

>
> The sages of this chatroom, er, newsgroup, will have everyone
> believe that hams all over the world are using OOK CW right
> now, therefore everyone licensed "must" be proficient in that
> mode...ergo the code test is an absolute "must." :-)

Hams all over the world ARE using morse at any given moment of the day.

> >PSK31 is nice, but through a variety of reasons it is primarily only
> >used on HF.
>
> It was devised by Peter Martinez, G3PLX, a long-time innovator
> in amateur radio and early proponent of direct-conversion
> receivers and the Gingell polyphase network (circa 1974).
> It is just one form out of many for written communications via
> a very narrow bandwidth not requiring morse code skill.
>
> A problem with the entrenched narrowbanders in hamdom is that
> PSK31 invokes some information coding theory which seems
> alien to those narrowbanders.

Gee, Len, you've just given us another history lesson in which you write
of PSK-31 using "a very narrow bandwidth" and then you begin to spout
about entrenched narrowbanders. I just looked around the old narrow
trench. I see morse ops and I see PSK-31 ops but I don't see you.
Please try to elucidate on how PSK-31 coding seems alien to those who
are already hams.

> They don't understand it, don't
> want to understand it, it isn't "natural" and therefore it must be
> downplayed and even denigrated since it is not like their own
> superb skill at morsemanship.

Wow, you've managed to work several false assumptions into one really
long and clunky sentence.

> There could be a lot more experimentation at digital voice on HF
> except it, too, involves information coding theory and the narrow-
> banders seem to think a thousand-dollar PC is "necessary" to
> decode/encode digital voice. Such isn't necessary but the
> narrowbanders will seize any opportunity to downplay anything
> they feel is alien to the established order.
>
> Digital voice IS being used on HF right now, both by governments
> and SW broadcasters (three years on trials so far) and it DOES
> work. Governments, particularly militaries, have used it longer on
> HF to VHF, but few amateurs know what the signals sound like
> so they simply cast it out. Their receivers can't demodulate the
> signals so they dismiss it as just some kind of noise.

I'm sure that digital voice will really take off for SW broadcasters as soon as Brute Force Cybernetics (the company which creates a need and then fills it) figures a way to get all those third world listeners $29 receivers capable of receiving digital voice signals.

As to the rest of your paragraph's claims, my receiver can't demodulate it so I'll just dismiss it as some kind of noise.

> >As far as packet, that has fallen so far behind, that it is a serious shame.
> >Most of the programs are old, crappy DOS based programs, (am unaware of any
> >Windows based programs) and with incredibly slow transmission speeds and
> >limited file sharing capability, I am surprised it hasn't died out
> >completely.
>
> There's insufficient paradigm adjustment in amateur radio packet.
> Most everyone involved seems content with the old ways before
> the Internet and modeling on the BBSs for "up to date" methods.

Just as soon as some wanna-be expert starts spouting terms like "insufficient paradigm adjustment", I'd advise his audience to be very, very wary.

>
> That's rather beyond the entrenched narrowband thinking again.
> :-)
>
> It's been a couple years since the first announcement of an HT
> accessory to take images and transmit JPG format images as
> well as display them. It didn't seem to meet with any ham market
> success...yet the cellular phones with picture capability are
> currently a rage with the general public. Entrenched thinking in
> amateur radio seems to be ears-only communications. ATV and
> slow-scan imagining never got to any big thing in hamdom.

Just get the folks at Brute Force Cybernetics involved, Leonard. As soon as they convince hams that they need such devices, they'll take off. That should take place about the same time you become a participant in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

3083. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 07:49:58 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306212349.6752af71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69322

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030621122338.08200.00000338@mb-m25.aol.com>...

>
> One of the first things even the semi-rare ones do is to work split in order to
> FORCE the pack to spread out. And the 'phone folks have to spread out a lot,
> unlike CW, where a difference of a few dozen Hz is enough.

Yew betchum although the cw piles usually get spread out more than
just a few dozen Hz., more like a kHz.

> And the CW folks
> with QSK can listen to the dx's freq between letters and words.

Which is exactly why the big guns use two rcvrs simultaneously, built
into the xcvr or otherwise.

> >
> >I think you're in for a reality check.
> >
> >> - and stop pretending there's no problem!
> >
> >Has nothing to do with pretending anything, it's obvious that your
> >problem is not a problem for others.
> >
> Heck. let's define the problem:
>
> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide exclusive
> amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get 7200-7300. What problems
> will remain after that happens?

None on our side of either pond. It's all uphill. The dx will by far
be the huge beneficiaries which is as it should be. Having a lot more
space to work each other and themselves is the one huge overriding
benefit of the overall effort to harmonize 40.

As far as the ssb transceive thing goes I expect that Alun & Co. will
be better able to snipe a new one here and there but not to the extent
I sense he expects. Band condx on 40 rule much more so than on 20 for
instance and the dx will be much more able to shrug off The Hordes
many more hours per day than they can on 20. When The Hordes do have
openings and become nuisances the dx will simply drop back down into
their age-old sheltered spaces and carry on and nothing will change in
this respect.

Actually I 'druther Alun's dream would come true. Us beepers might
finally get the damned spazzy Donald Ducks outta *OUR* 7.000-7.100 . .

.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3084. ARNewsline 1349 - June 20 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 08:32:46 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622043246.09140.00000895@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 69323

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1349 – June 20, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1349 with a release date of Friday, June 20th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A petition to end High Fidelity S-S-B transmissions is filed with the F-C-C, severe interference knocks out ham satellite operations ion Perth Australia and an update on W-R-C 2003. All this and more on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1349 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO LAW: HAMS PETITION TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB

On-air experimentation with so-called High Fidelity or Enhanced Single Sideband transmissions could be outlawed if thr FCC adopts a proposed rules change requested by two radio amateurs on opposite sides of the country. Amateur Radio Newsline's Paul Courson, WA3VJB, reports from the nations capital:

--

A petition for rulemaking was sent to the FCC and accepted by the agency May 27th. It was not immediately issued a Rulemaking Number so it was hard to find in the public record. However, Newsline has talked with two sources who have seen the proposal, and it calls for what many would consider severe bandwidth limitations on HF phone.

The petition asks for a federally mandated bandwidth limit of 2.8 kilohertz for SSB, well below the extended bandwidth needed for what has been called enhanced audio.

One of the two hams who submitted the petition told the FCC they are motivated by interference problems caused by two groups of single sideband operators. These groups are portrayed by the petitioners as, in both cases, having cast aside traditional voluntary limits on bandwidth of roughly three kilohertz. The petition therefore asks that these voluntary limits be made mandatory to provide a clear enforcement mechanism for regulators.

The petitioners, Michael Lonneke WØYR of Virginia, and Melvin Ladisky W6FDR of California, said hams from one of the groups come on during radio contests, and are found tweaking their transmitters to splatter purposely to provide elbowroom on a very crowded band. The two men characterize the other group as those who experiment with high-fidelity audio, apparently trying to replicate the sound of FM Broadcast stations.

Newsline has recently reported on advisory letters sent out by FCC Enforcement Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, who wrote to several members of the enhanced SSB group telling them the agency had received interference complaints. The letters did not validate nor dispute the complaints, but warned the stations that if such complaints continued, the unresolved friction could trigger petitions for rulemaking. One such petition is now at hand.

A Newsline reporter spoke with Lonneke, who declined to provide a copy of his petition for this report. He said he and Ladisky hold the same views on the matter of excessive bandwidth causing interference, and that they teamed up on the petition to add strength to their call for regulatory intervention. Lonneke declined further comment, and said the petition will speak for itself if the FCC chooses to assign it a rulemaking number and put it to public comment.

Members of the enhanced SSB group have told Newsline they believe their experimentation with improved audio is totally in line with the spirit of ham radio, and thet when conducted under appropriate conditions, is every bit as justified in bandwidth consumption as any other spectrum-intensive activity, including contesting. But the FCC's Hollingsworth, reacting to such comments, disagreed, suggesting the mode of SSB was commissioned for the amateur service as a spectrum conservation mode, counter to the idea of high-fidelity audio and the bandwidth it requires.

Hollingsworth could not be reached to comment on the proposed Petition, and another FCC official declined to comment.

The petition also mentions the legacy mode of AM, and said it, quote, does not create the same problems that the burgeoning use of so-called 'Hi-Fi Single Sideband' creates. Nonetheless, the petition asks the FCC to impose a 5.6 kilohertz bandwith limitation on AM, with the restrictions asked for on all HF allocations below 28.8 megahertz.

Previous regulatory proposals based on bandwidth have failed, including Docket 20777 from the mid 1970s. The conclusion then was that having loosely-defined technical standards allowed the greatest range of experimentation in ham radio, as long as such signals are clean. Indeed, many present-day violations of splatter, overdriven amplifiers, and poorly administered audio lashups can already trigger enforcement action under existing FCC rules governing the purity of signal.

Reporting for Newsline, Paul Courson, WA3VJB, in Washington

--

As we go to air, the ten page petition by W0YR and W6FDR has not been been assigned a Rule Making number designation. More on this story in future amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline™, W5YI)

**

ON THE AIR: PERTH HAMS JAMMED OFF 2.4 GHZ

A cloud of radio frequency interference has settled in on the 2 point 4 Gigahertz in the city of Perth Australia. For many hams it is making satellite operations impossible. Felix Scerri, VK4FUQ, reports from the city

of Ingham – down under:

--
You may not hear many VK6 hams on AO40 for a while. Many are suffering from interference from some form of wide band data transmission centred on 2.4GHz. The signal covers much of the Perth metro area and is very strong. So strong in fact that it does not matter where you beam you can still hear it - mainly from reflections.

The signal, which runs continuously, sounds like a 100Hz buzzing sound and has a bandwidth of about MHz. Looking at the signal on a spectrum analyzer it has a flat top and very steep sides. The signal started about 6 weeks ago and one suggestion is that it might be an image response of S band down converters to the 2.1GHz G3 mobile phone service that have just started tests.

--

At airtime, the interference is still there and hams in Perth are wondering what to do to make the problem, go away. (Q-News)

**

WRC 2003: AN UPDATE

Radio regulators from around the world are still gathered in Geneva Switzerland trying to work out numerous spectrum issues including some dealing with Amateur Radio. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is here with the latest:

--

The International Telecommunication Union's 2003 World Radiocommunication Conference got under way June 9th in Geneva Switzerland. Amateur Radio is only a small part of the conference which is trying to complete work on more than 40 agenda items.

Amateur Radio is but a small part of the conference, which is trying to complete work on more than 40 agenda items. Three are especially important to us: realignment of 7 MHz allocations (agenda item 1.23), revision of the regulations governing the amateur and amateur-satellite services (agenda item 1.7), and consideration of an allocation for satellite-borne synthetic aperture radars (SARs) in the 70-cm band (agenda item 1.38).

Two other agenda items that could potentially have a great impact are the drafting of an agenda for the next WRC scheduled for 2007 (agenda item 7.2) and the revision of footnotes to the Table of Frequency Allocations (agenda item 1.1). A member of the IARU core team has been assigned to follow each of these five items, with the most focus being on 7 MHz.

It is the intention of the IARU core team to send timely and accurate reports of final decisions reached on Amateur Radio issues. It is important to remember that nothing is final until the second reading of a document in the Plenary, which in the case of controversial issues
will not take place until the final week of the conference, 30 June to 4 July.

--

Look for up to date briefings on the ARRL website at www.arrl.org and weekly summaries here on Amateur Radio Newsline. (ARRL, Q-News)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Montgomery Amateur Radio Club's 146.955 repeater serving Rockville Maryland.

(5 sec pause here)

**

IN THE MEDIA: HAM RADIO HIGHLIGHTED ON WBUR RADIO

Ham radio was the featured guest when WBUR radio in Boston Massachusettes devoted its show titled "The Connection" to the hobby on Thursday, June 12th. Hosted by Dick Gordon, the show's theme was that ham radio is alive and vital with close to two-and-a-half million hams world wide still consider ham radio their preferred way to fly.

The program was also centered around the new book titled "Hello World: A Life in Ham Radio" by Danny Gregory and Paul Sahre. A book based on the collection of QSL cards of silent key W2OJW. And while neither of the authors was there, Bob Hopkins, WB2UDC was. Hoskins is Director of the Computer Center at Cooper Union University in New York and played a key role in the books development:

--

Hopkins: "Hello World is a wonderful book, and where I work over at Cooper Union I have collegues that do many things. We have an engineering school, an art school and an arcetecture school. Because of the archecture aspect, a collegue of mine who works at the Princeton Archecture Press as well as Cooper Union contacted me and said that he had a couple of friends who were thinking of putting together a book on ham radio post cards and wanted to do the graphic design and would I be interested in having a conversation with them. I said -- oh sure -- fine -- bring them in. These guys came in with these fabulous cards dating back to 1927 up to the present."

--

Also appearing on the program were were Moody Law, WQ6I in Claremont California, Joe Leto, W0ANT from Ankeny Iowa, and Harry Han, BG4AGY, in Shanghai. Each spoke on the way ham radio has affected their personal lives and those around them.

Even though its well over a week since the perogram aired, it is archived as a Real Audio stream at the WBUR website. To hear it take your web browser to http://www.theconnection.org/shows/2003/06/20030612_b_main.asp

Our thanks to Daron Manoogian who is the Manager of National Program Marketing at WBUR for permission to use the audio you heard in this report. (K1TW)

**

RADIO LAW: NY HAM CITED UNDER STATE SCANNER LAW

A New York ham has been cited for having radio gear in his car even though the state law governing scanner radios exempts licensed Amateur Radio operators. On May 31st Richard C. Lalone II, KC5GAX, of Calcium, says that he was stopped while driving well under the posted speed limit by a New York State Trooper and given a ticket for having Icom IC 1500 and IC 706 radios in his vehicle.

Lalone says via the qrz.com website that he did try to explain that that he was an Amateur Radio Operator and even provided his Amateur license for the officer’s review. Apparently, this was not good enough and the ticket was issued.

Lalone appeared in court on June 10th to answer the summons. At that time he approached the judge with both his license and a copy of New York Traffic Law 397 a copy of PR Docket 91-36. But the Court Recorder immediately took the documentation from the judge and returned it to KC5GAX. The judge then conferred with the Court Recorder after which he told Lalone that he was entering a plea of innocent for him. He then instructed Lalone to seek an attorney and be present in court July 9th. They court then offered KC5GAX paperwork to obtain a public defender, and returned the citation with the new court date.

Its not clear as to what will transpire on July 9th. Lalone’s posting did not state if this was a trial date or other type of preliminary hearing. If he is convicted of violating New York’s scanner control law Lalone faces a fine of $1000, 6 months in jail, or both. (W6EM, qrz.com)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC WRITES PART 15 DEVICE USERS ABOUT ALLEGED INTERFERENCE TO AMATEUR RADIO

Turning to enforcement issues, the FCC has written two Northern Virginia residents to follow up on complaints from a local amateur. A ham who alleges that he's on the receiving end of harmful interference from telephone devices with the capability to support multiple cordless remotes. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--

According to the ARRL Letter both units interfereing with Bernie Keiser, W4SW, of Vienna, Virginia, are unlicensed Part 15 consumer electronics made by a well-known manufacturer. In separate June 2nd letters to the two users, the FCC’s Sharon Bowers pointed out that if their units are the cause of harmful interference to a licensed spectrum user, they are responsible for solving the problem. Also, that the operator of the device is responsible for correcting the interference or ceasing operation whenever such interference occurs.

Bowers is the deputy chief of the Consumer Inquiries and Complaint Division of the FCC's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. She explained in her letters that the equipment was classified as an intentional radiator and noted that harmful interference to a licensed radio service from such a device is a violation of FCC rules. She advised the consumers that the alleged harmful interference must be corrected before they may use the devices legally. She suggested they contact the manufacturer or retailer of the equipment to see if they'd either allow them to return them or exchange them for devices that don't cause interference.

The interference to W4SW’s ham radio operation took the form of broadband noise from 2400 to 2450 Mhz. This made it it difficult for him to hear the AO-40 downlink and beacon in the 2.4 Ghz band.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

The complaints against the two Vienna Virginia consumers represent a bit of a turnabout from the typical interference scenario. Usually its the ham who generates complaints of RFI to consumer electronic gear and hears from the FCC. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM ACCUSED OF FALSE DISTRESS CALLS ORDERED OFF THE AIR

A California ham has lost his right to operate an Amateur Radio station. This, based on allegations by the FCC that he may have been the source of a number of phony distress calls made by radio.

On June 3rd the agency’s Riley Hollingsworth notified Michael V. Swift, the now former KG6QOB to inform him that his license had been cancelled. This, based on evidence that the San Ramon ham had made numerous false distress calls on Marine Channels 16 and 22A.

In his letter Hollingsworth said that in view of the agency’s action that Swift no longer has authority to operate Amateur Radio transmitting equipment. He also warned that any continued on-air operation by Swift could lead to a fine or criminal prosecution. (FCC, RAIN)

**

SPECTRUM REALLOCATION: FCC PROPOSES UNLICENSED DEVICES IN THE 5 GHZ BAND

Still with regulatory matters, the FCC has proposed making 5.47 to 5.725 Gigahertz available to National Information Infrastructure devices, including Radio Local Area Networks, on an unlicensed basis. If adopted, this plan will increase the spectrum available to license-free devices in the 5 GHz region by nearly 80%.

The complete story is on the web at the FCC’s website. A direct link to it is http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-110A1.doc (CGC)

**

WITH THE HANDI HAMS: NEW BLIND FRIENDLY WEB THEME FOR WWW.HANDIHAM.ORG

Phil Temples, K9HI, has created a blind-friendly theme for the Handi Ham System website. The reorganized site eliminates the complicated page structure that works well for sighted users but was difficult for blind users employing audio programs like JAWS or Window-Eyes to navigate. To take advantage of the new navigation system visit www.handiham.org and choose the "Courage" theme for easy blind navigation. (HandiHams)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: WA8SME NEW COORDINATOR OF ARRL'S "THE BIG PROJECT"

Mark Spencer, WA8SME, has joined the ARRL Headquarters staff as the new coordinator of the ARRL Amateur Radio Education and Technology program. That program is better known in ham radio circles "The Big Project." Spencer succeeds Jerry Hill, KH6HU, who has returned to Hawaii. (ARRL)

**

FOR YOUR READING PLEASURE: HEATHKIT - A GUIDE TO THE AMATEUR RADIO PRODUCTS

If you've ever owned a piece of Heathkit amateur radio gear, or wish you had, the Second Edition of Heathkit - A Guide to the Amateur Radio Products, by Chuck Penson, WA7ZZE, is a must for your library. Greatly expanded and updated, this 328-page collection of facts, photos and Heathkit history offers a terrific trip down memory lane for anyone who has built or has owned Heathkit gear. Its published by CQ and available for order on-line at www.cq-amateur-radio.com or by phone at 1-800-853-9797 Monday to Friday from 9 a.m to 5 p.m. Eastern U-S. time. (CQ)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: THE TRUE UNIVERSAL REMOTE

A true universal remote unit that will literally help to control your entire lifestyle is now under development. Researchers on the project say that the all-in-one controller that would choreograph not just home entertainment systems but also intelligent appliances all around the house.

Maya Designs Inc. in cooperation with Pennsylvania’s Carnegie Mellon University has created a prototype based on a Compaq iPAQ portable digital assistant. The experimental handheld has so far been used to control two lamps, a fan and a stereo with a five-CD changer. Researchers say that more is on the way once standardization of remote control codes for various appliances

is achieved.

The Consumer Electronics Association is working on this aspect of the problem. It estimates the average household has at least four remote control units. It also understand why the consumer electronics industry considers a universal remote an important device for the marketplace. (Science Today)

**

RADIO AND SPACE: MOUNTAIN PEAK NAMED IN HONOR OF ILL FATED COLUMBIA CREW

A Colorado mountain peak has been named Columbia Point. This, in honor of the seven astronauts who died when the space shuttle Columbia broke up over Texas on Februay 1st.

The peak on Kit Carson Mountain in the Sangre de Cristo Range near Colorado Springs is close to the 14,081-foot Challenger Point. That peak was named in honor of the seven crew members who died in the Challenger space shuttle explosion in 1986. The newly cvhristened Columbia Point also is roughly 14,000 feet. (ANS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - EUROPE: PMR446 MEANS FUN

From a listener in Europe comes word of a new communications network called PMR446. This is a licence free 500 milliwatt personal mobile radio service that is quite similar to the United States Family Radio Service with one big difference. The pan-Eueropean service permits is users to connect their radio gear to the Internet using personal computers and software interfaces. The software of choice is eQSO and with it Eueropean experimenters have created a network of linked rf-gateways.

On the R-F side, the radio gear is limited to flea power and built-in antennas, but thanks to gateway linking PMR 446 is quickly developing into quite a hobby thats bringinging together hams and non hams alike. In fact, it even has its own home in cyberspace at www.446user.co.uk. Drop by and have a look at what’s happening on the other side of the Atlantic. (PMR446 Users Group)

**

INTERNATIONAL - HOLLAND: RADIO NETHERLANDS TARGETED BY PUBLIC BROADCASTER

Radio Netherlands management have reacted angrily to a recent edition of the Dutch domestic current affairs TV programme Nova. A story reported on Nova said that drastic budget cuts of up to 85% was in the offering for Radio Netherlands, and as a result everything except broadcasts to the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam would be scrapped.

According to Radio Netherlands, the erroneous item was based on a leaked copy of a report into the efficiency of public broadcasting that was jointly commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of Culture and the broadcasters themselves. Nova seized on one section of the report and interviewed a representative of the Dutch Association of Journalists, who said this would effectively mean the

end of Radio Netherlands.

But Radio Netherlands says that the report was not a call to action. Rather, its purpose of the report was to identify multiple scenarios where cost savings could be made. The example quoted by Nova was just one. The Hilversum based station also noted that decisions on the mission of Radio Netherlands are made by politicians in The Hague, not by other public broadcasters or the authors of a commissioned report. (Media Network)

**

ON THE AIR: MUSEUM SHIPS 2003

On the air, K3CLG says that the 2003 Museum Ships Weekend special event stations will be held on the weekend July 19th and 20th. Operations will encompass all modes including phone, C-W, PSK-31, APRS and even contacts via the Internet Radio Linking Project or IRLP. You can check on all the details at this easy to copy URL. Its all at www.qsl.net/ww2dd/event.html (K3CLG)

**

DX

In D-X, word that SM3CVM, plans to be on as portable CU2 from Sao Miguel in the Azores through July 6th. Activity will be mainly CW on 80 through 10 meters. This will be a holiday operation, so he will mostly be active late evenings local time. QSL to his home callsign via the bureau or direct to his callbook address. (GB2RS)

Also V31MX and V-31-M-F will be active from Caye Caulker from July 23rd until noon of July 29th. They will operate on 80 through 10 meters SSB with some CW activity. QSL both callsign via KZBCN, either direct or via the bureau. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: N6ZE’S CROSS-COUNTRY ROVING ODYSSEY

And finally this week, the story of Peter Heins, N6ZE, who may now hold the record for a QRP Rover in the June ARRL VHF QSO Party. In less than two days, Pete managed to rove coast-to-coast, from Grid Square FN-20 to CN-87. Thats a distance of 2754 miles and he operated 6 and 2 meter SSB from each location. Here’s how he did it.

From 1400 to 14:45 E-D-T on Saturday June 14th, Pete was on the air from park bench overlooking Hudson River at Weehawken New Jersey. From there he even managed to work a station in grid EL-86 thru the tremendous E skip that was present at the time.

A bit more operating from a hotel room in midtown Manhattan followed until 15:30 Eastern Daylight Time. Then a quick drive out to the airport where Pete, who is a commercial airline pilot, traded his ham radio microphone and key for the co-pilots seat of a Boeing jetliner. He then spent the next several hours flying to Salt Lake City Utah.

During the layover, Pete rented a car, unpacked his FT-690 and IC-202 and took to the airwaves. From 8:45 to 15:30 Mountain Daylight Time hN-6-Zed-E roved through Grids DN30, 31, 40 and 41 operating both 6 and 2 meters.

He then repacked the gear, got back in the plane and flew it another 689 miles on to Seattle. Thanks to another hours time change, Pete was back on the air around 19:52 Pacific Daylight Time in Grid CN-87 from the airport ramp making two QSO’s. His last contact took place at 19:59 Pacific Daylight Tine. That was just 1 minute before end of contest.

His totals for the contest period: On 6 meters he had 16 QSO’s, 16 QSO points and 8 multipliers. 2 meters yielded 24 QSO’s, 24 QSO points and 9 multipliers for a grand total of 960 points.

In his posting to the VHF Reflector, Pete put out a special thank you to the hams in the Salt Lake City area who provided lots of information for operating sites in 4 grids that helped to make his cross country VHF roving odyssey, complete. (ARNewsline™, N6ZE)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

3085. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 12:23:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622082344.09955.00000307@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 69325

In article <Xns93A1D84BDFB14elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide
>> exclusive amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get 7200-7300.
>> What problems will remain after that happens?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>The only one that I can think of is that the BC stations will fail to QSY.
>
Won't they have to, if the treaty changes?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3086. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 12:23:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622082345.09955.00000308@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 69324

In article <d22b54c3.0306212349.6752af71@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030621122338.08200.00000338@mb-m25.aol.com>...

>> One of the first things even the semi-rare ones do is to work split in
>> order to
>> FORCE the pack to spread out. And the 'phone folks have to spread out a
>> lot,
>> unlike CW, where a difference of a few dozen Hz is enough.
>
>Yew betchum although the cw piles usually get spread out more than
>just a few dozen Hz., more like a kHz.

I mean they separate a few dozen Hz from each other...
>
>> And the CW folks
>> with QSK can listen to the dx's freq between letters and words.

>Which is exactly why the big guns use two rcvrs simultaneously, built
>into the xcvr or otherwise.

And even the little guns with K2s have A/B capability.

>> Heck. let's define the problem:

>> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide >>
exclusive
>> amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get 7200-7300. What >>
problems
>> will remain after that happens?
>
>None on our side of either pond. It's all uphill. The dx will by far
>be the huge beneficiaries which is as it should be. Having a lot more
>space to work each other and themselves is the one huge overriding
>benefit of the overall effort to harmonize 40.

Add to that the decrease in QRM from SWBC making 7100-7300 much more usable when inter-region paths are open, and the need for 5 MHz really decreases.
>
>As far as the ssb transceive thing goes I expect that Alun & Co. will
>be better able to snipe a new one here and there but not to the extent
>I sense he expects. Band condx on 40 rule much more so than on 20 for
>instance and the dx will be much more able to shrug off The Hordes
>many more hours per day than they can on 20. When The Hordes do have
>openings and become nuisances the dx will simply drop back down into

>their age-old sheltered spaces and carry on and nothing will change in
>this respect.

BINGO. Same thing that happens on other bands.
>
>Actually I 'druther Alun's dream would come true. Us beepers might
>finally get the damned spazzy Donald Ducks outta *OUR* 7.000-7.100 . .

Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to run SSB down
to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I mistaken, Alun?

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>w3rv
>
>

3087. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 12:45:37 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vfb9a6tgoi1649@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69326

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgugt63.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 13:34:52 -0400, lk wrote:
>
> ..... When will you be admitted to practice
> before the Supreme Court of the United States so you can debate
> Federal law on an equal basis with those of us who have?
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Oh, now I understand, government by some people,
for some people, and of some people.

Thanks, Larry, KC8EPO

3088. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 13:03:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd49l3nkp1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69327

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:vf97bjqluoqr91@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgsi0xk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 08:45:17 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > > I was a supervicor in a Long Lines overseas operator office (32 A of
> > > A in NYC) from 74 to 75.
> >
> > "This is a test transmission for circuit adjustment purposes from a
> > radio station of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.
> > This statsion is located near New York City."
> >
> > How well I remember that as a SWL in NYC in the early 50s, and again
> > when we would set up the HF circuits from Tel Aviv to NY in the
> > mid-60s. I even got to talk on the order wire to one of the NY
> > techs once from Rishpun (the transmitting station north of TA) when
> > they were having some problem. It was a double-hop path, as I
> > remember it. We preferred the path from TA to Paris and then on
> > TAT-4 to NY for reliability. All gone now, replaced by satellites
> > and underseas cable in the Med and the Atlantic.
>
> Very interesting, you guys should write article about the HF circuits.
>
> Were HF circuits full or half duplex?
> How many voice channels?
> What kind of antenna did they used?
>
> Larry, KC8EPO

By the time I was involved (74/75),
HF was not being used at all (or for only a ver few
locations) from the USA. I was in a NYC operator center
and had day-to-day responsibilities for the operator
services themselves. The circuits were maintaiuned by
a different organization of technicians.

Some of the connections may have used HF at
the foriegn end, but the USA to the other continent was all cable.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3089. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 13:20:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4al0vuq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69328

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306212248.12b53ded@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd1sfu$ce6$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > I have often thought the same way. But I figure it won't happen till
Im
> > dead anyway. So I'll enjoy it while I can. And fight it tooth and nail
all
> > the way.
>
> I certainly agree with that!

As do I. Additionally, we have heard the conspiracy theories
for over 10 years now and other than the totally underused 220MHz
loss, ham radio has not had any other frequencies so threatened.
The track record of frequency losses is contrary to the doomsday
presictions of Fritz, et al.

That doesn't mean hams can or should be compalaent...as we
can look to the 220 loss as to what can/could happen if WE
don't stay active and proactive in using our
valuable freuency resources.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> > <Evil Ham@USA.com.spam> wrote in message
> > news:o1PIa.57515$Io.5409909@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 01:50:15 +0200, Fritz Wuehler
> > > <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
> > > >CW will be abolished.
> > >
> > > Don't worry BPL will drive all hams off of HF as soon as the CW
> > requirement
> > > is gone. I think it is too late for ham radio and the removal of the
morse
> > > code requirement is twenty years to late. Kids today are into instant
> > world
> > > wide communications with NEXTEL, Web cell phones and Computers on the
> > > Internet.
> > > Good Luck, because the ham radio community is going to need it. The
ARRL
> > > talking about providing communications during emergencies will not

> > overcome
> > > the money factor of BPL.
>
> There's another whole dimension to the BPL thing. Gurus within the
> power gen biz are saying that the cost of implementing BPL is
> astronomical and that it would take ten years after broadscale
> implementation to get the first positive ROI on the required
> investment. The Achilles heel of BPL lies in the need to install
> pricey black boxes across every power transformer in the system to
> pass the RF around those xfmrs, i.e., on every pole pig on your
> street. Then comes the maintenace . .
>
> Show me an investor with deep enough pockets to fund BPL given this
> reality who is also willing to wait ten years for a payback and I'll
> show you either a nutcase or the whole scheme was stillborn from the
> gitgo.
>
> Who knows what the cable and light pipe guys will have come up with
> ten years hence which will drive their stakes even further into BPL?
>
>
> > Besides if the FCC took away 144 and 222 they
> > > would generate $10 billion dollars per year in the US economy.
>
> That's about four hours worth Federal gummint expenditures.
>
>
> > > In 20 years ham radio will have a few channels on HF and the ARRL
> > building
> > > will be a dusty museum.
> > > I'm a ham, but I can see the writing on the wall. When I obtained my
> > ticket
> > > the Personal Computer was just hitting the market and CB was beginning
to
> > > fade.
>
> Newbie.
>
> The same general BS was floated around in the early '50's when Novices
> got HF privs with a weenie 5 wpm test. Then came Incentive Licensing.
> The sky did not fall on ham radio then either.
>
> > > Now we have instant and reliable worldwide communications from a
> > > wireless device from many locations all over the world. No need for
> > > propagation or huge towers with 500 watt amplifiers. Ham Radio is
old
> > > technology.
>
> Bah. So are feet, bicyles and oars old tyechnologies. So WHAT?
>

> w3rv

3090. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 13:33:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4bfadmp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69329
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"fartnoises" <1bekno12@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ef53876@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "STB" <telegrapher@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:bd37et$6dv$1@news.chatlink.com...
> > The sooner the FCC can get us used to being "channelized," the sooner
they
> > can move forward with further demise of ham radio as we used to know it.
> > This band is an insult to hams. The restriction on Morse to me sounds
like
> > more paranoia by the feds over a mode they no longer understand.
>
> The new 5 Mhz allocation is "channelized" because the
> FCC *knows* that, for 98% of the hams to to get on
> this band, they will have to "cut diode D-21" or similar
> to "open up" their existing japanese-made radio.
>
> This raises a *** VERY INTERESTING ISSUE ***
>
> When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
> with this suggestion.

Amateur radio transcievers are NOT type-accepted.
There is NO issue there.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3091. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 14:50:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306220650.736ef0b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69330
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<bd3ko8paf1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> "fartnoises" (1bekno12@yahoo.com) writes:
> > "STB" <telegrapher@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:bd37et$6dv$1@news.chatlink.com...
> >> The sooner the FCC can get us used to being "channelized," the sooner they
> >> can move forward with further demise of ham radio as we used to know it.
> >> This band is an insult to hams. The restriction on Morse to me sounds like
> >> more paranoia by the feds over a mode they no longer understand.
> >
> > The new 5 Mhz allocation is "channelized" because the
> > FCC *knows* that, for 98% of the hams to to get on
> > this band, they will have to "cut diode D-21" or similar
> > to "open up" their existing japanese-made radio.
> >
> > This raises a *** VERY INTERESTING ISSUE ***
> >
> > When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> > you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> > of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
> > with this suggestion.
> >
> > I have measured the spectal purity of several late-model
> > Icom trancievers, and in 3 out of 5, the transmitted signal
> > exhibited more spurious harmonics when the "wideband
> > transmit" was activated (after clipping D-21) than before.
> >
> > Perhaps this channel-power scheme for 5 mHz was done
> > more for (by the FCC) reduction of (the) *potential* for
> > harmonic interference than anything else?
> >
> Huh?
>
> There is no type acceptance on amateur equipment.

There is in the U.S. Every catalog piece of ham gear I've bought since
whenever has an FCC type acceptance tag on the rear panel. Except in
the cases of one-off sales of hombrewed and/or modified ham gear it's
illegal to sell any device which transmits RF unless it's been thru
the FCC type acceptance process. However once in hand hams can do
whatever they want as far as mods are concerned.

> You operate equipment on an amateur band, and it's allowed.
> You do have to fulfill certain standards, but that's the
> operator's responsibility and has nothing to do with the manufacturer.
>
> If you operate out of band, it likely isn't allowed because the
> other service requires that equipment be type accepted. Since amateur
> equipment isn't type accepted in the first place, for amateur or
> other use, then it will be breaking the rules.
>
> However, the band, or channels, under discussion is an amateur band,
> albeit with a few specific standards added in. Anything that will
> fit the standards will work there, and it needs absolutely no type
> acceptance.

>
> Michael VE2BVW

w3rv

3092. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 15:09:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306220709.67d88952@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69331

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> My oh My......I love it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Gotta love it.

The Russians are really adamant about retaining s25.5 or some
variation of it. It's not too hard to shrug off the clout of some of
the small states like the Balkans but the Russians & Saudis do not
take kindly to being shrugged off and are quite capable of upsetting
dipolomatic apple carts. Nobody has heard from Red China yet either .
. there's another 900 pound gorilla which is not into giveaways and
making life easy for anybody.

There are no surprises in any of it, none of it is new news. All of it
has been available for eons via the various dx, contesting and cw
reflectors.

w3rv

3093. Want HAM radio radio program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 15:12:20 UTC
From: dfrantz@tennessee.com
Message-ID: <1d55d24a.0306220712.430348f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69332

Shortwave Radio Station WWRB (www.wwrb.org) Wants a pro ham radio program for a prime time night time slot. (and various other fill in slots)

This program is to get our listeners intrested in HAM radio and get licensed.
this is your chance to promote ham radio to novices

Please think about this and call WWRB shortwave at 1 -931 -841 -0492

3094. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 15:14:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306220714.4690e0c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0306211927.1e74815@posting.google.com>...
> The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice
> about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL
> employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares
> very little about the average ham and even less about its employees.
> Go read it and see what you think.

Wayne Green and a disgruntled former employee: Pfft!

w3rv

3095. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 16:27:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622122759.07705.00001524@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 69334

>Subject: Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 6/22/03 10:14 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0306220714.4690e0c5@posting.google.com>
>
>hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
>news:<792e029d.0306211927.1e74815@posting.google.com>...
>> The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice
>> about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL
>> employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares
>> very little about the average ham and even less about its employees.
>> Go read it and see what you think.
>
>Wayne Green and a disgruntled former employee: Pfft!

Exactly.

Anything that appears in the pages of "73" other than purely technical or operating articles is subject to that LARGE "grain of salt" acceptance.

Wayne Green has been worthless to Amatuer Radio since the 70's and he is even more worthless today, and his hatred (despite flaunting his "life membership") is well known.

Once upon a time, Wayne could have said "Send Me Your Money And An Association I Will Make" and people would have done it. He's one of those who whines and fusses about what he doesn't like, yet has no desire or plan to fix it.

I got into an exchange of letters with him in 1979, and again in 1994. Both times after particularly stinging "editorials" of the League in "73", and both times after urging him to "do something" about it.

Wayne's lame and snivvling answer was that "I am only interested in spawning the creativity of others to action". In other words, all he wanted to do was complain. He is his own worst enemy. He's a loser.

Sound like someone else we know...?!?!

73

Steve, K4CAP

3096. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 16:41:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <U_kJa.20070$8f.9923307@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 69335

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306220709.67d88952@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > My oh My......I love it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Gotta love it.
>
> The Russians are really adamant about retaining s25.5 or some
> variation of it. It's not too hard to shrug off the clout of some of
> the small states like the Balkans but the Russians & Saudis do not
> take kindly to being shrugged off and are quite capable of upsetting
> dipolomatic apple carts. Nobody has heard from Red China yet either .
> . there's another 900 pound gorilla which is not into giveaways and
> making life easy for anybody.
>
> There are no surprises in any of it, none of it is new news. All of it
> has been available for eons via the various dx, contesting and cw
> reflectors.
>
> w3rv

Fingers are in "tightly crossed" mode. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3097. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 16:45:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4mcnosg1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69336
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Isn't this Phillips guy the one that 'handled' the RFI department? If my memory serves me correct. He did a piss poor job in that department in my opinion. I 'tried' to deal with him on various occassions about my power line noise. Let me say the result was less than I expected.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306220714.4690e0c5@posting.google.com...
> hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0306211927.1e74815@posting.google.com>...
> > The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice
> > about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL
> > employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares
> > very little about the average ham and even less about its employees.
> > Go read it and see what you think.
>
> Wayne Green and a disgruntled former employee: Pfft!
>
> w3rv

3098. Re: Liberty Net 3.960

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 16:46:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4mfebsm1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69337
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Isn't it amazing how KJI is still on the air. After lying his arse off in writting no less, and getting away with it. Amazing.

Dan/W4NTI

"Captan Blome roger-roger" <44dfrancer@juno.com> wrote in message news:3ef50f99@snipnews.snip.net...
> Liberty Net is on 3.960
>
> QRM'ers are NOT welcome.
>
> If U want to QRM go to 14.313 with KJI and his fools
>
> "TH" <not@listed.net> wrote in message
> news:m78Ja.906$Vx2.459764@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > Opps... fat fingers.... 3960
> >
> >
> > "TH" <not@listed.net> wrote in message
> > news:Q58Ja.905$Vx2.459731@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > > 5960
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

3099. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 16:49:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4ml6$tq9$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69338

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EF558EF.B4A42128@earthlink.net...
> Fritz Wuehler wrote:
> >
> > Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
> > CW will be abolished.
>
> ...not likely, Fritz.
>
> > The dream will become reality and old farts CW
> > coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
> > mass on the HF bands.
>
> I see. "Today CW; tomorrow, the world!" or something like that, huh?
>
> > In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
> > half of ham operators that are technicians.
>
> I'm sure there are a number of countries which will be disappointed in
> not making your "civilized countries" list.
>
> > Think
> > that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
> > that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.
>
> What is going to turn these guys into instant DXers? How is this
> "abolishment" of CW to take place?
>
> > Most of hams have a bad antenna system.
>
> From where do you obtain your facts?
>
> > 2 kW are not necessary to make a QSO.
>
> It might well be if 1.9 KW can't get the job done.
>
> > You can get
> > a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
> > your antenna acts like a resistor.
>
> There aren't many guys running T2FD's.
>
> > Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
> > reports.

>
> If the noise is 59+55 db, it might well be necessary.
>
> > 56 is sufficient considering the QRN.
>
> I don't think you've considered QRN enough. Is it Summer where you are?
>
> > So, please stop using kW amplifiers (you generate
> > splatters, harmonics, etc ... on the bands)...
>
> Please explain how KW amplifiers by and of themselves necessarily
> produce "splatters" or harmonics.
>
> > and use
> > digital modes with low RF power.
>
> My regs permit a variety of modes and a great deal of power.
>
>
> > Remember that
> > HF bands are international and that you must
> > SHARE them with hams of other countries.
>
> Not just the "civilized countries"?
>
> > Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
> > and peace and love for all !
>
> Far out, man!
>
> Dave K8MN

I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting up a
fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.

Dan/W4NTI

3100. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 16:53:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4mrnvpc1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69339

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB1A94AD.1D112%stewart@say.net...
> "Evil Ham@USA.com.spam" wrote:
>
> > (snip) I'm a ham, but I can see the writing on
> > the wall. When I obtained my ticket the Personal
> > Computer was just hitting the market and CB was
> > beginning to fade. Now we have instant and
> > reliable worldwide communications from a wireless
> > device from many locations all over the world. No
> > need for propagation or huge towers with 500 watt
> > amplifiers. Ham Radio is *old* technology.
>
>
> My involvement with computers since 1981 leads me to an opposite
> conclusion. I don't see ham radio as old technology and I don't think
> wireless telephones or internet voice chat poses that great a threat to
ham
> radio (no more than online streaming video poses a threat to television).
> Radio is a unique technology and will continue to stand on its own. Ham
> radio will continue to exist right along with the rest of radio.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

As long as we can hear something and BPL/PLC is gonna clean our clocks.

Dan/W4NTI

3101. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:00:47 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 69213

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote

> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting up
a
> fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.

Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test contingent's
hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003

3102. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:04:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4nk1fes1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69340

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030622015611.23689.00001233@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <8L9Ja.54$2L.21@news01.roc.ny>
> >
> >Dan, frankly I'm not worried whether they eliminate the code or force us
all
> >to retest at 30 words per minute
>
> I'm game.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

Ive got no problem with a cw retest, but what would that accomplish?

Dan/W4NTI

3103. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:08:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd4nncovm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69341

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306220709.67d88952@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > My oh My......I love it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Gotta love it.
>
> The Russians are really adamant about retaining s25.5 or some
> variation of it. It's not too hard to shrug off the clout of some of
> the small states like the Balkans but the Russians & Saudis do not
> take kindly to being shrugged off and are quite capable of upsetting
> dipolomatic apple carts. Nobody has heard from Red China yet either .
> . there's another 900 pound gorilla which is not into giveaways and
> making life easy for anybody.
>
> There are no surprises in any of it, none of it is new news. All of it
> has been available for eons via the various dx, contesting and cw
> reflectors.
>
> w3rv

Yep indeed. But the no code advocates never bothered to check....hi hi.

Dan/W4NTI

3104. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:22:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306220922.2168acf7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69342

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030622082345.09955.00000308@mb-m21.aol.com>...

> >Which is exactly why the big guns use two rcvrs simultaneously, built
> >into the xcvr or otherwise.
>
> And even the little guns with K2s have A/B capability.

Ain't been an even half decent HF xcvr built since ancient days which
doesn't do A/B switching going back to the S-lines & Drakes. Two
complete *independent* rcvrs a la the Icom Pros, FT-1000s, Orion, etc.

> Add to that the decrease in QRM from SWBC making 7100-7300 much more usable
> when inter-region paths are open, and the need for 5 MHz really decreases.

Don't quite agree with that. 5 Mhz has it's own unique propagation
characteristics which make it ideal for HF comms inside our borders.
Provides longer legs than 75 during the day and shorter legs than 40
at night.

> >
> >Actually I 'druther Alun's dream would come true. Us beepers might
> >finally get the damned spazzy Donald Ducks outta *OUR* 7.000-7.100 . .
>
> Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to run SSB down
> to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I mistaken, Alun?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

w3rv

3105. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:58:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgvx2cf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69344

On Sun, 22 Jun 2003 08:45:37 -0400, lk wrote:

>> ..... When will you be admitted to practice
>> before the Supreme Court of the United States so you can debate
>> Federal law on an equal basis with those of us who have?
>>
>Oh, now I understand, government by some people, for some people, and
>of some people.

No, it's "don't play lawyer unless you are one".

It's that simple.

Do you also debate brain surgeons on the details of their field?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3106. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:58:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgvyhai.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69343
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 22 Jun 2003 07:50:56 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> There is no type acceptance on amateur equipment.
>
>There is in the U.S. Every catalog piece of ham gear I've bought since
>whenever has an FCC type acceptance tag on the rear panel. Except in
>the cases of one-off sales of hombrewed and/or modified ham gear it's
>illegal to sell any device which transmits RF unless it's been thru
>the FCC type acceptance process. However once in hand hams can do
>whatever they want as far as mods are concerned.

Hey Brian, go read FCC Rules Part 2 Subpart J (which deals with the
Equipment Authorization program), Part 15 (which deals with RF
Devices) and Part 97 (which deals with the Amateur Radio Services)
and show us where "type acceptance" or its successor - Certification
- is required for any HF amateur equipment but 10-meter amplfiers.
Do not confuse receiver certification (required for vhf and higher
receivers) with type acceptance / certification of transmitters.

"Cutting the diode" and operating on a frequency not authorized for
amateur operators is a different matter - unlicensed operation
and/or operating non-certified equipment when certifcation is
required.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3107. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:58:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgvxf3g.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69345
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 21 Jun 2003 20:27:03 -0700, Louis C. LeVine wrote:

>The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice
>about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL
>employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares
>very little about the average ham and even less about its employees.
>Go read it and see what you think.

Does the article go into why the author was terminated?

I suspect that the half-dozen or so satisfied staff members whom I know
have no intention to issue a rebuttal.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel
ARRL Volunteer Consulting Engineer
ARRL Life Member since 1968

3108. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:58:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgvxnqh.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69346
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 22 Jun 2003 01:02:41 -0400, fartnoises wrote:

>When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
>you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
>of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
>with this suggestion.

Ham radio HF transceivers are not required toi be "type accepted".
Have you found a Type Acceptance label on yours?

>Perhaps this channel-power scheme for 5 mHz was done
>more for (by the FCC) reduction of (the) *potential* for
>harmonic interference than anything else?

It was done because the "owner" of those channels - the NTIA -
insisted on it for uniformity with other users of those channels.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3109. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 17:58:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgvz72j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69347

On 21 Jun 2003 22:51:43 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>DOS died years ago, the rest of us have long since buried it fer
>chrissake.

My 2-m 24/7 packet-only box runs with jan-u-wine PC-DOS in a P-1
machine that I scrounged from surplus parts in three junkboxes.

Do not confuse this with my Athlon XP+ 2 GHz, 2GB RAM box with all
the bells and whistles running eComStation, a proprietary IBM OS,
which runs everything else except those few programs which
ab-so-lutely require "real" Win which I have to run on a separate
NT4 box.

>A good solid 1.02 on the Troll-O-Meter.

We use more high-tech instrumentation, the Bozo-Scope. It hits 10
on that one.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3110. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 18:39:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622143915.18497.00000862@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69348

In article <8L9Ja.54$2L.21@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Dan, frankly I'm not worried whether they eliminate the code or force us all
>to retest at 30 words per minute :)
>
Me neither. This time I'll bring along a Vibroplex for the sending test,
though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3111. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 18:39:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622143916.18497.00000863@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69349

In article <d22b54c3.0306220709.67d88952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
>> My oh My......I love it.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>
>Gotta love it.
>
>The Russians are really adamant about retaining s25.5 or some
>variation of it. It's not too hard to shrug off the clout of some of
>the small states like the Balkans but the Russians & Saudis do not
>take kindly to being shrugged off and are quite capable of upsetting
>dipolomatic apple carts. Nobody has heard from Red China yet either .
>. there's another 900 pound gorilla which is not into giveaways and
>making life easy for anybody.

Which raises a question about how these WRCs decide revisions to existing treaty sections like S25.5. Is it by simple majority, 2/3 majority, consensus of all, or what? And if they can't reach an agreement on a revision by the closing date, doesn't the old section stay in effect?
>
>There are no surprises in any of it, none of it is new news. All of it
>has been available for eons via the various dx, contesting and cw
>reflectors.

Yup.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3112. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 19:05:51 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <bd4um701op2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 69251
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Let's see -- 73 magazine, Wayne Green, and a disgruntled former ARRL employee -- who was let go from ARRL.

Has Fox "News" now taken over 73?

--

Joe S.

"Louis C. LeVine" <hamop_62@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:792e029d.0306211927.1e74815@posting.google.com...
> The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice
> about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL
> employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares
> very little about the average ham and even less about its employees.
> Go read it and see what you think.

3113. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 19:21:49 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <hlnJa.82$eh3.74@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 69350

Whew. Jim, I never sent well with a Vibroplex. I ended up using an HA1-TO keyer (back when). I like my CW to be indistinguishable from machine sent, and never could send decent CW above about 25 on a straight key nor CW at any speed on a Vibroplex :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030622143915.18497.00000862@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <8L9Ja.54$2L.21@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Dan, frankly I'm not worried whether they eliminate the code or force us all
> >to retest at 30 words per minute :)
> >
> Me neither. This time I'll bring along a Vibroplex for the sending test,
> though.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3114. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 20:20:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgw80bl.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69252

On 22 Jun 2003 18:39:16 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Which raises a question about how these WRCs decide revisions to existing
>treaty sections like S25.5. Is it by simple majority, 2/3 majority, consensus
>of all, or what?

By the "book" it's 51% majority but from a practical standpoint it's
by consensus if at all possible. That's where the "horsetrading"
comes in. Or so I was briefed for the one ITU Conference that I was
supposed to attend but never did because the Six Day War (1967) had
me otherwise occupied.

And if they can't reach an agreement on a revision by the
>closing date, doesn't the old section stay in effect?

Yes, the existing provision continues.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3115. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 20:22:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306221222.18cf5729@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69253
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd4bfadmp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...

> > When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> > you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> > of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
> > with this suggestion.
>
> Amateur radio transcievers are NOT type-accepted.
> There is NO issue there.

Icom announced the upcoming availability of their new top-end IC-7800
xcvr at Dayton a few weeks ago. Universal Radio (ham & SWL equipment
distributor)is advertising it in their website. Dial into:

http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/hamhf/0041.html

Note that the ad includes this caveat in red print:

"NOTICE: This device has not been approved by the Federal
Communications Commission. This device may not be sold or leased, or
be offered for sale or lease, until approval of the F.C.C. has been
obtained."

Looks to me like type acceptance is required. Or is there some other
flavor of FCC approval?

>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

w3rv

3116. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 20:38:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306221238.34516917@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd4mcnosg1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Isn't this Phillips guy the one that 'handled' the RFI department? If my
> memory serves me correct. He did a piss poor job in that department in my
> opinion. I 'tried' to deal with him on various occassions about my power
> line noise. Let me say the result was less than I expected.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Yes he was, he worked for Ed Hare the League lab manager, RFI/EMI guru
and author of the ARRL tome on RFI/EMI. Phillips held the title "RFI
Engineer" or some such.

w3rv

3117. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 20:39:55 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bd523usgr1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 69255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306221222.18cf5729@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd4bfadmp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
>
> > > When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> > > you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> > > of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
> > > with this suggestion.
> >
> > Amateur radio transcievers are NOT type-accepted.
> > There is NO issue there.
>
>
> Icom announced the upcoming availability of their new top-end IC-7800
> xcvr at Dayton a few weeks ago. Universal Radio (ham & SWL equipment
> distributor)is advertising it in their website. Dial into:
>
> http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/hamhf/0041.html
>
> Note that the ad includes this caveat in red print:
>
> "NOTICE: This device has not been approved by the Federal
> Communications Commission. This device may not be sold or leased, or
> be offered for sale or lease, until approval of the F.C.C. has been
> obtained."
>
> Looks to me like type acceptance is required. Or is there some other
> flavor of FCC approval?
>
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> w3rv

Amateur RECEIVERS, including the ones in transceivers, are required to be
Part 15 certified to not cause interference with other devices, as do all
receivers. The transmitter section does not require certification per Part
97.

3118. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 21:05:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgwa5fm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69256
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 22 Jun 2003 13:22:43 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>Icom announced the upcoming availability of their new top-end IC-7800
>xcvr at Dayton a few weeks ago. Universal Radio (ham & SWL equipment
>distributor)is advertising it in their website. Dial into:
>
>http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/hamhf/0041.html
>
>Note that the ad includes this caveat in red print:
>
>"NOTICE: This device has not been approved by the Federal
>Communications Commission. This device may not be sold or leased, or
>be offered for sale or lease, until approval of the F.C.C. has been
>obtained."
>
>Looks to me like type acceptance is required. Or is there some other
>flavor of FCC approval?

Yes there is. Type acceptance as we knew it is no longer in
existence. The equipment authorization processes are now
"certification" which requires submission to the FCC of test
measurements of compliance with applicable Rule sections
(essentially the same as type-acceptance was), "Declaration of
Conformity" which is the same as "certification" but the tests are
made by an authorized private-sector testing facility and not
submitted to the FCC, and "verification" which requires no
submission to the FCC but merely a statement by the manufacturer of
compliance with the limits set forth in Part 15 of the Rules.

If thr above transceiver has receiver capability above 30 MHz,
and/or a computer processor, it would have to be certified for rf
noise emission to Part 15 standards. That's what is probably pending.

Or alternatively, the manufacturer could have applied for
certification of the transmitter in services other than amateur but
that's doubtful.

--
Phil Kane

3119. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 21:08:29 UTC
From: wieland@copland.udel.edu
Message-ID: <bd55sdstk1@copland.udel.edu>
Source record: 69259
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <3ef53876@snipnews.snip.net> you write:
[snip]
> When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever you have
> technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance of that radio. I have
> had several agree, and several disagree with this suggestion.

True enough, but for hams, things are not so clear. Hams are allowed to operate with equipment lacking all type-acceptance, AFAIK the only radio service that is.

> I have measured the spectal purity of several late-model Icom
> trancievers, and in 3 out of 5, the transmitted signal exhibited more
> spurious harmonics when the "wideband transmit" was activated (after
> clipping D-21) than before.

Not sure what you mean. Does the purity degrade on the old frequencies? That would be a puzzler. As far as purity not being as good on newly-opened frequencies, I guess there's no output filter exactly right for the new frequencies, particularly ones (like 5 MHz) far removed from any previous ham band that the original designers would have worried about.

> Perhaps this channel-power scheme for 5 mHz was done more for (by the
> FCC) reduction of (the) *potential* for harmonic interference than
> anything else?

Maybe the FCC is just learning from mistakes. They limited 30 Meters to 200 watts, IIRC. Put up an antenna with 7dB gain, and you're legally running 1kW ERP, the very thing they didn't want done. So maybe they're writing the specs to avoid that this time.

As for channelization, I think this is the way they "sold" band-sharing to the other users, particularly the military. I have a suspicion the requirement for SSB voice-only also came from those other users, who wanted all potential interference to be in a mode their receivers & brains could follow & understand.

I don't see anything sinister, just a bunch of well-organized, smoothly-cooperating channelized users expecting the "new guys" (hams) to play by long-established house rules.

[big snip]
--

R F Wieland Newark, DE 19711-5323 USA 39.68N 75.74W
Icom R75 Heathkit GR-81 Inverted-L in the attic
Reply to wieland at me dot udel dot edu

3120. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 21:09:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgwad3n.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69257
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 22 Jun 2003 13:38:36 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>Yes he was, he worked for Ed Hare the League lab manager, RFI/EMI guru
>and author of the ARRL tome on RFI/EMI. Phillips held the title "RFI
>Engineer" or some such.

IIRC he didn't stay long.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3121. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 21:12:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd560ilol1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69258
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306221238.34516917@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd4mcnosg1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > Isn't this Phillips guy the one that 'handled' the RFI department? If
my
> > memory serves me correct. He did a piss poor job in that department in
my
> > opinion. I 'tried' to deal with him on various occassions about my
power
> > line noise. Let me say the result was less than I expected.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Yes he was, he worked for Ed Hare the League lab manager, RFI/EMI guru
> and author of the ARRL tome on RFI/EMI. Phillips held the title "RFI
> Engineer" or some such.
>
> w3rv

OK...thought so. He didn't handle my situation well. After he was out of
the picture things went a lot smoother. I really get annoyed when Im
ignored and my e-mails go un-answered for months.

Dan/W4NTI

3122. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 21:24:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622172428.21428.00000666@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 69260

In article <hlnJa.82$eh3.74@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Whew. Jim, I never sent well with a Vibroplex.

I got one for Xmas in 1974 and been using 'em ever since. Of course part of the skill is knowing how to adjust 'em. Now I have four. Most of the folks I work are amazed when I tell them I am using a bug.

>I ended up using an HA1-TO
>keyer (back when).

Whatever works.

>I like my CW to be indistinguishable from machine sent,

Me too - which is why I specified a Vibroplex and not just any bug.

>and never could send decent CW above about 25 on a straight key nor CW at
>any speed on a Vibroplex :)

At least ya tried. And you did find something that worked.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3123. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 22:22:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF62C31.6090209@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69261
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Phil Kane wrote:

>On Sun, 22 Jun 2003 01:02:41 -0400, fartnoises wrote:
>
>
>
>>When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
>>you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
>>of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
>>with this suggestion.
>>
>>
>
> Ham radio HF transceivers are not required toi be "type accepted".
> Have you found a Type Acceptance label on yours?
>
>
>
As I (mis)understand it, you only need type acceptance if you
manufacture more than
5 copies of something that transmits in a year. Or modify more than 5
of something
in a year. Thus you cannot sell lots of "modified" linears capable of
generating power
on 10m to "hams" or anybody else (freebanders).

3124. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 22:25:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF62CE9.9010905@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Robert F Wieland wrote:

>As for channelization, I think this is the way they "sold" band-sharing to
>the other users, particularly the military. I have a suspicion the
>requirement for SSB voice-only also came from those other users, who
>wanted all potential interference to be in a mode their receivers & brains
>could follow & understand.
>
>I don't see anything sinister, just a bunch of well-organized,
>smoothly-cooperating channelized users expecting the "new guys" (hams) to
>play by long-established house rules.
>
>
5 will be a different style of band from what we're used to. But I see
no reason that hams
won't be able to learn the "rules" of 5.

3125. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 22:42:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622184244.15462.00000989@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69264

In article <bd4al0vuq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

> Additionally, we have heard the conspiracy theories
>for over 10 years now and other than the totally underused 220MHz
>loss, ham radio has not had any other frequencies so threatened.

IIRC, originally the threat was that 220 would be completely lost.

>The track record of frequency losses is contrary to the doomsday
>presictions of Fritz, et al.

This is a different game. The PLC folks aren't asking for any spectrum at all.
They just want the Part 15 levels raised. Trouble is, the Part 15 levels are
already too high.

Note that PLC's competitors (DSL, cable modem) didn't get higher Part 15
levels.

>That doesn't mean hams can or should be compalaent...as we
>can look to the 220 loss as to what can/could happen if WE
>don't stay active and proactive in using our
>valuable freuency resources.

And letting FCC know the whole PLC thing is a bad idea.

Most populated areas I know of have at least one option besides dialup -
usually DSL or cable. Many have both. There are other options available or on
the way, too. Will PLC be faster or cheaper?

73 de Jim, N2EY

WWHD

3126. Re: GET OFF UR BUTTS AND WRITE A E-MAIL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 22:42:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622184245.15462.00000990@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69263

In article <bd2frd$ae5$1$8302bc10@news.demon.co.uk>, "?"
<Martin@NOSPAM.g1gyc.demon.co.uk> writes:

>> ==>ARRL URGES INFORMED COMMENTS IN FCC BPL INQUIRY
>>
>
>
>Remember that these systems are NOT radio and so are not a protected
>service.

There have been proposals here in the USA to have the rules rewritten so that unlicensed spectrum users are protected from interference from licensed users.

>If you have an operator trialling a system in your area make as much problem
>for his users as legally possible..... I mean operate your radio !!!

Trouble is, you may not know that a system is being tried in your area. And what band/mode do you use for maximum effect?

>If the system generates noise at HF / VHF then a strong HF / VHF signal will
>get in to the system just as good. If it can be shown that these "Broadband
>unscreened" systems will suffer much data loss then the users will not take
>them up as a preferred option.

Hopefully, anyway.

>If you have access to spectrum analyzer / frequency monitoring equipment
>connect it up and see what you local noise level looks like (capture the data
for
>future reference).

Not many of us have them hanging around the shack, though.

>and do like Dan say's get off your butt and lobby your political leaders.

That's the main thing.

>Make your voice (and signal) heard.

Good advice

73 de Jim, N2EY

3127. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 22:42:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622184245.15462.00000991@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69266

In article <vfa93jdndd2uac@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: Morse Code Watch
>From: "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
>Date: Sat, 21 Jun 2003 23:35:58 -0400
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030621192812.16978.00001346@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> >Subject: Morse Code Watch
>
>> Guess they didn't feel compelled to send a message that says "no news
>> yet". The WRC's NOT over yet, and promulgating stories based on
>half-truths
>> and supposition would be more damaging than good.
>>
>> Steve, K4CAP
>
>You probably right, but the information did come from the
>Wireless Institute of Australia.

Been repeated all over the place, too. But the conference doesn't end till July
4
>
>Here is some web links for news on WRC 2003.
>
>Wireless Institute of Australia - WIA Victoria
>
> http://www.wiavic.org.au/mcw/
>
> http://www.wiavic.org.au/mcw/archive.html
>
>IARU
>
> http://www.iaru.org/iaru-index.html#wrc2003
>
Tnx Larry

>I guess we need an imbedded RRAP member in Geneva. :-)
>
I thought we had one, in the form of the Executive Director of NCI. But not a
word from him yet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3128. Re: S25.5 proposal in Geneva

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 22:42:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622184246.15462.00000992@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69265

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgt0zto.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 21 Jun 2003 02:23:25 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>>> Or it may somehow stay alive if some sort of deal is struck. Ya never
>>>> know until the fat lady sings.
>>>
>>>The house light a dimming, an she about to sing.
>>
>>"Oh sweet mystery of life, at last I've found you!!!"

Nobody got the reference on that one. Boy do I miss N0BK....
>
> The Yogi Berra Rule applies: "It ain't over 'til it's over and
> even then it may not be over."

Yep.
>
> Don't throw away your Vibroplexers just yet......
>
No way!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3129. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:07:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd5cpn$hj7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69267

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030622184244.15462.00000989@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <bd4al0vuq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> > Additionally, we have heard the conspiracy theories
> >for over 10 years now and other than the totally underused 220MHz
> >loss, ham radio has not had any other frequencies so threatened.
>
> IIRC, originally the threat was that 220 would be completely lost.
>
> >The track record of frequency losses is contrary to the doomsday
> >presictions of Fritz, et al.
>
> This is a different game. The PLC folks aren't asking for any spectrum at
all.
> They just want the Part 15 levels raised. Trouble is, the Part 15 levels
are
> already too high.
>
> Note that PLC's competitors (DSL, cable modem) didn't get higher Part 15
> levels.
>
> >That doesn't mean hams can or should be compalaent...as we
> >can look to the 220 loss as to what can/could happen if WE
> >don't stay active and proactive in using our
> >valuable freuency resources.
>
> And letting FCC know the whole PLC thing is a bad idea.
>
> Most populated areas I know of have at least one option besides dialup -
> usually DSL or cable. Many have both. There are other options available or
on
> the way, too. Will PLC be faster or cheaper?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> WWHD

No it will be 'easier' to get into EVERY SINGLE persons house. Thus cheaper
FOR THE PROVIDER. And the provider will be your local power company.
Remember power line noise, and the years it takes to get it fixed???

Bet it wont do a damn thing to reduce the cost to the customer. Not to
mention destroying HF and most of VHF with its splatter and harmonics.

Dan/W4NTI

3130. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:09:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd5csq$q52$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69268
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

You are exactly correct Robert.

Dan/W4NTI

"Robert F Wieland" <wieland@copland.udel.edu> wrote in message
news:bd55sdstk1@copland.udel.edu...
> In article <3ef53876@snipnews.snip.net> you write:
> [snip]
> > When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever you have
> > technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance of that radio. I have
> > had several agree, and several disagree with this suggestion.
>
> True enough, but for hams, things are not so clear. Hams are allowed to
> operate with equipment lacking all type-acceptance, AFAIK the only radio
> service that is.
>
> > I have measured the spectal purity of several late-model Icom
> > trancievers, and in 3 out of 5, the transmitted signal exhibited more
> > spurious harmonics when the "wideband transmit" was activated (after
> > clipping D-21) than before.
>
> Not sure what you mean. Does the purity degrade on the old frequencies?
> That would be a puzzler. As far as purity not being as good on
> newly-opened frequencies, I guess there's no output filter exactly right
> for the new frequencies, particularly ones (like 5 MHz) far removed from
> any previous ham band that the original designers would have worried
> about.
>
> > Perhaps this channel-power scheme for 5 mHz was done more for (by the
> > FCC) reduction of (the) *potential* for harmonic interference than
> > anything else?
>
> Maybe the FCC is just learning from mistakes. They limited 30 Meters to
> 200 watts, IIRC. Put up an antenna with 7dB gain, and you're legally
> running 1kW ERP, the very thing they didn't want done. So maybe they're
> writing the specs to avoid that this time.
>
> As for channelization, I think this is the way they "sold" band-sharing to
> the other users, particularly the military. I have a suspicion the
> requirement for SSB voice-only also came from those other users, who
> wanted all potential interference to be in a mode their receivers & brains
> could follow & understand.
>

> I don't see anything sinister, just a bunch of well-organized,
> smoothly-cooperating channelized users expecting the "new guys" (hams) to
> play by long-established house rules.
>
> [big snip]
> --
>
> R F Wieland Newark, DE 19711-5323 USA 39.68N 75.74W
> Icom R75 Heathkit GR-81 Inverted-L in the attic
> Reply to wieland at me dot udel dot edu

3131. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:12:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd5d2e$ke8$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69269

I have two Vibrolex. A Johnson Speed X, and a Military J37.

I prefere my Speed X. And ur right, the adjustment is the key.

I was taught by a fresh water sailor of the Great Lakes....and I STILL have
that dang 'Sailors Swing'.

Dan/W4NTI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030622172428.21428.00000666@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <hlnJa.82$eh3.74@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Whew. Jim, I never sent well with a Vibroplex.
>
> I got one for Xmas in 1974 and been using 'em ever since. Of course part
of the
> skill is knowing how to adjust 'em. Now I have four. Most of the folks I
work
> are amazed when I tell them I am using a bug.
>
> >I ended up using an HA1-TO
> >keyer (back when).
>
> Whatever works.
>
> >I like my CW to be indistinguishable from machine sent,
>
> Me too - which is why I specified a Vibroplex and not just any bug.
>
> >and never could send decent CW above about 25 on a straight key nor CW at
> >any speed on a Vibroplex :)
>
> At least ya tried. And you did find something that worked.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3132. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:17:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622191748.15462.00000995@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69270

In article <3ef5393a@snipnews.snip.net>, "fartnoises" <1bekno12@yahoo.com>
writes:

>None of the local bookstores (even Borders!) around here
>carry neither 73, or QST in their news stand sections.
>It would be nice if this article could be reproduced
>online someplace, so more people can read the
>allegations.

Where is your "local" area, fartnoises?

In the Los Angeles area, all the Borders and Barnes & Noble
bookstores carry 73, QST, and CQ at their newsstands.

3133. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:17:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622191748.15462.00000994@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69273

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgvx2cf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sun, 22 Jun 2003 08:45:37 -0400, lk wrote:
>
>>> ..... When will you be admitted to practice
>>> before the Supreme Court of the United States so you can debate
>>> Federal law on an equal basis with those of us who have?
>>>
>>Oh, now I understand, government by some people, for some people, and
>>of some people.
>
> No, it's "don't play lawyer unless you are one".
>
> It's that simple.
>
> Do you also debate brain surgeons on the details of their field?

When did you argue a case before the Supreme Court of the USA,
Phil?

Unless there's been some kind of secret revolution in the USA, all
of us citizens of the USA can exercise our Constitutional rights on
free speech and free assembly and petitioning of our government.

When did "brain surgery" become a part of this thread? Or are you
doing non-physical-invasive surgery like the ARRL does? :-)

I am "reluctant" to continue any more "inductive" reasoning... :-)

3134. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:17:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622191749.15462.00000996@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69272

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hgw80bl.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 22 Jun 2003 18:39:16 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Which raises a question about how these WRCs decide revisions to existing
>>treaty sections like S25.5. Is it by simple majority, 2/3 majority,
>consensus
>>of all, or what?
>
> By the "book" it's 51% majority but from a practical standpoint it's
> by consensus if at all possible. That's where the "horsetrading"
> comes in. Or so I was briefed for the one ITU Conference that I was
> supposed to attend but never did because the Six Day War (1967) had
> me otherwise occupied.
>
>And if they can't reach an agreement on a revision by the
>>closing date, doesn't the old section stay in effect?
>
> Yes, the existing provision continues.

That "Six Day War" was 36 years ago, Phil. I'm sure that Geneva
and environs have changed somewhat since then. Ask the ARRL
"Team" what's happening in Geneva...they are "on the job, poised,
ready to work" (etc.). :-)

3135. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:17:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622191751.15462.00000998@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69271

In article <vfa93jdndd2uac@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030621192812.16978.00001346@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> >Subject: Morse Code Watch
>
>> Guess they didn't feel compelled to send a message that says "no news
>> yet". The WRC's NOT over yet, and promulgating stories based on
>half-truths
>> and supposition would be more damaging than good.
>>
>> Steve, K4CAP
>
>You probably right, but the information did come from the
>Wireless Institute of Australia.
>
>Here is some web links for news on WRC 2003.
>
>Wireless Institute of Australia - WIA Victoria
>
> http://www.wiavic.org.au/mcw/
>
> http://www.wiavic.org.au/mcw/archive.html
>
>IARU
>
> http://www.iaru.org/iaru-index.html#wrc2003
>
>I guess we need an imbedded RRAP member in Geneva. :-)

That would cause Switzerland to change from a neutral
country to an aggressive, biased one. :-)

I can't wait for the detailed, up-to-the-minute reports of what
is going down at WRC from the hardy ARRL "team" at work
there. I would guess that Executive President (for life) Sumner
doesn't have any petty cash left for a call home to Newington.

Maybe it was all used up in hydrating everyone during the
"unusually warm weather" around the "top floor" of the ITU
building during the "battles" of the second week?.

3136. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:17:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622191751.15462.00000997@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69275

In article <d22b54c3.0306212145.65ef5605@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20030621192812.16978.00001346@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Morse Code Watch
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 6/21/03 5:46 PM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <20030621184604.18497.00000846@mb-m05.aol.com>
>>
>> >Bravo to all those 1x2s in Geneva from ARRL there as "observers"
>> > who don't seem to be able to communicate with Newington.
>>
>> More insulting rhetoric from the cowardly putz who is not only NOT a
>League
>> member, but not even an Amateur licensee.
>>
>> Guess they didn't feel compelled to send a message that says "no news
>> yet". The WRC's NOT over yet, and promulgating stories based on
>half-truths
>> and supposition would be more damaging than good.
>>
>> Maybe YOU should have gotten an Amateur license, joined the League and
>> promoted yourself as an IARU representitive, Lennie.
>>
>> Then Dave Sumner and the rest cold have laughed themselves to death.
>>
>> Steve, K4CAP
>
>It's been floating around for a couple days.

No more than TWO days, Kellie.

The "float" you posted following is an exact copy of what was on WIA Victoria website:

>- - - - -
>
>Forwarded from the CW reflector, courtesy LU1DZ:
>
>Code issues bogs down at WRC03
>The World Radiocommunications Conference in Geneva, has had some firm
>opposition to the removal of mandatory code tests for amateur licensing.
>
>The review of ITU RR S25 which requires Morse code proficiency tests for

>amateur licences granted privileges below 30MHz is being strongly resisted
>by the the former USSR states and the Arab/African group.
>
>WIA observer at WRC03, Keith Malcolm VK1ZKM reports that the agenda item has
>gone through the initial stage during which delegates make their detailed
>presentations on their proposals.
>
>The chairman of the WRC03 working group handling this item is now
>considering how best to handle the matter, and has a difficult task ahead of
>him.
>
>20th June
>
>Alberto LU1DZ

Does this "Alberto" post to WIA Victoria or is he, like yourself, just copying from them verbatim? I say he is just copying...that ANYONE could do TWO DAYS ago from WIA.

Where is the "news" of WRC-03 at ARRL website? Or the IARU sub-page, managed by ARRL Executive President (for life) Sumner? Sumner is supposed to be IN Geneva. It's now been two weeks since WRC-03 got under way and there is NOTHING but a lot of gabble of generalities coming from the "team" in Switzerland. Here's what the "latest news" excerpt was 6 days ago from the "team" leader:

"Coming up: In Week Two we expect the real battles to begin on 7 MHz, Article 25, and 70 cm SARs. To help build support the IARU is hosting a reception on Wednesday evening for about 150 of the key delegates. The participants' list was reviewed and invitations addressed over the weekend with assistance from Linda Sumner, KA1ZD. Of course, we could not invite everyone we would have liked to; the room where are holding the reception, on the top floor of the ITU Tower, will not hold them all. We hope those we could not accommodate will understand our difficulty.

"We also hope to see a change in the unusually warm weather here in Geneva!"

That was posted on 16 June, halfway into the second week of WRC-03, and there is nothing additional now, on the 22nd, at either the IARU or ARRL websites. Maybe there was too much strain about the "top floor" or the "unusually warm weather" to actually report NEWS about the second week's "battles?" No doubt, no doubt. Your "team" in action...

3137. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:17:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030622191752.15462.00000999@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69274

In article <d22b54c3.0306212151.63a71c83@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>DOS died years ago, the rest of us have long since buried it fer >chrissake.

DOS (in computers) is still alive although Microsoft managed to disable a lot of things when it brought out MS-DOS 7 that was packaged first with Windows 95.

Morse code DIED (born 1844) years ago in radio communications but the long-time morseodist amateurs are living zombies, "fer chrissake." :-)

3138. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-22 23:43:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd5et0$3fa$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69276

Hey Lennie.....if we want any crap out of you we will squeeze your head.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030622191752.15462.00000999@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <d22b54c3.0306212151.63a71c83@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >DOS died years ago, the rest of us have long since buried it fer
> >chrissake.
>
> DOS (in computers) is still alive although Microsoft managed to
> disable a lot of things when it brought out MS-DOS 7 that was
> packaged first with Windows 95.
>
> Morse code DIED (born 1844) years ago in radio communications
> but the long-time morseodist amateurs are living zombies, "fer
> chrissake." :-)
>
>

3139. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 00:46:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgwini0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69277

On Sun, 22 Jun 2003 18:43:48 -0500, Dan/W4NTI quoted:

>> DOS (in computers) is still alive although Microsoft managed to
>> disable a lot of things when it brought out MS-DOS 7 that was
>> packaged first with Windows 95.

And IBM revived in PC-DOS 7 and Caldera likewise in DRDOS.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3140. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 01:41:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd5lse$v72$0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 69278

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > My oh My......I love it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Gotta love it.
>
> The Russians are really adamant about retaining s25.5 or some
> variation of it. It's not too hard to shrug off the clout of some of
> the small states like the Balkans but the Russians & Saudis do not
> take kindly to being shrugged off and are quite capable of upsetting
> dipolomatic apple carts. Nobody has heard from Red China yet either .
> . there's another 900 pound gorilla which is not into giveaways and
> making life easy for anybody.
>
> There are no surprises in any of it, none of it is new news. All of it
> has been available for eons via the various dx, contesting and cw
> reflectors.

But the hopeful press on, oblivious.....

3141. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 01:53:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd5mi9$2ee$0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 69279
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 22 Jun 2003 07:50:56 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> There is no type acceptance on amateur equipment.
> > >
> > >There is in the U.S. Every catalog piece of ham gear I've bought since
> > >whenever has an FCC type acceptance tag on the rear panel. Except in
> > >the cases of one-off sales of hombrewed and/or modified ham gear it's
> > >illegal to sell any device which transmits RF unless it's been thru
> > >the FCC type acceptance process. However once in hand hams can do
> > >whatever they want as far as mods are concerned.
> >
> > Hey Brian, go read FCC Rules Part 2 Subpart J (which deals with the
> > Equipment Authorization program), Part 15 (which deals with RF
> > Devices) and Part 97 (which deals with the Amateur Radio Services)
> > and show us where "type acceptance" or its successor - Certification
> > - is required for any HF amateur equipment but 10-meter amplfiers.
> > Do not confuse receiver certification (required for vhf and higher
> > receivers) with type acceptance / certification of transmitters.
> >

So why then is most all every piece of new-on-the-market gear always initially advertised with the caveat "pending FCC certification" when it doesn't already have it? I recall seeing that several times in the ham mags. Why is such a notice needed if no FCC certification or approval (same thing) is required?

Dick

> >
> > "Cutting the diode" and operating on a frequency not authorized for
> > amateur operators is a different matter - unlicensed operation
> > and/or operating non-certified equipment when certifcation is
> > required.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3142. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:06:12 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A2E0CD0615Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69280

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:3EF559E8.B22543B3@earthlink.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
>> news:3EF3ACEA.2EBC60FD@earthlink.net:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer wrote:
>> >>
>> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> >> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
>
>> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there
>> >> are Ws on it is truly warped.
>> >
>> > Howzat? If the realigned band is opened to U.S. ops, there'll be no
>> > DX refuge.
>
>> As I explained, that isn't so. We can only use phone down to 7150 in
>> the US, and no-one expects it to go lower than 7100 if the Novice
>> subband is 're-farmed' The phone subband in other countries goes down
>> to at least 7050, and even down to 7030 in some cases.
>
> You have no idea what will be permitted where after any changes are
> made at the conference.
>

On the contrary, either there will be no change, or 7000-7200 will be
worldwide (with or without 7200-7300 at a later date), or all of 7000-
7300. No other proposals are on the table, and none of the proposals
affect CW subbands in any way.

None of the proposals affect the so-called 'DX refuge' which will remain
at least 7050-7100 everywhere no matter what happens. Ergo, you are
talking utter garbage.

>> If you are expecting any of
>> that spectrum to be reallocated to CW in other countries, dream on.
>
> Reallocated to CW? Where did you get that idea?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

3143. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:08:10 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3EF6610A.24FE3A08@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 69281
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer wrote:
>
> Have fun proving who posted this FUCKHEAD.

No proof needed. It is that bottom-feeding, shriveled up little troll from Glen Dale otherwise known by the disgraced name of "Woger Wiseman."

Have you figured out r.m.s. voltage yet, Woger? Are you aware that brothers are genetically related to their sisters yet Woger? And how is your cat doing? I am full of all kinds of questions for you, but we need to leave the people in this news group alone. Why don't we move over to your usual news group, alt.teletubbies.pant.pant.pant?

3144. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:09:49 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A2E16B1D88Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69282

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030622082344.09955.00000307@mb-m21.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93A1D84BDFB14elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide
>>> exclusive amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get
>>> 7200-7300. What problems will remain after that happens?
>>>
>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>>The only one that I can think of is that the BC stations will fail to
>>QSY.
>>
> Won't they have to, if the treaty changes?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

In theory, but 90% are owned by governments.

3145. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:11:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd5nku$2ee$1@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 69283
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 22 Jun 2003 07:50:56 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > >> There is no type acceptance on amateur equipment.
> > >
> > >There is in the U.S. Every catalog piece of ham gear I've bought since
> > >whenever has an FCC type acceptance tag on the rear panel. Except in
> > >the cases of one-off sales of hombrewed and/or modified ham gear it's
> > >illegal to sell any device which transmits RF unless it's been thru
> > >the FCC type acceptance process. However once in hand hams can do
> > >whatever they want as far as mods are concerned.
> >
> > Hey Brian, go read FCC Rules Part 2 Subpart J (which deals with the
> > Equipment Authorization program), Part 15 (which deals with RF
> > Devices) and Part 97 (which deals with the Amateur Radio Services)
> > and show us where "type acceptance" or its successor - Certification
> > - is required for any HF amateur equipment but 10-meter amplfiers.
> > Do not confuse receiver certification (required for vhf and higher
> > receivers) with type acceptance / certification of transmitters.
> >
>
> So why then is most all every piece of new-on-the-market gear always
> initially advertised with the caveat "pending FCC certification" when it
> doesn't already have it? I recall seeing that several times in the ham
> mags. Why is such a notice needed if no FCC certification or approval (same
> thing) is required?
>
> Di

DISregard, you alredy answered this one

3146. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:14:38 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A2E23C78588elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69284

<SNIP>
>
> Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to run
> SSB down to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I mistaken,
> Alun?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>w3rv
>>
>>
>
>

Yes, you're mistaken, I only want to go down to 7.045, as per IARU recommendations for regions 1 and 2 (it's 7.030 for region 3), and I have never asked even for that, as I know we won't get it. In the earlier thread I only suggested SSB down to 7.075, which is what US licenced hams in region 3 already have.

3147. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:25:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF66545.70503@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69285

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> Wayne's lame and snivvling answer was that "I am only interested in
> spawning the creativity of others to action". In other words, all he wanted to
> do was complain. He is his own worst enemy. He's a loser.

Gawd Steve, THAT is priceless! He put the best spin on complaining that
I've ever heard. I wonder if he'd mind if I made a poster of that saying?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3148. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:26:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF66599.1020606@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Joe S. wrote:
> Let's see -- 73 magazine, Wayne Green, and a disgruntled former ARRL
> employee -- who was let go from ARRL.
>
> Has Fox "News" now taken over 73?

Probably.

3149. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:32:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306221832.dc91692@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69287

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<hlnJa.82$eh3.74@news01.roc.ny>...
> Whew. Jim, I never sent well with a Vibroplex. I ended up using an HA1-TO
> keyer (back when). I like my CW to be indistinguishable from machine sent,
> and never could send decent CW above about 25 on a straight key nor CW at
> any speed on a Vibroplex :)

Neither can anybody else . . wishful thinking to the contrary.

Bug swings are *not* beautiful things although much to their credit
they absolutely will drive CW decoders outta their weenie little
digicrap minds.

I'd already given up straight keys as too much work before I even took
the test and went into the 80M Novice band with my WW2 surplus ARC-5
TX (from a 1943/44 24vdc Willys Jeep Euro Theatre Turbo GT Edition)
with a beat-to-crap bug of unknown parentage. I took said bug to the
FCC office to take my General sending test. Examiner rolled his eyes
upward when I whipped it out and did not give me a sending test. 1954
. . something like that. 1625 PA toobs cathode keying daze.

Not too much later QST pumped out a construction article on a very
early solid state keyer which required laying out the artwork then
exposing and developing the circuit board, scounging all the parts and
stuffing it yerself. Which I did. Helluva lotta fun & education and it
worked tits coming off the bench. After I solder-coated every trace on
the board of course. The iambic Mode A paddles was a pair of
back-to-back J-38s mounted vertically on a mongo brass base.

I don't think that in a half century in this game I've managed to pull
off a total of five q's with a straight key. I won't bore you about
what I think should be done with the few remaining bugs which are not
in collector's museums.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

w3rv

3150. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:33:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF6673E.7030603@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69288

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>
>>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd2tgi$8h7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
>>
>>>My oh My......I love it.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>Gotta love it.
>>
>>The Russians are really adamant about retaining s25.5 or some
>>variation of it. It's not too hard to shrug off the clout of some of
>>the small states like the Balkans but the Russians & Saudis do not
>>take kindly to being shrugged off and are quite capable of upsetting
>>dipolomatic apple carts. Nobody has heard from Red China yet either .
>>. there's another 900 pound gorilla which is not into giveaways and
>>making life easy for anybody.
>>
>>There are no surprises in any of it, none of it is new news. All of it
>>has been available for eons via the various dx, contesting and cw
>>reflectors.
>
>
> But the hopeful press on, oblivious.....

Everyone stand by for a major announcement from Nelson Muntz!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3151. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:49:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF66AB5.7050301@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69289

When I saw the title of this thread, I somehow thought of a wristwatch
that beeps out the time in Morse code..... :-)

3152. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 02:52:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF66B9E.1060401@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69290

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:<43193ef4dff3a3553deffd68275f84ef@dizum.com>...
>
>>As it was said by some hams here, digital modes
>>like PSK31 are few used, especially on 6m.
>>Why ?
>
>
> Because there is very little interest in 6M compared with the HF bands
> and 2M. You need to stir up more interest in 6M if it's a big deal
> for you.

Ain't that the truth!

>
>>If its true that 90 per cent of packet users use
>>old VT100 emulators at 1200 bauds, many
>>DXers are always stuck with CW because they
>>are old and do not understand how to use a
>>computer to play PSK31.
>
>
> Hogwash to the core.
>
> I'm older than dirt and I have a big Winbox with six drives, 256 Mb
> worth of RAM, a GE Force 4 video card w/64 Mb RAM, 19" high-res flat
> NEC monitor, yadda, yadda. And if I choose to do so with my current
> equipment I can run CW, SSB, PSK, FM, AM, RTTY and all the others 160M
> thru 70 cm. And I'm at the low end as far as the investment in a
> contesting/dxing station is concerned.

There is a large percentage of really mature hams using digital modes.
I've typed to several in their 80's who are technically savvy and
computer literate. I had a great QSO with a guy in California who was
well into his 90's. He was still havin fun, still learning.

So lack of understanding is a bogus argument.

>
>>Its stone age
>>although PSK31 is 10 dB better than CW.
>
>
> We all know that. PSK is not in competion with CW on any basis,
> particularly in "stone age" CW contesting/dxing any more than PSK is

> in competition with SSB.
>
>
>>More, there is a money reason explaining that
>>PSK31 is not used. It requires a portable computer
>>(for portable/contest operation)
>
>
> Where did you get that silly notion? Most serious contesters & dxers
> use 'puters in tower cases and operate parked on their arses at their
> home stations.

>
>>that must have a
>>sound card, a lot of RAM to use Win9x and
>>a CD-ROM to install Win9x. Actually, in all
>>the world (because USA is not the only country
>>on Earth), surplus lowest priced laptops are
>>principally 486 based computers with no sound
>>card, no CD-ROM and 4 or 8 MB RAM,
>>running DOS and sometimes Win31.
>>With this equipment, impossible to play PSK31.
>>All the hams on Earth do not have $1000 to
>>spend in a modern laptop just to play with PSK31.
>>Its impossible to add a PCMCIA sound card on
>>these old laptops because the PCMCIA bus has
>>NO DMA, so there is no PCMCIA sound blaster
>>clone card available.
>
>
> 99% irrelvant. See above re: tower case station integration and
> operation.

Hmmmmmm. Has Nomen looked at the side of a laptop. (Hint - most of 'em
have built in sound in and out) I love my old Thinkpad for just that
reason. Just plug the cables into the Mic and headphone jacks.

Lesse, It's a pentium 166 with 32 megs of RAM, running WIn95 and
Digipan. Cheap city.

PCMCIA sound cards? Sheesh!

>
>>Any cheap PSK31 interface solution ? Tell us ...
>
>
> Hamscope is one of many.

I think I spent maybe 6 dollars on my homebrew interface.

>>There is no acceptable PSK31 program running
>>under DOS (although waterfall graphics will be

>>possible also under DOS), and even on Win9X,
>>the author of WinPSKse is too much lazybones to
>>allow 640x480 display (same problem with
>>WSJT, running only in 800x600 mode) and on a
>>486 laptop, its not possible to run 800x600.
>>Here are some reasons that explain why PSK31
>>is not very used especially on 6m. More, there
>>is no worldwide PSK31 consensus to determine
>>a DX calling frequency for PSK31 on 6m.
>
>
> DOS died years ago, the rest of us have long since buried it fer
> chrissake.

I guess Nomen thinks that Hams can't afford anything, everything has to
be free, and that we get dumb as we age.

>
>
>>Packet interest had fallen. TAPR was a pioneer
>>in the years 80s and we all thank TAPR for their
>>TNC2 project (always used in APRS today) but
>>the applications of packet-radio were limited to
>>DX (yes it was possible with level 2) and BBS
>>traffic. BBS killed packet interest and now Internet
>>has killed BBS, so the packet network is quite
>>desert except some DX clusters and APRS
>>channels but its NOT really ham-radio activities.
>>Many hams use now ECHOLINK but ECHOLINK
>>is not AUTHORIZED in all countries. Many pirates
>>interface their VHF/UHF ham station to Internet
>>to allow ECHOLINK but it is often forbidden to
>>make a bridge between radio bands and Internet
>>(for security reasons, terrorists could use
>>ECHOLINK to communicate).
>
>
> Your point here is . . . ??

I'm lost here too...........

>
>>Thats the deal. We have modern modes of
>>transmissions like PSK31, but laws speaking
>>always of CW (19th century). Its time like for
>>sea ships, to forbid CW on HF bands in order
>>to oblige the users to get modern equipments.
>
>
> A good solid 1.02 on the Troll-O-Meter.

I wonder if this might actually be Vipul? THe argument seems formed in the same fashion.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3153. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 03:00:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF66D95.6010305@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69291

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EF558EF.B4A42128@earthlink.net...
>
>>Fritz Wuehler wrote:
>>
>>>Within 15 days, WRC 2003 will be finished and
>>>CW will be abolished.
>>
>>...not likely, Fritz.
>>
>>
>>>The dream will become reality and old farts CW
>>>coders will be (at least) smashed by the new ham
>>>mass on the HF bands.
>>
>>I see. "Today CW; tomorrow, the world!" or something like that, huh?
>>
>>
>>>In quite all civilized countries, there is about one
>>>half of ham operators that are technicians.
>>
>>I'm sure there are a number of countries which will be disappointed in
>>not making your "civilized countries" list.
>>
>>
>>>Think
>>>that the amount of DXers on HF will increase on
>>>that bands soon with the abolishment of CW.
>>
>>What is going to turn these guys into instant DXers? How is this
>>"abolishment" of CW to take place?
>>
>>
>>>Most of hams have a bad antenna system.
>>
>>From where do you obtain your facts?
>>
>>
>>>2 kW are not necessary to make a QSO.
>>
>>It might well be if 1.9 KW can't get the job done.
>>
>>

>>>You can get
>>>a low SWR, but poor radiation of the power if
>>>your antenna acts like a resistor.
>>
>>There aren't many guys running T2FD's.
>>
>>
>>>Its not necessary to make a QSO with 59+60dB
>>>reports.
>>
>>If the noise is 59+55 db, it might well be necessary.
>>
>>
>>>56 is sufficient considering the QRN.
>>
>>I don't think you've considered QRN enough. Is it Summer where you are?
>>
>>
>>>So, please stop using kW amplifiers (you generate
>>>splatters, harmonics, etc ... on the bands)...
>>
>>Please explain how KW amplifiers by and of themselves necessarily
>>produce "splatters" or harmonics.
>>
>>
>>>and use
>>>digital modes with low RF power.
>>
>>My regs permit a variety of modes and a great deal of power.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Remember that
>>>HF bands are international and that you must
>>>SHARE them with hams of other countries.
>>
>>Not just the "civilized countries"?
>>
>>
>>>Welcome to the technicians worldwide on HF
>>>and peace and love for all !
>>
>>Far out, man!
>>
>>Dave K8MN
>
>
> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting up a
> fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.
>

> Dan/W4NTI

Stay tuned for that big announcement by Nelson Muntz!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3154. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 03:19:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bd5rk0$d4u@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 69292

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EF66AB5.7050301@ix.netcom.com...
> When I saw the title of this thread, I somehow thought of a wristwatch
> that beeps out the time in Morse code..... :-)
>

=:o That's in the box of Cap'n Crunch, isn't it?!

Kim W5TIT

3155. 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 03:45:38 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <myuJa.17416$bH3.11055@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 69293

It is true that USB is the only mode allowed on the new 5MHz channels.

HOWEVER, that does not mean Morse Code is prohibited! Only the CW mode (with LSB, FM. AM) are prohibited.

All you need to do is go into the SSB mode and operate audio Morse Code (such as with a practice keyer) and you will be perfectly legal.

Sorry no-coders, but this is the truth.

73 de KR4AJ

3156. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 03:49:10 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0306221949.78953113@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"fartnoises" <1bekno12@yahoo.com> wrote

> When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> of that radio.

There is no FCC requirement for "Type Acceptance" of HF transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service. We can make ANY modifications we desire to commercial equipment, or even scratch build our own equipment, so long as we operate on authorized frequencies within the power levels and spectral purity requirements of Part 97.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3157. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 04:20:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF6807C.FCFAF8D9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69295

```
Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3EF559E8.B22543B3@earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> >> news:3EF3ACEA.2EBC60FD@earthlink.net:
> >>
> >> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> >> >> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there
> >> >> are Ws on it is truly warped.
> >> >
> >> > Howzat? If the realigned band is opened to U.S. ops, there'll be no
> >> > DX refuge.
> >>
> >> As I explained, that isn't so. We can only use phone down to 7150 in
> >> the US, and no-one expects it to go lower than 7100 if the Novice
> >> subband is 're-farmed' The phone subband in other countries goes down
> >> to at least 7050, and even down to 7030 in some cases.
> >
> > You have no idea what will be permitted where after any changes are
> > made at the conference.
> >
>
> On the contrary, either there will be no change, or 7000-7200 will be
> worldwide (with or without 7200-7300 at a later date), or all of 7000-
> 7300. No other proposals are on the table, and none of the proposals
> affect CW subbands in any way.
>
> None of the proposals affect the so-called 'DX refuge' which will remain
> at least 7050-7100 everywhere no matter what happens. Ergo, you are
> talking utter garbage.

Al, There is nothing whatever to prevent the FCC from permitting US
amateurs additional SSB frequencies lower in the band no matter what
takes place at the conference. The Commission did so quite a number of
years ago in the case of 20 and 15m. Perhaps you've heard of it.
```

> >> If you are expecting any of
> >> that spectrum to be reallocated to CW in other countries, dream on.
> >
> > Reallocated to CW? Where did you get that idea?

No response? You must have been talking utter garbage.

Dave K8MN

3158. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 04:45:37 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A37B07164Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69296

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:3EF6807C.FCFAF8D9@earthlink.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
>> news:3EF559E8.B22543B3@earthlink.net:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer wrote:
>> >>
>> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
>> >> news:3EF3ACEA.2EBC60FD@earthlink.net:
>> >>
>> >> > Alun Palmer wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> >> >> news:d22b54c3.0306190356.6f7c383@posting.google.com:
>> >> >
>> >> >> Your viewpoint that they 'don't get' the extra spectrum if there
>> >> >> are Ws on it is truly warped.
>> >> >
>> >> > Howzat? If the realigned band is opened to U.S. ops, there'll be
>> >> > no DX refuge.
>> >
>> >> As I explained, that isn't so. We can only use phone down to 7150
>> >> in the US, and no-one expects it to go lower than 7100 if the
>> >> Novice subband is 're-farmed' The phone subband in other countries
>> >> goes down to at least 7050, and even down to 7030 in some cases.
>> >
>> > You have no idea what will be permitted where after any changes are
>> > made at the conference.
>> >
>>
>> On the contrary, either there will be no change, or 7000-7200 will be
>> worldwide (with or without 7200-7300 at a later date), or all of 7000-
>> 7300. No other proposals are on the table, and none of the proposals
>> affect CW subbands in any way.
>>
>> None of the proposals affect the so-called 'DX refuge' which will
>> remain at least 7050-7100 everywhere no matter what happens. Ergo, you
>> are talking utter garbage.
>
> Al, There is nothing whatever to prevent the FCC from permitting US
> amateurs additional SSB frequencies lower in the band no matter what
```

> takes place at the conference. The Commission did so quite a number of
> years ago in the case of 20 and 15m. Perhaps you've heard of it.
>

This may be true, but the US position has always been that the whole world should realign the whole band instead, which seems to be happening. Quite a few people expect the FCC to extend phone down to 7100 when the Novice subbands are abolished, but the FCC says that it won't even do that unless there is a consensus, and even if it did that would make no difference.

>> >> If you are expecting any of
>> >> that spectrum to be reallocated to CW in other countries, dream on.
>> >
>> > Reallocated to CW? Where did you get that idea?
>
> No response? You must have been talking utter garbage.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

The only other way that the 'DX refuge' could disappear, is if other countries, after getting more spectrum, raise the cw/phone boundary further up the band. I don't think they will, and even if they did, in most it is not compulsory.

3159. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 05:08:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623010812.27503.00000661@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 69297

In article <bd5et0$3fa$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Hey Lennie.....if we want any crap out of you we will squeeze your head.

Dannie, you couldn't do it with help from the Gang of Four.

:-)

Now, go take your meds like a good boy, Dannie. You'll feel
much better in the morning.

3160. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 06:14:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623021450.23044.00001703@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 69298

>Subject: Re: Why digital modes are few used
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/03 12:08 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030623010812.27503.00000661@mb-m24.aol.com>

>Subject: Re: Why digital modes are few used
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/03 12:08 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030623010812.27503.00000661@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>In article <bd5et0$3fa$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
><w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
>>Hey Lennie.....if we want any crap out of you we will squeeze your head.
>
> Dannie, you couldn't do it with help from the Gang of Four.

All it takes is nine ounces of pressure, Lennie, and we'll be cleaning
LennieCrap off the walls for weeks.

>Now, go take your meds like a good boy, Dannie. You'll feel
> much better in the morning.

You should know. Is your correspondence school shrink wife writing
scripts for you, Lennie?

She should......

Steve, K4CAP

3161. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 07:36:33 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bd6am1inn1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 69299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Robert Casey (wa2ise@ix.netcom.com) writes:
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
>>On Sun, 22 Jun 2003 01:02:41 -0400, fartnoises wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
>>>you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
>>>of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
>>>with this suggestion.
>>>
>>>
>>
>> Ham radio HF transceivers are not required toi be "type accepted".
>> Have you found a Type Acceptance label on yours?
>>
>>
>>
> As I (mis)understand it, you only need type acceptance if you
> manufacture more than
> 5 copies of something that transmits in a year. Or modify more than 5
> of something
> in a year. Thus you cannot sell lots of "modified" linears capable of
> generating power
> on 10m to "hams" or anybody else (freebanders).
>
No, that's about amplifiers in the US. And while there is an issue
of type acceptance, ironically it has nothing to do with the amateur
service. It's there to inhibit the propogation of such amplifiers
to activities where their use would be illegal, ie CB and the band
between it and 10 meters.

Michael VE2BVW

3162. Something amusing from QST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 08:07:16 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <863ci1z07f.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 69300

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

I was reading an article in the latest QST about official observers,
and the lead photo for the article had a rig tuned to 14.313.

Coincidence?

Jack.
(still haven't heard anything on that frequency.)
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+9rU6GPFSfAB/ezgRAlZaAKDgbMzTP7JRWJt5jmZdUmMUkF6bOgCg7VAd
mzxVfMRo8u134afmqwez0RU=
=EWQ7
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3163. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 09:49:16 UTC
From: Frank Todd <k3eko@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3EF6CD1B.2040007@yahoo.com>
Source record: 69212
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And just what is wrong with Fox News?

Frank

Joe S. wrote:
> Let's see -- 73 magazine, Wayne Green, and a disgruntled former ARRL
> employee -- who was let go from ARRL.
>
> Has Fox "News" now taken over 73?
>

3164. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 10:22:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623062253.04207.00001003@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 69215

In article <bd5rk0$d4u@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3EF66AB5.7050301@ix.netcom.com...
>> When I saw the title of this thread, I somehow thought of a wristwatch
>> that beeps out the time in Morse code..... :-)
>>
>
>=:o That's in the box of Cap'n Crunch, isn't it?!
>
I think you mean Cracker Jack

73 de Jim, N2EY

3165. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 10:23:28 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A340F52BB59elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69214

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in news:bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net:

>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>
>> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting
>> up a fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.
>
> Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test
> contingent's
> hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003
>
>
>

Note that the RSGB have said that s25.5 has been agreed in principle, i.e.
it's a question of what wording will appease the Russians and Germans, but
it will just say that *they* can keep code testing and everyone else can
ditch it!

3166. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 11:49:47 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vfdqdh66ktde10@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69216

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:myuJa.17416$bH3.11055@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com...
> It is true that USB is the only mode allowed on the new 5MHz channels.
>
> HOWEVER, that does not mean Morse Code is prohibited! Only the CW mode
(with
> LSB, FM. AM) are prohibited.
>
> All you need to do is go into the SSB mode and operate audio Morse Code
> (such as with a practice keyer) and you will be perfectly legal.
>
> Sorry no-coders, but this is the truth.
>
> 73 de KR4A

There nothing to be sorry about, no-coders only want to
delete 47 CFR 97.503(a). They do not care how much you
operate CW.

A primary government user will not be able to tell if operating
CW or MCW. Internally, some transceivers actual generate
CW as you describe. So before you get a NAL, I suggest
you check with ARRL or Bill Cross at the FCC .
You won't hurt the no-coders, only yourself and the
Amateur Radio service.

Larry, kc8epo

3167. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 11:51:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230351.218b782a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69217
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgwad3n.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 22 Jun 2003 13:38:36 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >Yes he was, he worked for Ed Hare the League lab manager, RFI/EMI guru
> >and author of the ARRL tome on RFI/EMI. Phillips held the title "RFI
> >Engineer" or some such.
>
> IIRC he didn't stay long.

He was hired with the usual fanfare sometime in 2001, dunno when/why
he "went looking for another career opportunity".

3168. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 12:14:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230414.2cdedff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69218

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd4al0vuq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306212248.12b53ded@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<bd1sfu$ce6$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > > I have often thought the same way. But I figure it won't happen till
> Im
> > > dead anyway. So I'll enjoy it while I can. And fight it tooth and nail
> all
> > > the way.
> >
> > I certainly agree with that!
>
> As do I. Additionally, we have heard the conspiracy theories
> for over 10 years now and other than the totally underused 220MHz
> loss, ham radio has not had any other frequencies so threatened.
> The track record of frequency losses is contrary to the doomsday
> presictions of Fritz, et al.

Absolutely. I don't have the info on "the way it was" but I suspect
that if we compare the total number of mHz hams had available, for
instance, in 1963, 1983 and today we've continuously gotten
additional spectrum space, not less. In the case of HF I expect
we'll get even more space as the other HF users continue to move off
HF and into satellites and the Internet.

> That doesn't mean hams can or should be compalaent...as we
> can look to the 220 loss as to what can/could happen if WE
> don't stay active and proactive in using our
> valuable freuency resources.

Agreed again. If I was a Tech I would be a lot more concerned about
the threats than I am as an HFer. They're the bunch which really needs
to get their oars in the water.

>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

w3rv

3169. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 12:22:24 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230422.31b22f56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Brenda Ann" <brendad@shinbiro.com> wrote in message
news:<bd523u$sgr$1@news1.kornet.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0306221222.18cf5729@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<bd4bfa$dmp$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> >
> > > > When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> > > > you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> > > > of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
> > > > with this suggestion.
> > >
> > > Amateur radio transcievers are NOT type-accepted.
> > > There is NO issue there.
> >
> >
> > Icom announced the upcoming availability of their new top-end IC-7800
> > xcvr at Dayton a few weeks ago. Universal Radio (ham & SWL equipment
> > distributor)is advertising it in their website. Dial into:
> >
> > http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/hamhf/0041.html
> >
> > Note that the ad includes this caveat in red print:
> >
> > "NOTICE: This device has not been approved by the Federal
> > Communications Commission. This device may not be sold or leased, or
> > be offered for sale or lease, until approval of the F.C.C. has been
> > obtained."
> >
> > Looks to me like type acceptance is required. Or is there some other
> > flavor of FCC approval?
> >
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Amateur RECEIVERS, including the ones in transceivers, are required to be
> Part 15 certified to not cause interference with other devices, as do all
> receivers. The transmitter section does not require certification per Part
> 97.
```

Got it. Finally. Tnx.

w3rv

3170. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 12:22:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623082256.01814.00000019@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 69220

In article <bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>
>> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting up
>> a
>> fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.

Test or no test, CW/Morse USE will continue.
>
> Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test contingent's
>hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.

Is China really "communist" any more? Seems like we import a lot of consumer goods from them. They're also the #1 source of foreign adoptions to the USA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3171. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 12:22:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623082256.01814.00000020@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 69221

In article <bcvcb1$n4d$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>> Howzat?
>
> You were right - I do like it.

OK

> Are you the author?
>
Pretty much, except for Number 21. The list has been posted here a few times over the past few years. It was developed in response to someone who claimed that hams don't need operating skills, just technical and regulatory knowledge.

You may have noticed that not one of the skills is Morse code specific.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3172. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 12:40:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230440.3fffeeb8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69222
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgwa5fm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 22 Jun 2003 13:22:43 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >Icom announced the upcoming availability of their new top-end IC-7800
> >xcvr at Dayton a few weeks ago. Universal Radio (ham & SWL equipment
> >distributor)is advertising it in their website. Dial into:
> >
> >http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/hamhf/0041.html
> >
> >Note that the ad includes this caveat in red print:
> >
> >"NOTICE: This device has not been approved by the Federal
> >Communications Commission. This device may not be sold or leased, or
> >be offered for sale or lease, until approval of the F.C.C. has been
> >obtained."
> >
> >Looks to me like type acceptance is required. Or is there some other
> >flavor of FCC approval?
>
> Yes there is. Type acceptance as we knew it is no longer in
> existence.

"They" got me again.

> The equipment authorization processes are now
> "certification" which requires submission to the FCC of test
> measurements of compliance with applicable Rule sections
> (essentially the same as type-acceptance was), "Declaration of
> Conformity" which is the same as "certification" but the tests are
> made by an authorized private-sector testing facility and not
> submitted to the FCC, and "verification" which requires no
> submission to the FCC but merely a statement by the manufacturer of
> compliance with the limits set forth in Part 15 of the Rules.

Hoo-boy, that move went right over my head at some point.

> If thr above transceiver has receiver capability above 30 MHz,
> and/or a computer processor, it would have to be certified for rf
> noise emission to Part 15 standards. That's what is probably pending.

NOW I get it. The 7800 has a flock of CPUs plus it's operable on 6M.

Zo in summary the stickers on my gear are "certificate of compliance" notices WRT to the rcvr and CPUs tossing out trash per part 15 and don't have anything to do with transmitter type acceptance. I find that a bit odd but OK.

> Or alternatively, the manufacturer could have applied for
> certification of the transmitter in services other than amateur but
> that's doubtful.

I can't imagine any other service using the 7800. The beast redefines the meaning of "complex equipment", ya need 40 hours in the manual to get it up and running right.

w3rv

3173. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:12:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623091223.20722.00000731@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69223

>Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/20/03 10:20 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bcv8odlnv1@nd.eastky.net>

>I didn't insult ANYBODY in my original post in this thread, I asked
>questions and made observations.

The perception of insult is individual, but usually making assertions of generally negative tone and unfounded nature are sure to set it off.

Steve, K4CAP

3174. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:17:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623091702.20722.00000732@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69224

>Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/20/03 2:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bcvp2b$sk9$1@nd.eastky.net>

>> Just put your name at the end of the post along with your callsign
>and
>> quit being a troll, "Robert".
>
> I have to make my home address available on the internet to satisfy
>you? Think again.

Like I said...Not one person here, including the most foul of all trollers
Lennie Anderson has had anything happen to them as a result of their posting
here.

That you seem to think you're a special case makes me wonder about your
true intentions here. I doubt your licensure and experience in Amateur Radio,
and are probably an import from rec.radio.cb.

Until then...your qualifications to make informed opinion is dubious at
best.

Steve, K4CAP

3175. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:19:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623091946.20722.00000733@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69225

>Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/21/03 5:49 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bd1dg4icf1@nd.eastky.net>

>> Hey Bobby-Poo ya old deck ape, give my regards to the rest of the
>> folks on Wiley Hillard Rd.
>
> What a collection of rocket scientists I've stumbled across. You
>just proved my point Brian. Well done.

We're just left a bit too cynical by numerous transient trollers who pass through, drop thier usual load of unfounded negativity about Amateur Radio, then scurry on.

Unfortunately YOU are proving some of Brian's point, too.

Steve, K4CAP

3176. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:22:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623092230.20722.00000734@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69226

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/20/03 3:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bcvqqltai1@nd.eastky.net>

>A gay-flame - says a lot more about you than it does about me.
>What's your beef with the military, anyway? 4F due to terminal cranio-rectal
>defilade?

Wait...are we discussing the military or the Navy?

>> Yep...talks like one too. No couth...no class....If ya can't out
>think
>> them, cuss them!
>
> "Out-think"? He'd have to be engaged in something resembling thought
>for me to worry about out-doing him at it.

I doubt that being involved in "something resembling thought" is anything
we need accuse you of any time soon.

>He's dishing it out - if he can't take it, oh well

Back to ya.

Steve, K4CAP

3177. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:26:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230526.560dd2ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69227

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A340F52BB59elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in news:bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net:
>
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
> >
> >> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting
> >> up a fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.
> >
> > Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test
> > contingent's
> > hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
> >
> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003
> >
> >
> >
>
> Note that the RSGB have said that s25.5 has been agreed in principle, i.e.
> it's a question of what wording will appease the Russians and Germans, but
> it will just say that *they* can keep code testing and everyone else can
> ditch it!

The ITU sets the *minimum* requirements, it does not tell sovereign administrations like the FCC what additional requirements above & beyond those minimums may be imposed in their countries. In other words the Russians could set a 15 wpm code test as their entry-level code test with or without S25.5. And have been able to do that going back to the dawn of ham radio. Ditto the FCC. Therefore the Russians & their cohorts obviously don't need "appeasment", they do want to retain S25.5 in some form or another. Ya gotta be a complete stupid if ya don't think they're serious threat to the nocode dream.

As far as us PTCAs are concerned the botom line is that we have absolutely nothing to lose or gain, we already have it all and S25.5 could disappear tomorrow with no effect on us. It's not us who have the stake in abolishing S25.5, it's you codeless types who are providing the amusement.

So keep praying and posting, we're enjoying your thrash enormously.

w3rv

3178. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:28:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623092800.20722.00000735@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69228

>Subject: Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was
>curious.....)
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 6/23/03 7:40 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0306230440.3fffeeb8@posting.google.com>

>I can't imagine any other service using the 7800. The beast redefines
>the meaning of "complex equipment", ya need 40 hours in the manual to
>get it up and running right.

I agree. Other than being an opportunity to show that you can afford one,
it does precious little more than what my aging FT757GX and an outboard DSP and
antenna tuner can do in terms of getting a signal out or picking one out of the
trash.

A skilled operator helps too! =)

73

Steve, K4CAP

3179. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:33:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230533.7cdbdedd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69229
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bd0c61$474$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EF3B012.B713216D@earthlink.net...
> > Robert wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
> > >
> > > > You don't strike me as the kind of fellow looking for a welcome.
> > >
> > > A welcoming kind of crowd wouldn't start threads titled "Typical
> > > no-code brain fart".
> > >
> > A crowd didn't start the thread and a crowd won't do the welcoming.
> >
> The semantic difference twixt "crowd" and "room full of guys" is one
> that, fortunately, escapes me.
>
>

Hey Dave, looks like we have the Second Coming of The Putz here. Right
down to the half-vast "military comms" expertise.

w3rv

3180. PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:55:16 UTC
From: channel391@juno.com
Message-ID: <ae188f77.0306230555.1fb50431@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69230
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Newsline has the following report on the problems being caused by
those hi-fi SSB operators and a petition to run them off the airwaves:

RADIO LAW: HAMS PETITION TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB

On-air experimentation with so-called High Fidelity or Enhanced Single
Sideband
transmissions could be outlawed if thr FCC adopts a proposed rules
change
requested by two radio amateurs on opposite sides of the country.
Amateur
Radio Newsline's Paul Courson, WA3VJB, reports from the nations
capital:

--

A petition for rulemaking was sent to the FCC and accepted by the
agency May
27th. It was not immediately issued a Rulemaking Number so it was hard
to find
in the public record. However, Newsline has talked with two sources
who have
seen the proposal, and it calls for what many would consider severe
bandwidth
limitations on HF phone.

The petition asks for a federally mandated bandwidth limit of 2.8
kilohertz for
SSB, well below the extended bandwidth needed for what has been called
enhanced
audio.

One of the two hams who submitted the petition told the FCC they are
motivated
by interference problems caused by two groups of single sideband
operators.
These groups are portrayed by the petitioners as, in both cases,
having cast
aside traditional voluntary limits on bandwidth of roughly three
kilohertz. The
petition therefore asks that these voluntary limits be made mandatory
to
provide a clear enforcement mechanism for regulators.

The petitioners, Michael Lonneke W0YR of Virginia, and Melvin Ladisky W6FDR of
California, said hams from one of the groups come on during radio contests, and
are found tweaking their transmitters to splatter purposely to provide elbowroom on a very crowded band. The two men characterize the other group as
those who experiment with high-fidelity audio, apparently trying to replicate
the sound of FM Broadcast stations.

Newsline has recently reported on advisory letters sent out by FCC Enforcement
Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, who wrote to several members of the
enhanced SSB group telling them the agency had received interference complaints. The letters did not validate nor dispute the complaints, but warned
the stations that if such complaints continued, the unresolved friction could
trigger petitions for rulemaking. One such petition is now at hand.

A Newsline reporter spoke with Lonneke, who declined to provide a copy of his
petition for this report. He said he and Ladisky hold the same views on the
matter of excessive bandwidth causing interference, and that they teamed up on
the petition to add strength to their call for regulatory intervention. Lonneke
declined further comment, and said the petition will speak for itself if the
FCC chooses to assign it a rulemaking number and put it to public comment.

Members of the enhanced SSB group have told Newsline they believe their
experimentation with improved audio is totally in line with the spirit of ham
radio, and thet when conducted under appropriate conditions, is every bit as
justified in bandwidth consumption as any other spectrum-intensive activity,
including contesting. But the FCC's Hollingsworth, reacting to such comments,
disagreed, suggesting the mode of SSB was commissioned for the amateur service
as a spectrum conservation mode, counter to the idea of high-fidelity audio and
the bandwidth it requires.

Hollingsworth could not be reached to comment on the proposed Petition, and
another FCC official declined to comment.

The petition also mentions the legacy mode of AM, and said it, quote, does not
create the same problems that the burgeoning use of so-called 'Hi-Fi Single
Sideband' creates. Nonetheless, the petition asks the FCC to impose a 5.6
kilohertz bandwith limitation on AM, with the restrictions asked for on all HF
allocations below 28.8 megahertz.

Previous regulatory proposals based on bandwidth have failed, including Docket
20777 from the mid 1970s. The conclusion then was that having loosely-defined
technical standards allowed the greatest range of experimentation in ham radio,
as long as such signals are clean. Indeed, many present-day violations of
splatter, overdriven amplifiers, and poorly administered audio lashups can
already trigger enforcement action under existing FCC rules governing the
purity of signal.

Reporting for Newsline, Paul Courson, WA3VJB, in Washington

--

As we go to air, the ten page petition by W0YR and W6FDR has not been been
assigned a Rule Making number designation. More on this story in future
amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline(tm), W5YI)

3181. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 13:58:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623095814.09140.00000956@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 69231

>Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
>From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>Date: 6/20/03 2:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <bcvp2b$sk9$1@nd.eastky.net>

>I have to make my home address available on the internet to satisfy
>you? Think again.

Sound's like KG4ZXM to me.

Steve, K4CAP

3182. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 14:14:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230614.7acf1dfa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69232

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgvz72j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 21 Jun 2003 22:51:43 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >DOS died years ago, the rest of us have long since buried it fer
> >chrissake.
>
> My 2-m 24/7 packet-only box runs with jan-u-wine PC-DOS

What, no MS-DOS??

I have a customeer who has an original IBM 8086 PC with two 360K 5.25"
floppy drives and no hard drive. The thing has been churning out
strips of adhesive wire tags in his panel shop for at least twenty
years.

> in a P-1
> machine that I scrounged from surplus parts in three junkboxes.
>
> Do not confuse this with my Athlon XP+ 2 GHz, 2GB RAM box with all
> the bells and whistles running eComStation, a proprietary IBM OS,
> which runs everything else except those few programs which
> ab-so-lutely require "real" Win which I have to run on a separate
> NT4 box.

Woo-woo! The Athalon box is a screamer and a half. 2Gb RAM huh?
Yoicks. There's a game machine to kill for.

You do tend to make concerted and extended efforts to avoid Microsloth
dontcha? I been watching the Sun, IBM and SCO brawls. Offhand I'd say
Bill needs to be concerned.

>
> >A good solid 1.02 on the Troll-O-Meter.
>
> We use more high-tech instrumentation, the Bozo-Scope. It hits 10
> on that one.

The old Troll-O-Meter has front-end sensitivity problems I guess.

w3rv

3183. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 14:24:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306230624.3065eae6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69233

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3EF66B9E.1060401@adelphia.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

>
>
> There is a large percentage of really mature hams using digital modes.
> I've typed to several in their 80's who are technically savvy and
> computer literate. I had a great QSO with a guy in California who was
> well into his 90's. He was still havin fun, still learning.
>
> So lack of understanding is a bogus argument.

My mother got a 'puter and got herself online for the first time when
she was 84 or so.

> >>Thats the deal. We have modern modes of
> >>transmissions like PSK31, but laws speaking
> >>always of CW (19th century). Its time like for
> >>sea ships, to forbid CW on HF bands in order
> >>to oblige the users to get modern equipments.
> >
> >
> > A good solid 1.02 on the Troll-O-Meter.
>
>
>
> I wonder if this might actually be Vipul? THe argument seems formed in
> the same fashion.

You might be right. The writing style and cluelessness are also
suspiciously similar.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

3184. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 14:37:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd7394scg1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69234

Whatever it takes to shut you whinners up is fine by me.

Dan/W4NTI

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>
> > I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting
up
> a
> > fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.
>
> Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test
contingent's
> hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003
>
>

3185. Re: Something amusing from QST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 14:45:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd73nj$4aa$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69235

It has be 'Rileyized'. The only thing left is Donnie dumbass and his followers. Even the Herpster is history there. Sorry Jack your a bit late.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message news:863ci1z07f.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

I was reading an article in the latest QST about official observers, and the lead photo for the article had a rig tuned to 14.313.

Coincidence?

Jack.
(still haven't heard anything on that frequency.)
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+9rU6GPFSfAB/ezgRAlZaAKDgbMzTP7JRWJt5jmZdUmMUkF6bOgCg7VAd
mzxVfMRo8u134afmqwez0RU=
=EWQ7
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3186. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 16:43:38 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_XFJa.136$IT4.9@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 69236

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:vfdqdh66ktde10@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:myuJa.17416$bH3.11055@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com...
> > It is true that USB is the only mode allowed on the new 5MHz channels.
> >
> > HOWEVER, that does not mean Morse Code is prohibited! Only the CW mode
> (with
> > LSB, FM. AM) are prohibited.
> >
> > All you need to do is go into the SSB mode and operate audio Morse Code
> > (such as with a practice keyer) and you will be perfectly legal.
> >
> > Sorry no-coders, but this is the truth.
> >
> > 73 de KR4A
>
> There nothing to be sorry about, no-coders only want to
> delete 47 CFR 97.503(a). They do not care how much you
> operate CW.
>
> A primary government user will not be able to tell if operating
> CW or MCW. Internally, some transceivers actual generate
> CW as you describe. So before you get a NAL, I suggest
> you check with ARRL or Bill Cross at the FCC .
> You won't hurt the no-coders, only yourself and the
> Amateur Radio service.
>
> Larry, kc8epo

Only those (enforcement) rights not specifically granted to the Federal Govt' (FCC) belong to the States (us). It matters not that the primary users cannot understand our communications. However, if they wish to be able to identify the callsigns of the secondary users, then they may wish to learn CW for these rare situations, since Part 97 allows, in ALL cases, a Morse call sign identification not faster than 20 wpm.

Why the guilt trip about hurting amateur radio? Why would anybody care if I used Morse (as you yourself say?). I did study psychology at the University and I am always curious as to why people attempt to use "guilt" as a hook in an attempt to control the behavior of others (wives do it all the time!). In ham radio, there is only ONE controlling factor: KD4ZDH.

73

KR4AJ

3187. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 17:37:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306230937.612ea6d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69237

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030623082256.01814.00000020@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <bcvcb1$n4d$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> > You were right - I do like it.
>
> OK
>
> The list has been posted here a few times over the past few years.

It's actually more than five years old. Tempus fugit or something like
that.

> It was developed in response to someone who claimed
> that hams don't need operating skills, just technical and regulatory
> knowledge.

Here's a link to the post where I think the list originated. It's a
response to a nocodetest person who could be a
bit...ummm....outspoken, shall we say?

Enjoy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=01bd8923%24dddc39a0%240100005a%40wa6vse&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain

3188. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 17:40:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306230940.22479793@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69238

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030623082256.01814.00000020@mb-m10.aol.com>...

Posted the wrong link!

This should be the right one:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=1998053119121300.PAA17169%40ladder01.news.aol.com&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain

73 de Jim, N2EY

3189. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 17:44:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF73CF7.3B98B4A9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69239
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bd0c61$474$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EF3B012.B713216D@earthlink.net...
> > > Robert wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
> > > >
> > > > > You don't strike me as the kind of fellow looking for a welcome.
> > > >
> > > > A welcoming kind of crowd wouldn't start threads titled "Typical
> > > > no-code brain fart".
> > >
> > > A crowd didn't start the thread and a crowd won't do the welcoming.
> >
> > The semantic difference twixt "crowd" and "room full of guys" is one
> > that, fortunately, escapes me.
> >
> >
>
> Hey Dave, looks like we have the Second Coming of The Putz here. Right
> down to the half-vast "military comms" expertise.

Agreed. Did it ever occur to you that Len is much like Wayne Green
without an amateur license?

Dave K8MN
```

3190. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 17:59:52 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <seHJa.9236$Kg7.5329@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 69240

Amusing.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0306230940.22479793@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030623082256.01814.00000020@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>
> Posted the wrong link!
>
> This should be the right one:
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=1998053119121300.PAA17169%40ladder01.news.aol.com&oe=
UTF-8&output=gplain
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3191. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:02:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231002.135b3aa5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69241

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030623082256.01814.00000019@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
>
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
> >
> >> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting up
> >> a
> >> fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.
>
> Test or no test, CW/Morse USE will continue.

Put that in the bank.

> > Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test contingent's
> >hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
>
> Is China really "communist" any more?

You bet, but not as hard-core Communist as it was in Mao's days. It's
still a monster opressive single-party state which is creaking and
leaking as it plods toward democracy. Incredible volumes of
corruption. Chinese hams came back on the air some time ago after
being shut down for decades following the onset of WW2 but there
aren't very many of 'em so far.

They're very heavy hitters at the ITU along with the Russians and tend
to think like the rest of our former Cold War adversaries. e.g., they
still hang together and they ain't much into freebies and work
avoidance. Or "consensus building" which is the name of the game at
WRC03 according to Phil. They're all much more comfortable with
"negotiating" via bully politics. The question as far as S25.5 is
concerned could well be whether or not the thrust for a consensus to
abolish S25.5 will collapse in the face the bully politics. The easy
way out of that quagmire for everybody of course would be to do
absolutely nothing about S25.5 and take a hike on it.

I suspect that this is what was meant when the VK1ZKM reported:

"The chairman of the WRC03 working group handling this item (S25.5) is
now
considering how best to handle the matter, and has a difficult task
ahead of
him."

> Seems like we import a lot of consumer
> goods from them. They're also the #1 source of foreign adoptions to the USA.

It's all about money. Start tossing the almighty Yankee dollar around
and all of a sudden the local ideologies move to a back seat.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3192. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:34:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231034.4e0adbe2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69242

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030623092800.20722.00000735@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was
> >curious.....)
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 6/23/03 7:40 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0306230440.3fffeeb8@posting.google.com>
>
> >I can't imagine any other service using the 7800. The beast redefines
> >the meaning of "complex equipment", ya need 40 hours in the manual to
> >get it up and running right.
>
> I agree. Other than being an opportunity to show that you can afford one,
> it does precious little more than what my aging FT757GX

That one has a bit of gray beard but if it works OK there ain't
nothing wrong with it. Helluva lotta radio for the buck if you buy a
used one.

> and an outboard DSP and
> antenna tuner can do in terms of getting a signal out or picking one out of the
> trash.

Umm . . the 7800 does a bunch of tricks the 757 can't do. Two complete
rcvrs is one. 200 watts out is another. Lotta IF DSP. Check the specs.
The high-end contesters & dxers will go for it. In truth most of 'em
are not into impressing anybody with what they spend. They have the
dinero and use it to buy the best technology out there simply to boost
their competitive positions on the air. I was in one of these types
shacks about a month ago. I noticed a stack of big black boxes in a
corner and took a closer look. A whole frigging pile of Acom 2000A
solid state amps. The damned things cost $6,000 apiece. The guy just
shrugged, "yeah, they're pretty handy". No shit . . !

>
> A skilled operator helps too! =)

Put a lid in front of a 7800 and giggle.

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

w3rv

3193. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:43:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <oTHJa.10164$Jz5.8369@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69243

Sorry, Dan. The 'controlling' factor includes the FCC, but is considerably bigger than the FCC. There are international agreements. As was pointed out, some rigs generate CW by using SSB and feeding an audio sine wave into the audio system. With high carrier suppression and high unwanted sideband rejection, it is virtually indistinguishable from 'normal' CW (on off keying of a carrier). Dan tried to point this out. I would suggest you check with the FCC on this one. It might (just might) be possible to send an id within the legal bandwidth in Morse, but in all likelihood it would irritate the current users of that band. The last thing anyone should want to do is cause problems with the current users or we could loose the 5 MHz allocation. That would have nothing to do with 'legal' or 'illegal', it is simple reality. Flaming the newsgroups (which I don't consider your post to be) is one thing; causing problems on the air (especially in the new 5 MHz allocation) is quite another.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3194. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:45:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231045.15192104@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69244

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030623091223.20722.00000731@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Solar storms : who cares
> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
> >Date: 6/20/03 10:20 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <bcv8odlnv1@nd.eastky.net>
>
> >I didn't insult ANYBODY in my original post in this thread, I asked
> >questions and made observations.
>
> The perception of insult is individual, but usually making assertions of
> generally negative tone and unfounded nature are sure to set it off.
>
> Steve, K4CAP

Ya mean like without any discussion of the subject or provaction at
all the way Bobby immeduately got into code bashing? Fuggem.

w3rv

3195. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:49:24 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <TYHJa.10165$rB5.62@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69245

Dave, I've cut my reply to the policy group only. My ISP takes a dim view of too much cross posting (although we are allowed a limited amount of it). Too many folks try this 'legal'/'illegal' stuff and try and push the envelope. Had the folks who wanted to try this ensured their rigs were clean and weren't splattering *and* had they kept the transmissions to fairly quiet bands (say 10 meters which is very wide or 80 meters during the daytime), there likely wouldn't be a problem. Unfortunately, some of the mentality which permeates some other radio users also seems to affect some of the amateur radio folks. The result is that if we can't share resources responsibly, someone else will start passing laws (or taking resources away). Not a pretty picture :(

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3196. Re: Something amusing from QST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:53:11 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86fzm0mxrc.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 69246

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dan" == w4nti <w4nti@nospammindspring.com> writes:

Dan> It has be 'Rileyized'. The only thing left is Donnie dumbass and
Dan> his followers. Even the Herpster is history there. Sorry Jack
Dan> your a bit late.

It happens.

Perhaps that was the point of using that particular frequency in the
picture, as an example to others or something.

Dan> Dan/W4NTI

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+90yeGPFSfAB/ezgRAsWoAKDFF7CpKxUqHwHiPaEmrW8OCbjQggCgyzhA
LpKO2dino8AHmQ5yJXcfi0Y=
=sST1
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3197. Re: Ham Radio Sunset Era Has Begun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145908.23406.00000436@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69353

In article <d22b54c3.0306230414.2cdedff@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Absolutely. I don't have the info on "the way it was" but I suspect
>that if we compare the total number of mHz hams had available, for
>instance, in 1963, 1983 and today we've continuously gotten
>*additional* spectrum space, not less.

Do all the available searching you need, Kellie, but there was NEVER any "number of mHz hams available" anywhere.

Ain't NO US ham allocations for operation below MF, Kellie.

ITU-R stops low-end spectrum allocations at 9 KHz. :-)

3198. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145909.23406.00000437@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69249

In article <d22b54c3.0306230533.7cdbdedd@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>> > > A welcoming kind of crowd wouldn't start threads titled "Typical
>> > > no-code brain fart".
>> >
>> > A crowd didn't start the thread and a crowd won't do the welcoming.
>>
>> The semantic difference twixt "crowd" and "room full of guys" is one
>> that, fortunately, escapes me.
>
>Hey Dave, looks like we have the Second Coming of The Putz here. Right
>down to the half-vast "military comms" expertise.

Hey, Robert, looks like a member of the Gang of Four...who NEVER
did any military service anywhere...is going to whine and carry on
with his half-vast HF AMATEUR expertise. Kellie is a Crowd of One.

Yet another typical pro-code brainfart expended in here.

3199. Re: Tech+ to General upgrade question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145910.23406.00000438@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69355

In article <bcv8e9lnm1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3EF31FB2.2050001@psu.edu...
>> Robert wrote:
>> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>> >
>> >>Hey Robert! Do you make a habit of searching really hard for something
>> >>to argue about? No kidding that I can search out and find out who you
>> >>are? Sheesh, I'm getting an education here.
>> >>
>> >>Fact is, you are posting anonymously.
>> >
>> > Do you work this hard at being wrong all the time?
>>
>> Lots of us post here under our names. If not we have our names in our
>> posts. You do neither, you aren't Robert Bake, and you don't put your
>> whole name in your posts. it's all about transparency. No one here has
>> to look up my name to see if I'm real or not
>
> Of course they do - you can type _anything_ in that box.

Go easy with the hockey puck. He thinks he is the only one.

>> - though no doubt many do.
>
> That's a sure sign of being just a bit obsessed and paranoid.

...or someone deliberately looking for a FIGHT. The Gang of Four
in here share that wonderful attribute.

>> >>If I wanted to find out who you
>> >>were, I would have to work at it. And since your not being libelous, I'm
>> >>not going to.
>> >
>> > Well, if I wanted to find out who "Mike Coslo" is, I'd have to
work
>> > at that, too, and just as hard.
>>
>> Uh-huh. go to arrl.org or QRZ.com, using my callsign provided. Lots of
>> info about me in just a click.
>
> So what? Mike (if that _is_ your real name) I don't CARE. (And
>there's a valid argument to be made about making life easy for loons - I'm
>not going to make it, but you've got ZERO business judging somebody using a
>valid e-mail and their real name.)

That's a typical MO of the flamer-fighter. They get all excited and angry about "anonymity" when no Official Federal Merit Badge callsign is signed in a posting. It's a DIVERSION to get away from the thread subject and they hope that others will think they are "better" with all the trappings of Official Callsigns, etc., etc.

>> I decided to look you up, as a comparison
>> and it took a bit longer.
>
> Ah, well. You're showing early symptoms there.

Heh. He's been doing that more and more over the last year.

>> But discussing things with you is like trying to wrestle with eels.
>
> Rrrright - I'm only in two discussions - one regarding the telephone
>system and ISP's in which it was EVERYBODY ELSE who was off chasing
>non-existent rabbits, and a rather pleasant chat about testing. Everything
>else is just allowing fools to demonstrate just how mind-numbingly stupid
>they are.

Warning: Those "fools" are Official and have the Nobel-level amateur test under their golden belts and can therefore "sign" with that beloved callsign to prove they are Somebody. :-)

>> We
>> get all over the place and don't accomplish much. So be it.
>
> Well, when the Dickies and the Brians come out of the gate with
>playground slurs, you're not going to get much focus.

There is little "focus" in here as it is with all the puerility running rampant.

Good representatives of the US amateur radio community of today. :-)

3200. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69250

In article <d22b54c3.0306230440.3fffeeb8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Or alternatively, the manufacturer could have applied for
>> certification of the transmitter in services other than amateur but
>> that's doubtful.
>
>I can't imagine any other service using the 7800. The beast redefines
>the meaning of "complex equipment", ya need 40 hours in the manual to
>get it up and running right.

Tsk, tsk, tsk..."too technical" for you "skilled operators" constrained to the outside of the front panels? :-)

What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE of modern transceivers?

3201. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145911.23406.00000440@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69351

In article <myuJa.17416$bH3.11055@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
<djfinn2@bellsouth.net> writes:

>It is true that USB is the only mode allowed on the new 5MHz channels.
>
>HOWEVER, that does not mean Morse Code is prohibited! Only the CW mode (with
>LSB, FM. AM) are prohibited.
>
>All you need to do is go into the SSB mode and operate audio Morse Code
>(such as with a practice keyer) and you will be perfectly legal.
>
>Sorry no-coders, but this is the truth.

Nooooo. Technically, a beeping audio modulation is going to appear
as on-off keyed CW in the channel spectrum if the carrier and un-
wanted sideband suppression is good. Think about basics of
SSB modulation.

The best you could do to be on the pro-code side of that technical
gray area is to use a trashy audio tone so that it creates sideband
products on either side of the beeping audio tone. That will appear
as multiple RF signals within the allocated bandwidth, looking less
like a single RF signal.

3202. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145912.23406.00000441@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69247

In article <bd7394scg1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Whatever it takes to shut you whinners up is fine by me.

Yes, yes, Dannie, keep on taking those tranks, don't slip up and
miss a dose like you did yesterday.

Note: A plural of WIN, as in WINNERS, uses two Ns. A plural
of WHINE, as in WHINERS, uses only one N.

You seem confused between WIN and WHINE. :-)

3203. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145912.23406.00000442@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69354

In article <d22b54c3.0306230526.560dd2ad@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>As far as us PTCAs are concerned the botom line is that we have
>absolutely nothing to lose or gain, we already have it all and S25.5
>could disappear tomorrow with no effect on us. It's not us who have
>the stake in abolishing S25.5, it's you codeless types who are
>providing the amusement.

Anything to keep an old ghoul friend happy. :-)

>So keep praying and posting, we're enjoying your thrash enormously.

Nobody is "praying." [are you attending the same seminary as Rev. Jim?]

You PCTAs keep dumping all the CW TRASH on here and we NCTAs will just clean up after you. No problem. :-)

3204. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145913.23406.00000443@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69248

In article <bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>
>> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting up a
>> fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.
>
> Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test contingent's
>hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.

"Better red than dead." :-)

3205. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145914.23406.00000445@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69352

In article <20030623062253.04207.00001003@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <bd5rk0$d4u@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
>writes:
>
>>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>>news:3EF66AB5.7050301@ix.netcom.com...
>>> When I saw the title of this thread, I somehow thought of a wristwatch
>>> that beeps out the time in Morse code..... :-)
>>>
>>
>>=:o That's in the box of Cap'n Crunch, isn't it?!
>>
>I think you mean Cracker Jack

I think she means what she wrote, "CAP'N CRUNCH."

Tsk, tsk, for a "historian" you don't know much about
communications hacking. :-)

3206. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145914.23406.00000444@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69357

In article <bcvqqltai1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>> >Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....
>> >From: "Robert" rdbake@prtcnet.org
>> >Date: 6/16/03 9:59 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <bcklvkfdi1@nd.eastky.net>
>>
>> >Dick, I qualified in submarines, spent nearly 10 years in the Navy,
>> >and worked with a little communications outfit at MacDill AFB you've
>never
>> >heard of.
>>
>> That figures....Going down with seamen. Why am I not surprised?
>
> A gay-flame - says a lot more about you than it does about me.
>What's your beef with the military, anyway? 4F due to terminal cranio-rectal
>defilade?

He's a bitter ex-USMC medical drop-out who is desperately
looking for a substitute in rank, status, and uniforms with
preety medals on it. Thinks he's a Dill Instructor (at Camp
Clausen).

This ex-USMC never worked any military comm in his 18 years,
doesn't know about the AN/PRC-119 and family that has been
operational for the last 13 years (quarter million total built as of
2002) and didn't know squat about the earlier AN/PRC-25 or the
PRC-77 that date back to the Vietnam war. Basic small-unit
radios in the US military for the last 30 years.

Ol' Steamy's "experience" in electronics engineering was a less-
than-a-year stint as Purchasing Agent in a medium-sized TN
set-top box maker...and then claims to know everything that
goes on in electronics engineering. :-)

>> >I've done things and been places that would leave you confused
>> >about whether to shit or go blind, and then you'd fart and close one eye.
>>
>> Yep...talks like one too. No couth...no class....If ya can't out think
>> them, cuss them!
>
> "Out-think"? He'd have to be engaged in something resembling thought
>for me to worry about out-doing him at it.
> He's dishing it out - if he can't take it, oh well.

Not only is he an ex-gyrene but he's hypocritcal in the extreme.

All is EMOTION with Steamy and he tosses all social civility out the window if anyone disagrees with him. He will cuss at you, call you names, etc., then turn right around and whine and complain about "couth" if gets return fire. :-)

Problem in here is that ol' Steamy now has you targeted and you have been added to his HATE LIST where he tosses all "couth" aside and is obsessed with heckling. He needs some mental help desperately but doesn't understand his problem.

Len Anderson
ex-RA16408336 (1952-1960)

3207. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 18:59:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623145915.23406.00000446@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69356

In article <20030623021450.23044.00001703@mb-m13.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steamy, Mighty Warrior of the CAP) shouts with spittle drooling:

>>In article <bd5et0$3fa$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>><w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>>Hey Lennie.....if we want any crap out of you we will squeeze your head.
>>
>> Dannie, you couldn't do it with help from the Gang of Four.
>
> All it takes is nine ounces of pressure, Lennie, and we'll be cleaning
>LennieCrap off the walls for weeks.

Sounds like a THREAT to me, Steamy.

Is that the way you "fought" in those "seven hostile actions?"

You mouthed off at all those "hostiles" and they capitulated?

Wow, I'll bet you got lots of preety MEDALS on your uniform
for that! :-)

>>Now, go take your meds like a good boy, Dannie. You'll feel
>> much better in the morning.
>
> You should know. Is your correspondence school shrink wife writing
>scripts for you, Lennie?
>
> She should......

My wife has a MASTERS DEGREE in BOTH Education and Social
Work, granted by the UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS. If you still think
that is a "correspondence school" then you are just a dime-a-
dozen military medical drop-out witless jerk who thinks his
beloved amateur radio license is some kind of "doctorate" in
physics.

The best degree you can claim is a "98" on a warm day.

Go back to shouting from under the bridge, Troll.

3208. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 19:00:34 UTC
From: Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us>
Message-ID: <m7IJa.46$603.2606@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 69358
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In rec.radio.shortwave Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> Icom announced the upcoming availability of their new top-end IC-7800
> xcvr at Dayton a few weeks ago. Universal Radio (ham & SWL equipment
> distributor)is advertising it in their website. Dial into:

> http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/hamhf/0041.html

> Note that the ad includes this caveat in red print:

> "NOTICE: This device has not been approved by the Federal
> Communications Commission. This device may not be sold or leased, or
> be offered for sale or lease, until approval of the F.C.C. has been
> obtained."

> Looks to me like type acceptance is required. Or is there some other
> flavor of FCC approval?

Required for a manufacturer to sell the radio. But where do the regs
prohibit a ham from modifying his rig (as long as it is used within the
amateur bands)?

Art Harris N2AH

3209. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 19:05:53 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231105.2577fab2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69359

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030622122759.07705.00001524@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

> Wayne's lame and snivvling answer was that "I am only interested in
> spawning the creativity of others to action". In other words, all he wanted to
> do was complain. He is his own worst enemy. He's a loser.

I had the misfortune of running into him in three different venues.
First was the old ham mags where he spewed his vitriol all over those
pages. Then I subscribed to Byte and dammit there he was again with
the same BS. When I got my first issue of "CD Review" magazine I
almost came apart, there he was once more with his crap, could not
believe it. In every case the mags he founded were bought out for tidy
sums of money and immediately cleaned up by the new owners. That's
what he's actually all about and he's good at it. As much as that
galls me.

>
> Sound like someone else we know...?!?!

Lessee . . I gotta work on this . . QRX . .

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

w3rv

3210. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 19:34:50 UTC
From: Anonymous <rebleep@bleep.dynip.com>
Message-ID: <afc09c09b0d1a2fb5ef18f00051175e2@rebleep>
Source record: 69361

In article <3EF6610A.24FE3A08@houston-hunks.com>
AIDS infected child molester Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com> blathreed out of his fatass:
>
>
> Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer wrote:
> >
> > Have fun proving who posted this FUCKHEAD.
>
> No proof needed. <Cocaine-induced babbling from the short, fatass who took the monkier of a negro, mainly because he's sure his daddy was black>

You couldn't provide it just like you had proof of the Marshall County Ares site that you tried to pass off as the one in WV eh, fucktard?

"Then what is at http://www.geocities.com/skywarncanwarn/ doodle brain?
It sure looks like the Marshall County ARES, and it even has a place
to send email." blathers the retard Fuckhead Lee in <afvsc2$6aa$1@pita.alt.net>.

>
> Have you figured out r.m.s. voltage yet, Woger?

The thing is have YOU? You sure are afraid to post your ham callsign, eh, Fred Hambrecht? Too bad you bribed the VE team and still cheated to get your license.

Jaeger, Leonard P Jr
107 Woodlawn Ave,
New Orleans, LA 70123-4328
(504)737-5086

3211. Re: Solar storms : who cares

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 19:35:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623153504.23406.00000447@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 69360

In article <d22b54c3.0306231045.15192104@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Ya mean like without any discussion of the subject or provaction at
>all the way Bobby immeduately got into code bashing? Fuggem.

Use the Couth, Kellie.

Remember who you are replying to... :-)

"Provaction?" "Immeduately?" :-)

If we want some more pro-code noises in here, we will press your distended belly button to get more mindless pro-code brainfarts. :-)

3212. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 19:39:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231139.5eb5981e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69362

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A2E16B1D88Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030622082344.09955.00000307@mb-m21.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns93A1D84BDFB14elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide
> >>> exclusive amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get
> >>> 7200-7300. What problems will remain after that happens?
> >>>
> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>
> >>
> >>The only one that I can think of is that the BC stations will fail to
> >>QSY.
> >>
> > Won't they have to, if the treaty changes?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
>
> In theory, but 90% are owned by governments.

Are you saying that government stations are not subject to the
provisons of ITU treaties?

w3rv

3213. Re: Crisis communications - the internet on 9/11

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 19:43:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231143.7ca3caf1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69363

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bcvj7u$pt8$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> See:
>
> http://books.nap.edu/books/0309087023/html/1.html#pagetop
>
>

I'm sorry but I don't understand what this has to do with discussions
about amateur radio policy topics. Can you help me with this?

w3rv

3214. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 19:57:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgwr4m0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69364

On 22 Jun 2003 19:32:14 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>with a beat-to-crap bug of unknown parentage. I took said bug to the
>FCC office to take my General sending test. Examiner rolled his eyes
>upward when I whipped it out and did not give me a sending test. 1954

We had a set of clip les which we used to connect those folks who
brought their own kets/bugs/keyers but forgot to bring the leads.

>.. . something like that. 1625 PA toobs cathode keying daze.

The All American rig - first the tubes went red, then white, then
blew.....750 V on the plates at 100 mills.

Didn't EVERYONE start with one in thise days? I just ran a quick
search on eBay for "ARC 5" and there were a couple posted.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3215. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 20:48:25 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0306231248.cc08efe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

channel391@juno.com (Dave Welby) wrote in message
news:<ae188f77.0306230555.1fb50431@posting.google.com>...
> Newsline has the following report on the problems being caused by
> those hi-fi SSB operators and a petition to run them off the airwaves:
>
> RADIO LAW: HAMS PETITION TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB
>
> On-air experimentation with so-called High Fidelity or Enhanced Single
> Sideband
> transmissions could be outlawed if thr FCC adopts a proposed rules
> change
> requested by two radio amateurs on opposite sides of the country.
> Amateur
> Radio Newsline's Paul Courson, WA3VJB, reports from the nations
> capital:

More whining hambos! I always thought amateur radio was all about
experimenting.

If this is so bad, why is Hi-Fi AM still allowed on 75 meter phone?
Talk about your wide bandwidth!

3216. SAQ On The Air June 29

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:01:17 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306231301.690c03c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69366

Radio station SAQ in Grimeton, Sweden will be activated on June 29.
SAQ is the last operational Alexanderson alternator transmitter in the
world.

See:

http://www.alexander.n.se.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3217. Re: Dave High-el, fatass who lets his cuntyeast Finn wife reek

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:10:03 UTC
From: "A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com>
Message-ID: <ede68e21b5bdba7f45c283dc509e240d@melontraffickers.com>
Source record: 69367

In article <3ef3812a@snipnews.snip.net>
"51629A" <allforemus1@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
>
> "lcs Mixmaster Remailer" <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu> wrote in message
> news:20030620060001.18964.qmail@nym.alias.net...
> > In article <3ef214e4@snipnews.snip.net>
> > "51629A" <allforemus1@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > Remember Dave, <much asskissing from High-el's gay lover]
> >
> > So, how DO you 51629A, get that malformed
> > head of yours up FATASS High-el's ass and still breathe?
>
> Not at all W.W. Such activity is old-hat.

Thanks for the admission you have your head up fatass High-el's ass, dickbreath.
Now try to keep those drug-addicted kids from the drug dealers in your neighborhood, bad hair bill. That southern NJ polluted air still giving you fits, asswipe?

3218. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:13:47 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vferf16fc6ae3d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69368

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:oTHJa.10164$Jz5.8369@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> Sorry, Dan. The 'controlling' factor includes the FCC, but is
considerably
> bigger than the FCC. There are international agreements. As was pointed
> out, some rigs generate CW by using SSB and feeding an audio sine wave
into
> the audio system. With high carrier suppression and high unwanted
sideband
> rejection, it is virtually indistinguishable from 'normal' CW (on off
keying
> of a carrier). Dan tried to point this out. I would suggest you check
with
> the FCC on this one. It might (just might) be possible to send an id
within
> the legal bandwidth in Morse, but in all likelihood it would irritate the
> current users of that band. The last thing anyone should want to do is
> cause problems with the current users or we could loose the 5 MHz
> allocation. That would have nothing to do with 'legal' or 'illegal', it
is
> simple reality. Flaming the newsgroups (which I don't consider your post
to
> be) is one thing; causing problems on the air (especially in the new 5 MHz
> allocation) is quite another.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim

Right Jim, the government gave the amateur radio service the allocation,
miss use it and they will take it back. And, if they take it, what will
happen the next time ARRL applies for another secondary allocation?
Geeeees Dan, ink is not even dry in the rule book and you want
challenge it. Gives a break.

Larry

3219. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:36:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623173652.09634.00000954@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 69369

>Subject: Re: Why digital modes are few used
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/03 1:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030623145915.23406.00000446@mb-m27.aol.com>

>In article <20030623021450.23044.00001703@mb-m13.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steamy, Mighty Warrior of the CAP) shouts with spittle drooling:

Gee, Lennie...Seems to me you sure do get mad when someone who should know
better makes unfounded or baseless claims about something that you hold dear to
you......

Sucks, doesn't it? How's it feel?

>My wife has a...(SNIP)

....tolerance for living with idiots, it seems.

>If you still think
> that is a "correspondence school" then you are just a dime-a-
> dozen military medical drop-out witless jerk who thinks his
> beloved amateur radio license is some kind of "doctorate" in
> physics.

Get those digs in , Lennie! Seethe a bit longer...let your angst drool a
bit more as you pound away on the keyboard, trying to hit all those "buttons
you wanna push.

>The best degree you can claim is a "98" on a warm day.

Cute, Lennie! Come up with that on your own, or did Mrs, maseters Degree
help you pick out the words?

>Go back to shouting from under the bridge, Troll.

There's a troll here, alright, Your Scumminess, but it's not me.

Steve, K4CAP

3220. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:40:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623174055.09634.00000955@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 69370

>Subject: Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/03 1:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030623145912.23406.00000442@mb-m27.aol.com>

>You PCTAs keep dumping all the CW TRASH on here and we
> NCTAs will just clean up after you. No problem.

"We", Lennie?

There's no "we" here for you. Not until you are licensed in the Amateur Radio service and participating in some meaningful way.

Until then, there is "us" and there is "you".

Steve, K4CAP

3221. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:49:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF775ED.1010808@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69371

Dan Finn wrote:

>It is true that USB is the only mode allowed on the new 5MHz channels.
>
>HOWEVER, that does not mean Morse Code is prohibited! Only the CW mode (with
>LSB, FM. AM) are prohibited.
>
>All you need to do is go into the SSB mode and operate audio Morse Code
>(such as with a practice keyer) and you will be perfectly legal.
>
>
I don't think so. The rules didn't say "USB" itself, but a designator
that specifies "voice encoded
onto an upper sideband signal". Audio beeps are not voice....

3222. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:54:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF77722.8040505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69372

Jim Hampton wrote:

>Sorry, Dan. The 'controlling' factor includes the FCC, but is considerably
>bigger than the FCC. There are international agreements. As was pointed
>out, some rigs generate CW by using SSB and feeding an audio sine wave into
>the audio system. With high carrier suppression and high unwanted sideband
>rejection, it is virtually indistinguishable from 'normal' CW (on off keying
>of a carrier). Dan tried to point this out. I would suggest you check with
>the FCC on this one. It might (just might) be possible to send an id within
>the legal bandwidth in Morse, but in all likelihood it would irritate the
>current users of that band. The last thing anyone should want to do is
>cause problems with the current users or we could loose the 5 MHz
>allocation.
>
As we are secondary users in 5MHz, it would be best if we observe the
primary conventions and
rules of this band. We need to prove ourselves as good neighbors and an
asset to the primary
users, not a liability.

3223. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 21:56:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623175638.09634.00000956@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 69373

>Subject: Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz......
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/03 1:59 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030623145914.23406.00000444@mb-m27.aol.com>

>He's a bitter ex-USMC medical drop-out who is desperately
> looking for a substitute in rank, status, and uniforms with
> preety medals on it. Thinks he's a Dill Instructor (at Camp
> Clausen).

Cute, Lennie! Mrs Master's Degree helping you out again?

>This ex-USMC never worked any military comm in his 18 years,
> doesn't know about the AN/PRC-119 and family that has been
> operational for the last 13 years (quarter million total built as of
> 2002) and didn't know squat about the earlier AN/PRC-25 or the
> PRC-77 that date back to the Vietnam war. Basic small-unit
> radios in the US military for the last 30 years.

I probably know just as much as you about any box starting with an
"AN/..." designation, Lennie...and certainly anything that a mouse and browser
allows one to cut and paste...like yourself...

>Ol' Steamy's "experience" in electronics engineering was a less-
> than-a-year stint as Purchasing Agent in a medium-sized TN
> set-top box maker...and then claims to know everything that
> goes on in electronics engineering

Sorry, Lennie. More untruths from Lenover21 again. That company was
never in Tennessee and I certainly NEVER claimed anything of the sort.

You are certainly at liberty to post a URL wherein you claim I do, but as
usual that offer will go unrewarded with an answer. And your LACK of response
will certainly prove, ONCE AGAIN, which side of the continent the smoke is
originating from...

>All is EMOTION with Steamy and he tosses all social civility out
> the window if anyone disagrees with him.

We can go back and Goggle-up some of your responses, Lennie.

Pot/kettle/black.

>Problem in here is that ol' Steamy now has you targeted and
> you have been added to his HATE LIST where he tosses all
> "couth" aside and is obsessed with heckling. He needs some
> mental help desperately but doesn't understand his problem.

Nope. No hate list. I know that thinking one exists makes you feel
better, Lennie, but it doesn't.

>Len Anderson
> ex-RA16408336 (1952-1960)

I am sure that meant something once upon a time. In a USENET group
dedicated to Amateur Radio policy, it's meaningless.

Steve, K4CAP

3224. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 22:01:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF778CF.4080808@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69374

Len Over 21 wrote:

> I think she means what she wrote, "CAP'N CRUNCH."
>
> Tsk, tsk, for a "historian" you don't know much about
> communications hacking. :-)
>
>
I used to eat Cap'n Crunch back in those days (mid sixties) and got a
few of those
infamous whistles. The ones that produced a tone at 2600 Hz IIRC.
Heard the
phone company made the company who made Cap'n Crunch recall all the cereal
boxes that had the whistles.... I actually tried one of those
whistles on the phone,
the phone call ended when I did it.

3225. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 22:41:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EF78232.4080408@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 69381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

fartnoises wrote:

>
> This raises a *** VERY INTERESTING ISSUE ***
>
> When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
> you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
> of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
> with this suggestion.

So what, ham equipment does not have to be type certified.

3226. Re: The Vanity Callsign System...& CB Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 23:00:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231500.27f69cd8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EF73CF7.3B98B4A9@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bd0c61$474$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3EF3B012.B713216D@earthlink.net...
> > > > Robert wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
> > > > >
> > > > > > You don't strike me as the kind of fellow looking for a welcome.
> > > > >
> > > > > A welcoming kind of crowd wouldn't start threads titled "Typical
> > > > > no-code brain fart".
> > > > >
> > > > A crowd didn't start the thread and a crowd won't do the welcoming.
> > > >
> > > The semantic difference twixt "crowd" and "room full of guys" is one
> > > that, fortunately, escapes me.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Hey Dave, looks like we have the Second Coming of The Putz here. Right
> > down to the half-vast "military comms" expertise.
>
> Agreed. Did it ever occur to you that Len is much like Wayne Green
> without an amateur license?

No but that's not a bad comparison at all. The Putz, this Bobby dude
and and Green would make a really interesting replacement for the
Three Stooges. Guffaws are where ya find 'em.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3227. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 23:14:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd81hi$916$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69376
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Perhaps he prefers the Jane Fonda network..you know CNN ??

And his swipe at 'journalism' is seriously funny. There is no such thing in this country. Guess we could all go read the 'gray lady'....hardy har har.

Were all being manipulated and lied to is one way or another. Those that dont know that by now are in serious trouble.

Dan/W4NTI

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:chKJa.9439$C83.926657@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> On Mon, 23 Jun 2003 09:49:16 GMT, Frank Todd <k3eko@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> >And just what is wrong with Fox News?
>
> If you have to ask then you are ignorant of journalism.
>
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/

3228. Re: Something amusing from QST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 23:39:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd8308ihq1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69377

Could be actually. And it only took 5 years. Unfortunatly the same
unidentified flakes are still there butting in and qrming.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86fzm0mxrc.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dan" == w4nti <w4nti@nospammindspring.com> writes:

Dan> It has be 'Rileyized'. The only thing left is Donnie dumbass and
Dan> his followers. Even the Herpster is history there. Sorry Jack
Dan> your a bit late.

It happens.

Perhaps that was the point of using that particular frequency in the
picture, as an example to others or something.

Dan> Dan/W4NTI

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+90yeGPFSfAB/ezgRAsWoAKDFF7CpKxUqHwHiPaEmrW8OCbjQggCgyzhA
LpKO2dino8AHmQ5yJXcfi0Y=
=sST1
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3229. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 23:42:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd837c$o9n$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69378

What meds are those Lennie the loser? Can you be specific, or do you need time to check with the lying bastards of the Stumpers? Get your fact right before opening your mouth shithead.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030623145915.23406.00000446@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <20030623021450.23044.00001703@mb-m13.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steamy, Mighty Warrior of the CAP) shouts with spittle drooling:
>
> >>In article <bd5et0$3fa$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> >><w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >>>Hey Lennie.....if we want any crap out of you we will squeeze your head.
> >>
> >> Dannie, you couldn't do it with help from the Gang of Four.
> >
> > All it takes is nine ounces of pressure, Lennie, and we'll be cleaning
> >LennieCrap off the walls for weeks.
>
> Sounds like a THREAT to me, Steamy.
>
> Is that the way you "fought" in those "seven hostile actions?"
>
> You mouthed off at all those "hostiles" and they capitulated?
>
> Wow, I'll bet you got lots of preety MEDALS on your uniform
> for that! :-)
>
> >>Now, go take your meds like a good boy, Dannie. You'll feel
> >> much better in the morning.
> >
> > You should know. Is your correspondence school shrink wife writing
> >scripts for you, Lennie?
> >
> > She should......
>
> My wife has a MASTERS DEGREE in BOTH Education and Social
> Work, granted by the UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS. If you still think
> that is a "correspondence school" then you are just a dime-a-
> dozen military medical drop-out witless jerk who thinks his
> beloved amateur radio license is some kind of "doctorate" in

> physics.
>
> The best degree you can claim is a "98" on a warm day.
>
> Go back to shouting from under the bridge, Troll.

3230. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 23:46:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd83h9kr1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69379

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306231139.5eb5981e@posting.google.com...
> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A2E16B1D88Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> > news:20030622082344.09955.00000307@mb-m21.aol.com:
> >
> > > In article <Xns93A1D84BDFB14elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> > >
> > >>> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide
> > >>> exclusive amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get
> > >>> 7200-7300. What problems will remain after that happens?
> > >>>
> > >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>The only one that I can think of is that the BC stations will fail to
> > >>QSY.
> > >>
> > > Won't they have to, if the treaty changes?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >
> >
> > In theory, but 90% are owned by governments.
>
> Are you saying that government stations are not subject to the
> provisons of ITU treaties?
>
> w3rv

I believe what he is saying is that they can/and possibly will do what they
want.

I remember some years back several middle east bc stations down around 7059.
Were there for years. Finally moved for whatever reason. Maybe Delta team
dropped some C4 on the feeds.

Dan/W4NTI

3231. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-23 23:50:41 UTC
From: Rasheed <USCitizen@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <bd83ohtmb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 69380
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:chKJa.9439$C83.926657@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
On Mon, 23 Jun 2003 09:49:16 GMT, Frank Todd <k3eko@yahoo.com> wrote:

>And just what is wrong with Fox News?

If you have to ask then you are ignorant of journalism.

////////////////
Fox News is despised by Marxist Leftists.....now, the Communist Network News
(CNN) is more down their lane and is yet another story.

3232. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 00:54:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgybse2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69383

On Sun, 22 Jun 2003 23:45:38 -0400, Dan Finn wrote:

>It is true that USB is the only mode allowed on the new 5MHz channels.
>
>HOWEVER, that does not mean Morse Code is prohibited! Only the CW mode (with
>LSB, FM. AM) are prohibited.
>
>All you need to do is go into the SSB mode and operate audio Morse Code
>(such as with a practice keyer) and you will be perfectly legal.
>
>Sorry no-coders, but this is the truth.

This is absoluteley wrong.

The actual Report and Order in ET Docket 02-98 adopted on April 29,
2003 (it's on the FCC web site - FCC-03-105 - look it up in EDOCS)
specifies emission type J3E, upper sideband.

According to Sect. 2.201 of the FCC Rules, J3E is SSB supressed-carrier
single-channel analog telephony, i.e. "phone" as specified in Sect.
97.3(c)(5). It cannot be stretched to cover communications by Morse
Code, although incidental use of MCW Morse for station ID is allowed
as part of "phone" communications.

Good try - you lose. Or were you trying to be funny?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3233. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 00:54:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgycf44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69382

On 23 Jun 2003 12:22:56 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Is China really "communist" any more? Seems like we import a lot of
>consumer goods from them. They're also the #1 source of foreign
>adoptions to the USA.

That's because "mainland" Chinese families are forbidden to have more than one child, and those who produce more face prison camps if they do not place the "extra" child for out-of-country adoption. We have several friends who have adopted such children, because healthy Caucasian newborns are virtually unavailable for adoption in the US any more.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3234. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 00:54:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgyc733.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69384

On 23 Jun 2003 11:02:36 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>"negotiating" via bully politics. The question as far as S25.5 is
>concerned could well be whether or not the thrust for a consensus to
>abolish S25.5 will collapse in the face the bully politics. The easy
>way out of that quagmire for everybody of course would be to do
>absolutely nothing about S25.5 and take a hike on it.

The "chicken" way is to take what is known as a footnote exception,
which would read something like "Countries A, B, and C reserve
the option to not require blah-de-blah". Had Japan done that at
the last W(A)RC, there would be no question that their no-code
license is in full conformance with the IRR.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3235. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 00:54:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgydzb5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69385

On 23 Jun 2003 07:14:07 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>You do tend to make concerted and extended efforts to avoid Microsloth
>dontcha? I been watching the Sun, IBM and SCO brawls. Offhand I'd say
>Bill needs to be concerned.

No BillyBloatware programs for me except for the "OS" if you want to
call it that on my NT machine and my wife's NT machine (she needs it
to run MSWord, Excel and AutoCad so she can work at home if need
be).

I posolutely do not run Internet Exploder or any of the other
virus-magnets even on the NT boxes.

If Linux had ports of the mailer, newsreader, and text editor with
which I do about 90% of my computer work, I'd be running that as my
primary system. Actually I have Red Hat 7 on an alternate-boot
drive on the NT box but I wasn't impressed with it. I do understand
that Linux 8 is better.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3236. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 01:03:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623210356.25815.00000888@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 69386

In article <seHJa.9236$Kg7.5329@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>Amusing.
>
Bert,

Do you recognize who I was responding to in that post with the original list?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3237. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 01:03:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030623210356.25815.00000887@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 69387

In article <20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
> of modern transceivers?

No problem for me!

3238. Mmmmmm ... one o'clock ... aaahhhh ... two o'clock ... (whistle) ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 01:51:41 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd8av1see1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69388

Oh, hi there. I'm using a new mic setup here in my quest for Outstanding Transmit Audio(TM). It's a modified free-range Heil binaural pair combined with a custom-made Neumann capsule inside a hollowed-out candy apple red RCA DX-77 Big Pill on a weightless Magnausium(TM) mic stand. Some call it a mic arm, I call it a mic stand. UMM-huh. I'm using a Ward-Beck console and high-temperature superconductor cables with gold-plated connectors to mix it all down to my ... uh ... well, it's an Alinco DX-70TH but you can't have EVERYTHING, can you?

How do I sound? Sibilance, silbilance, silibance. Outstanding Transmit Audioland(TM) here I come!

Did I mention that the DX-70 is hardened with depleted uranium plating? Makes a big difference.

73 Corry K4DOH
--
It Came From C. L. "That's not the only thing with DU" Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

3239. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 02:05:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF7B218.5020509@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69389
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

JJ wrote:
>
>
> fartnoises wrote:
>
>>
>> This raises a *** VERY INTERESTING ISSUE ***
>>
>> When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
>> you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
>> of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
>> with this suggestion.
>
>
> So what, ham equipment does not have to be type certified.
>

Homebrew.

If I design and make a rtnasmitter and reciever at home, I do not have
to submit it for type acceptance.

To me it is one of the biggest priveleges we have.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3240. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 02:10:14 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A3E1827E774elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69390

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0306230526.560dd2ad@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93A340F52BB59elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in
>> news:bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>> >
>> >> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are
>> >> putting up a fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs
>> >> big time.
>> >
>> > Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test
>> > contingent's
>> > hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
>> >
>> >
>> > ---
>> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>> > Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Note that the RSGB have said that s25.5 has been agreed in principle,
>> i.e. it's a question of what wording will appease the Russians and
>> Germans, but it will just say that *they* can keep code testing and
>> everyone else can ditch it!
>
> The ITU sets the *minimum* requirements, it does not tell sovereign
> administrations like the FCC what additional requirements above &
> beyond those minimums may be imposed in their countries.

Yet.

Mark my words, s25.5 will still exist, but it will specify an optional
requirement. Just you wait and see.

> In other
> words the Russians could set a 15 wpm code test as their entry-level
> code test with or without S25.5. And have been able to do that going

> back to the dawn of ham radio. Ditto the FCC. Therefore the Russians &
> their cohorts obviously don't need "appeasment", they do want to
> retain S25.5 in some form or another. Ya gotta be a complete stupid if
> ya don't think they're serious threat to the nocode dream.
>
> As far as us PTCAs are concerned the botom line is that we have
> absolutely nothing to lose or gain, we already have it all and S25.5
> could disappear tomorrow with no effect on us. It's not us who have
> the stake in abolishing S25.5, it's you codeless types who are
> providing the amusement.
>

Who's that? Not me. Look up N3KIP.

> So keep praying and posting, we're enjoying your thrash enormously.
>
> w3rv

3241. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 02:13:18 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A3E207C18E8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69391

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0306231139.5eb5981e@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93A2E16B1D88Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20030622082344.09955.00000307@mb-m21.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <Xns93A1D84BDFB14elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>> Suppose that as a result of WRC 2003, 7100-7200 becomes worldwide
>> >>> exclusive amateur and the SWBC moves away. Maybe we even get
>> >>> 7200-7300. What problems will remain after that happens?
>> >>>
>> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >>>
>> >>
>> >>The only one that I can think of is that the BC stations will fail
>> >>to QSY.
>> >>
>> > Won't they have to, if the treaty changes?
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >
>>
>> In theory, but 90% are owned by governments.
>
> Are you saying that government stations are not subject to the
> provisons of ITU treaties?
>
> w3rv
>

I'm saying that in many countries the regulatory agencies (the government)
will not rigorously enforce the rules against the SW BC stations (also the
government). Consider that an example of 'Realpolitik'.

3242. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 02:14:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EF7B43A.2000704@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike Coslo wrote:
> JJ wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> fartnoises wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> This raises a *** VERY INTERESTING ISSUE ***
>>>
>>> When you "clip that diode" to open-up your existing tranciever
>>> you have technically invalidated the FCC Type Acceptance
>>> of that radio. I have had several agree, and several disagree
>>> with this suggestion.
>>
>>
>>
>> So what, ham equipment does not have to be type certified.
>>
>
> Homebrew.
>
>
> If I design and make a rtnasmitter and reciever at home, I do not
> have to submit it for type acceptance.

Har! Wait till you all see my latest Rtnasmitter design! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3243. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 02:17:24 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A3E2B9B7659elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69393

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgyc733.pminews@netnews.attbi.com:

> On 23 Jun 2003 11:02:36 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>>"negotiating" via bully politics. The question as far as S25.5 is
>>concerned could well be whether or not the thrust for a consensus to
>>abolish S25.5 will collapse in the face the bully politics. The easy
>>way out of that quagmire for everybody of course would be to do
>>absolutely nothing about S25.5 and take a hike on it.
>
> The "chicken" way is to take what is known as a footnote exception,
> which would read something like "Countries A, B, and C reserve
> the option to not require blah-de-blah". Had Japan done that at
> the last W(A)RC, there would be no question that their no-code
> license is in full conformance with the IRR.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

That would be a first - a majority of member states listed in a footnote

It's more likely that those keeping it would be the footnote.

3244. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 02:36:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306231836.38c8c0e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69394

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20030623174055.09634.00000955@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 6/23/03 1:59 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030623145912.23406.00000442@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
> >You PCTAs keep dumping all the CW TRASH on here and we
> > NCTAs will just clean up after you. No problem.
>
> "We", Lennie?
>
> There's no "we" here for you. Not until you are licensed in the Amateur
> Radio service and participating in some meaningful way.

Rethink that Steve. He just offered to be our trash boy. I can't think
of anybody who is more qualified for the job.

> Until then, there is "us" and there is "you".
>
> Steve, K4CAP

w3rv

3245. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 02:44:36 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EF7BB14.2080108@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 69404
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike Coslo wrote:

>>
>> So what, ham equipment does not have to be type certified.
>>
>
> Homebrew.

You misread my post. I mean, so what? Ham equipment does not have to be type certified. It was not a question.

3246. Just Curious

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 03:20:18 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <spPJa.2618$XR4.746@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 69395

As most hams know, FCC recently asked Official Observers as well as other hams to monitor
for individuals, truckers, or other entities using our 10 Meter bands. How many of you hams
ARE participating in this? Have any been "caught" and turned over to Riley Hollingsworth?

I encourage all hams to monitor 10-12 Meters (particularly 28.085 AM) and make enough of
a dent in this illegal use of our bands for those guilty will sit up and take notice, and decide that
it is not worth it. Let's not wait for someone else to do it, let's all of us, for the sake of ALL or
Amateur spectrum, become pro-active to stop this.

73

Jerry
K4KWH

3247. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 03:53:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd8hvc$ns2$0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 69396
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Keith wrote:

> On Mon, 23 Jun 2003 09:49:16 GMT, Frank Todd <k3eko@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> >And just what is wrong with Fox News?
>
> If you have to ask then you are ignorant of journalism.
>
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/

YOU have it bassackwards.

3248. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:06:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgynntd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69397

On 24 Jun 2003 02:13:18 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>I'm saying that in many countries the regulatory agencies (the government)
>will not rigorously enforce the rules against the SW BC stations (also the
>government). Consider that an example of 'Realpolitik'.

Consider another example of 'Realpolitik' -- the regulatory bureau
chief will say to the broadcast/propaganda bureau chief: "If we
don't stick to the deal that we made (i.e. QSY), the guys that we
made the deals with this time will crap all over us next time".

That's one of the first things that I learned when I started in the
regulatory business.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3249. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:12:42 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ZcQJa.10505$A13.268@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Can't resist. 40 or 50 years ago? What was this moonbounce with 85 watts or less? Imagination? OMG, I'm getting tired. Helping the young folks with computer problems at work. Oh well, must be that CW has fried my brain. Errrr ... well, then, why do they have a problem and not me?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3250. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:14:21 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd8j6ttsb0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 69399

Robert Casey wrote:

> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >Sorry, Dan. The 'controlling' factor includes the FCC, but is considerably
> >bigger than the FCC. There are international agreements. As was pointed
> >out, some rigs generate CW by using SSB and feeding an audio sine wave into
> >the audio system. With high carrier suppression and high unwanted sideband
> >rejection, it is virtually indistinguishable from 'normal' CW (on off keying
> >of a carrier). Dan tried to point this out. I would suggest you check with
> >the FCC on this one. It might (just might) be possible to send an id within
> >the legal bandwidth in Morse, but in all likelihood it would irritate the
> >current users of that band. The last thing anyone should want to do is
> >cause problems with the current users or we could loose the 5 MHz
> >allocation.
> >
> As we are secondary users in 5MHz, it would be best if we observe the
> primary conventions and
> rules of this band. We need to prove ourselves as good neighbors and an
> asset to the primary
> users, not a liability.

Then again, the primary users never use it!

3251. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:15:21 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd8j8ptsb1@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 69400
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Perhaps he prefers the Jane Fonda network..you know CNN ??
>
> And his swipe at 'journalism' is seriously funny. There is no such thing in
> this country.

Except thast ..... Fox News is the closest there is!

3252. Re: Just Curious

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:15:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <LfQJa.10506$SV2.7465@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69401

Jerry,

I found 10 meters wide open earlier today. Big signals from the south, but I didn't hear the signals you suggest. I'm not suggesting they don't exist (I'm sure they do), but I only heard a couple of loud signals - both from licensed amateurs.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3253. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:31:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd8k6n$19n$0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 69402

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
> > of modern transceivers?
>
> No problem for me!

Had the cover off a few myself! I always bought the service manual for every rig I ever had.
Obviously servicing modern electronics isn't for every user. Would you want Miss Cleo doing your brain surgery? Lennie probably couldn't tell the difference!

3254. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:33:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd8ka6$19n$1@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 69403

Alun Palmer wrote:

> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0306230526.560dd2ad@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93A340F52BB59elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in
> >> news:bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
> >> >
> >> >> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are
> >> >> putting up a fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs
> >> >> big time.
> >> >
> >> > Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test
> >> > contingent's
> >> > hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > ---
> >> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> >> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> >> > Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> Note that the RSGB have said that s25.5 has been agreed in principle,
> >> i.e. it's a question of what wording will appease the Russians and
> >> Germans, but it will just say that *they* can keep code testing and
> >> everyone else can ditch it!
> >
> > The ITU sets the *minimum* requirements, it does not tell sovereign
> > administrations like the FCC what additional requirements above &
> > beyond those minimums may be imposed in their countries.
>
> Yet.
>
> Mark my words, s25.5 will still exist, but it will specify an optional
> requirement. Just you wait and see.

Alun has his crystal ball polished to a real shining sheen. And he hopes it doesn't cloud over in early July.

3255. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 04:59:59 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A4A2596E92elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69405

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bd8ka6$19n$1@208.206.142.93:

>
>
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0306230526.560dd2ad@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns93A340F52BB59elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in
>> >> news:bd4nbn$rev$1@nd.eastky.net:
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>> >> >
>> >> >> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are
>> >> >> putting up a fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these
>> >> >> goofs big time.
>> >> >
>> >> > Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test
>> >> > contingent's
>> >> > hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > ---
>> >> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>> >> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>> >> > Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> Note that the RSGB have said that s25.5 has been agreed in
>> >> principle, i.e. it's a question of what wording will appease the
>> >> Russians and Germans, but it will just say that *they* can keep
>> >> code testing and everyone else can ditch it!
>> >
>> > The ITU sets the *minimum* requirements, it does not tell sovereign
>> > administrations like the FCC what additional requirements above &
>> > beyond those minimums may be imposed in their countries.
>>
```

>> Yet.
>>
>> Mark my words, s25.5 will still exist, but it will specify an optional
>> requirement. Just you wait and see.
>
> Alun has his crystal ball polished to a real shining sheen. And he
> hopes it
> doesn't cloud over in early July.
>
>

We'll see, won't we?

3256. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 05:08:39 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bd9jua$q1lkt$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69415

The thing I *do* like about Wayne is that he gets people thinking..... I kinda compare him as the "Rush Limbaugh" of ham radio. Whether or not you agree with him or not, he gets you thinking. As lethargic as ham radio has gotten, we need more people like him, just to wake some of the old farts up. (speaking in generalities here, not specifics.)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EF66545.70503@adelphia.net...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Wayne's lame and snivvling answer was that "I am only interested in
> > spawning the creativity of others to action". In other words, all he
wanted to
> > do was complain. He is his own worst enemy. He's a loser.
>
>
> Gawd Steve, THAT is priceless! He put the best spin on complaining that
> I've ever heard. I wonder if he'd mind if I made a poster of that saying?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3257. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 05:14:33 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bd9jub$q1lkt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69416

My comments regarding the "retardation" of the digital capabilities in ham radio were based upon a recent meeting we had with the local emergency services director and "served agencies." What they need is not at the level it could and/or should be of what we can offer as hams..... Its gone beyond simple message-grams.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EF66B9E.1060401@adelphia.net...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:<43193ef4dff3a3553deffd68275f84ef@dizum.com>...
> >
> >>As it was said by some hams here, digital modes
> >>like PSK31 are few used, especially on 6m.
> >>Why ?
> >
> >
> > Because there is very little interest in 6M compared with the HF bands
> > and 2M. You need to stir up more interest in 6M if it's a big deal
> > for you.
>
> Ain't that the truth!
>
> >
> >>If its true that 90 per cent of packet users use
> >>old VT100 emulators at 1200 bauds, many
> >>DXers are always stuck with CW because they
> >>are old and do not understand how to use a
> >>computer to play PSK31.
> >
> >
> > Hogwash to the core.
> >
> > I'm older than dirt and I have a big Winbox with six drives, 256 Mb
> > worth of RAM, a GE Force 4 video card w/64 Mb RAM, 19" high-res flat
> > NEC monitor, yadda, yadda. And if I choose to do so with my current
> > equipment I can run CW, SSB, PSK, FM, AM, RTTY and all the others 160M
> > thru 70 cm. And I'm at the low end as far as the investment in a
> > contesting/dxing station is concerned.

>
>
> There is a large percentage of really mature hams using digital modes.
> I've typed to several in their 80's who are technically savvy and
> computer literate. I had a great QSO with a guy in California who was
> well into his 90's. He was still havin fun, still learning.
>
> So lack of understanding is a bogus argument.
>
> >
> >>Its stone age
> >>although PSK31 is 10 dB better than CW.
> >
> >
> > We all know that. PSK is not in competion with CW on any basis,
> > particularly in "stone age" CW contesting/dxing any more than PSK is
> > in competition with SSB.
> >
> >
> >>More, there is a money reason explaining that
> >>PSK31 is not used. It requires a portable computer
> >>(for portable/contest operation)
> >
> >
> > Where did you get that silly notion? Most serious contesters & dxers
> > use 'puters in tower cases and operate parked on their arses at their
> > home stations.
>
>
>
> >
> >>that must have a
> >>sound card, a lot of RAM to use Win9x and
> >>a CD-ROM to install Win9x. Actually, in all
> >>the world (because USA is not the only country
> >>on Earth), surplus lowest priced laptops are
> >>principally 486 based computers with no sound
> >>card, no CD-ROM and 4 or 8 MB RAM,
> >>running DOS and sometimes Win31.
> >>With this equipment, impossible to play PSK31.
> >>All the hams on Earth do not have $1000 to
> >>spend in a modern laptop just to play with PSK31.
> >>Its impossible to add a PCMCIA sound card on
> >>these old laptops because the PCMCIA bus has
> >>NO DMA, so there is no PCMCIA sound blaster
> >>clone card available.
> >
> >
> > 99% irrelvant. See above re: tower case station integration and
> > operation.

>
> Hmmmmmm. Has Nomen looked at the side of a laptop. (Hint - most of 'em
> have built in sound in and out) I love my old Thinkpad for just that
> reason. Just plug the cables into the Mic and headphone jacks.
>
> Lesse, It's a pentium 166 with 32 megs of RAM, running WIn95 and
> Digipan. Cheap city.
>
> PCMCIA sound cards? Sheesh!
>
>
> >
> >>Any cheap PSK31 interface solution ? Tell us ...
> >
> >
> > Hamscope is one of many.
>
> I think I spent maybe 6 dollars on my homebrew interface.
>
> >>There is no acceptable PSK31 program running
> >>under DOS (although waterfall graphics will be
> >>possible also under DOS), and even on Win9X,
> >>the author of WinPSKse is too much lazybones to
> >>allow 640x480 display (same problem with
> >>WSJT, running only in 800x600 mode) and on a
> >>486 laptop, its not possible to run 800x600.
> >>Here are some reasons that explain why PSK31
> >>is not very used especially on 6m. More, there
> >>is no worldwide PSK31 consensus to determine
> >>a DX calling frequency for PSK31 on 6m.
> >
> >
> > DOS died years ago, the rest of us have long since buried it fer
> > chrissake.
>
> I guess Nomen thinks that Hams can't afford anything, everything has to
> be free, and that we get dumb as we age.
>
> >
> >
> >>Packet interest had fallen. TAPR was a pioneer
> >>in the years 80s and we all thank TAPR for their
> >>TNC2 project (always used in APRS today) but
> >>the applications of packet-radio were limited to
> >>DX (yes it was possible with level 2) and BBS
> >>traffic. BBS killed packet interest and now Internet
> >>has killed BBS, so the packet network is quite
> >>desert except some DX clusters and APRS
> >>channels but its NOT really ham-radio activities.
> >>Many hams use now ECHOLINK but ECHOLINK

> >>is not AUTHORIZED in all countries. Many pirates
> >>interface their VHF/UHF ham station to Internet
> >>to allow ECHOLINK but it is often forbidden to
> >>make a bridge between radio bands and Internet
> >>(for security reasons, terrorists could use
> >>ECHOLINK to communicate).
> >
> >
> > Your point here is . . . ??
>
> I'm lost here too.....
>
> >
> >>Thats the deal. We have modern modes of
> >>transmissions like PSK31, but laws speaking
> >>always of CW (19th century). Its time like for
> >>sea ships, to forbid CW on HF bands in order
> >>to oblige the users to get modern equipments.
> >
> >
> > A good solid 1.02 on the Troll-O-Meter.
>
>
>
> I wonder if this might actually be Vipul? THe argument seems formed in
> the same fashion.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3258. FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 05:15:49 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69406

Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats" who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about 104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than "20WPM Extras"!

So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.

... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse Code.

So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code, the popularity of HF will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the changes.

- Stewart (N0MHS)

3259. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 06:05:24 UTC
From: Rene <delete_rene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bd8pn5$prsjc$1@ID-153362.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69407

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> schreef in bericht
news:3EF775ED.1010808@ix.netcom.com...
> Dan Finn wrote:
>
> >It is true that USB is the only mode allowed on the new 5MHz channels.
> >
> >HOWEVER, that does not mean Morse Code is prohibited! Only the CW mode
(with
> >LSB, FM. AM) are prohibited.
> >
> >All you need to do is go into the SSB mode and operate audio Morse Code
> >(such as with a practice keyer) and you will be perfectly legal.
> >
> >
> I don't think so. The rules didn't say "USB" itself, but a designator
> that specifies "voice encoded
> onto an upper sideband signal". Audio beeps are not voice....

I think it said J3E. In that case, CW/morse would be excluded....

Rene

3260. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 09:44:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306240144.58621f53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69408

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com>...
> Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
> were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the
> assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
> who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K
> loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about
> 104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
> "20WPM Extras"!
>
> So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just
> passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception
> among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.
>
> ... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated
> and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and
> General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the
> PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse
> Code.
>
> So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code, the popularity of HF
> will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices
> and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to
> understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for
> so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the
> changes.
>
> - Stewart (N0MHS)

Troll-O-Meter = 0.3

w3rv

3261. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 10:22:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030624062244.23745.00000702@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69409

In article <5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
>were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras

Not a "give" at all.

>(based on the
>assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
>who were simply handed their Extra papers),

On what do you base that assumption? Do you have ANY objective information on
the percentage of hams with medical waivers?

>and figuring about a 3K
>loss in numbers due to attrition...

That's about the only reasonable number you've given, so far, and it's on the
high end.

>and given that we now have about
>104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
>"20WPM Extras"!

Wishful thinking on your part, Stew.

Besides, I haven't seen any licenses that say "20 wpm Extra" or "Extra Light"
or Extra Lite". Just "Amateur Extra".
>
>So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just
>passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception
>among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.

What ARE you talking about, Stew?

It's been more than three years since the restructuring, and total growth is
10-11 kilohams. Amateur Extras make up only about 15% of the total, even though
the code test is the same as for all other code-tested licenses and the written
test requirements dropped from 5 tests to 3.
>
>... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated
>and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and
>General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the
>PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse
>Code.

That depends on how you define "efficient".
>
>So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code, the popularity of HF
>will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices
>and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to
>understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for
>so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the
>changes.
>
Ah - just another troll. Ho hum.

The other night I had a very nice 40 meter CW QSO with a relatively new 1x2 Extra. He was going about 6 wpm, which was a comfortable speed for him and a no-brainer for me. Lots of fun.

Let's see how the digital modes do on Field Day

73 de Jim, N2EY

3262. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 11:37:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306240337.1a0d4726@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69410

e"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgydzb5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 23 Jun 2003 07:14:07 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >You do tend to make concerted and extended efforts to avoid Microsloth
> >dontcha? I been watching the Sun, IBM and SCO brawls. Offhand I'd say
> >Bill needs to be concerned.
>
> No BillyBloatware programs for me except for the "OS" if you want to
> call it that on my NT machine and my wife's NT machine (she needs it
> to run MSWord, Excel and AutoCad so she can work at home if need
> be).

Those are three of my biggies. When I'm working - which I'm not at the
moment.

> I posolutely do not run Internet Exploder or any of the other
> virus-magnets even on the NT boxes.

I run Exploder but haven't had any noteworthy problems with it. But I
absolutely refuse to go anywhere near any flavor of Outlook which is
the absolute worst of the bug magnets.

> If Linux had ports of the mailer, newsreader, and text editor with
> which I do about 90% of my computer work, I'd be running that as my
> primary system. Actually I have Red Hat 7 on an alternate-boot
> drive on the NT box but I wasn't impressed with it. I do understand
> that Linux 8 is better.

One of my brothers is a far-end Linux wonk, a journalism grad who is a
statistician, robotics guru, webmeister and Perl code warrior for GM.
Pony tail. Iconoclast. Family odd duck. He has a row of Linux boxes at
home. I dunno what he does with 'em but he does it all night and keeps
mumbling "Kill Bill!"

He keeps lashing me to get a life and get Linux running here. I keep
telling him I'll do that as soon as he ports Acad, Inventor and all
the other engineery stuff I run over to Linux.

Maybe some day . . .

w3rv

3263. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 11:51:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306240351.7e755bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69411

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030623210356.25815.00000887@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
> > of modern transceivers?
>
> No problem for me!

Good. Wanna take a whack at my 940?

w3rv

3264. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 12:56:53 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306240456.30c6d928@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69412

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com>...

> So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just
> passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception
> among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.

Amateur Radio is no closer to nor farther away from being
obsolete based on this premise than it was 50 years ago or will be 50
years hence.

> ... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated
> and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and
> General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the
> PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse
> Code.

No, it's not more efficient than Morse Code. It requires far
more ahrdware to support it and cannot be run without that additional
hardware.

> So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code...(SNIP)

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHA
! ! ! ! ! ! !

>...the popularity of HF
> will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices
> and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to
> understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for
> so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the
> changes.

Amateur Radio has already been "benefiting" from PSK-31 and other
digital modes from a long time before "Restructuring" and will
continue to do so.

The only thing "clear", Stew, is what ever you've been sipping on
before launching into yet another troll.

Steve, K4CAP

3265. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 13:07:02 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306240507.5c4428a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69413

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd837c$o9n$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...

> What meds are those Lennie the loser? Can you be specific, or do you need
> time to check with the lying bastards of the Stumpers? Get your fact right
> before opening your mouth ####head.

I shouldn't have let him draw me in on my service career, Dan.
He can't stand it that others have actually DONE something he can only
read about in a Clancy novel or have USED some of the gear he spouts
off about. Oh well...

But that's OK...Word's out that Mrs. Lennie's gonna spike his
pablum with Geritol from now on and calm him down a bit...Or at least
we can hope so.

73

Steve, K4CAP

> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030623145915.23406.00000446@mb-m27.aol.com...
> > In article <20030623021450.23044.00001703@mb-m13.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steamy, Mighty Warrior of the CAP) shouts with spittle drooling:
> >
> > >>In article <bd5et0$3fa$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > >><w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > >>
> > >>>Hey Lennie.....if we want any crap out of you we will squeeze your
> head.
> > >>
> > >> Dannie, you couldn't do it with help from the Gang of Four.
> > >
> > > All it takes is nine ounces of pressure, Lennie, and we'll be
> cleaning
> > >LennieCrap off the walls for weeks.
> >
> > Sounds like a THREAT to me, Steamy.
> >
> > Is that the way you "fought" in those "seven hostile actions?"
> >
> > You mouthed off at all those "hostiles" and they capitulated?
> >
> > Wow, I'll bet you got lots of preety MEDALS on your uniform

> > for that! :-)
> >
> > >>Now, go take your meds like a good boy, Dannie. You'll feel
> > >> much better in the morning.
> > >
> > > You should know. Is your correspondence school shrink wife writing
> > >scripts for you, Lennie?
> > >
> > > She should......
> >
> > My wife has a MASTERS DEGREE in BOTH Education and Social
> > Work, granted by the UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS. If you still think
> > that is a "correspondence school" then you are just a dime-a-
> > dozen military medical drop-out witless jerk who thinks his
> > beloved amateur radio license is some kind of "doctorate" in
> > physics.
> >
> > The best degree you can claim is a "98" on a warm day.
> >
> > Go back to shouting from under the bridge, Troll.

3266. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 13:24:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bd9jdg$4cc$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 69414

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>
> >Len Anderson
> > ex-RA16408336 (1952-1960)
>
> I am sure that meant something once upon a time. In a USENET group
> dedicated to Amateur Radio policy, it's meaningless.
>

Haven't you got it yet, Steve? Lennie's *life* is meaningless. Why else would he waste his time in a continuous troll of a ham radio NG where he has no intention of ever involving himself otherwise?

3267. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 15:24:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd9qd5$p0i$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69417
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bd8j8ptsb1@208.206.142.93...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > Perhaps he prefers the Jane Fonda network..you know CNN ??
> >
> > And his swipe at 'journalism' is seriously funny. There is no such
thing in
> > this country.
>
> Except thast ..... Fox News is the closest there is!
>

True....I miss Huntley and Brinkley.

Dan/W4NTI

3268. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 15:25:28 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <I3_Ja.12758$Kg7.6113@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 69418

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030623210356.25815.00000888@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <seHJa.9236$Kg7.5329@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >Amusing.
> >
> Bert,
>
> Do you recognize who I was responding to in that post with the original
list?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

That's what made it so amusing. I also took note that the subject's USENET
etiquette was a tad more abrasive than the moe recently displayed polish.
IOW, a budding pseudo-politician.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3269. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 15:28:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd9qk2$m7t$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Red Cloud" <redcloud3811@ZZZZ.yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:tp7ffv0t3muuuoaop6ktc42bh3o70ftnr5@4ax.com...
> On 23 Jun 2003 13:48:25 -0700, richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium)
wrote:
>
> >More whining hambos! I always thought amateur radio was all about
> >experimenting.
>
> Yeah right! Maybe 40-50 years ago.
>

But we experimented too much. We created the ham equivilant of the
'Frankenstein monster'. Now we have to live with it.

Dan/W4NTI

3270. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 15:30:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd9qob$9ds$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Red Cloud" <redcloud3811@ZZZZ.yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:ctkffvsd18i8llqsp025igippjdbq9q0t8@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 04:12:42 GMT, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
wrote:
>
> >Can't resist. 40 or 50 years ago? What was this moonbounce with 85
watts
> >or less?
>
> Moonbounce? I think there was an article in 73 back in about 1976 about
how to
> do that, not at <85W, but still doable.
>

There was one in QST back in the early 60s on two meters with a KW.

Now its done with single yagis and 180watts. Big changes.

Dan/W4NTI

3271. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 15:35:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd9r15bsg1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69421

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com...
> Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
> were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the
> assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
> who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K
> loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about
> 104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
> "20WPM Extras"!
>
> So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just
> passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception
> among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.
>
> ... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated
> and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and
> General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the
> PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse
> Code.
>
> So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code, the popularity of HF
> will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices
> and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to
> understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for
> so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the
> changes.
>
> - Stewart (N0MHS)

Yeah we sure are. How many of the 100K plus extra lights know how to put up
a dipole? My guess. 3.

Dan/W4NTI

3272. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 15:40:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd9rb3$d3u$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69422

Wayne Green has been a thorn in the ARRLs side since he and they had a
'parting of ways'. Now 40 years later he is just a bitching old fart.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bd9jua$q1lkt$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> The thing I *do* like about Wayne is that he gets people thinking..... I
> kinda compare him as the "Rush Limbaugh" of ham radio. Whether or not you
> agree with him or not, he gets you thinking. As lethargic as ham radio
has
> gotten, we need more people like him, just to wake some of the old farts
up.
> (speaking in generalities here, not specifics.)
>
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EF66545.70503@adelphia.net...
> > Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >
> > > Wayne's lame and snivvling answer was that "I am only interested
in
> > > spawning the creativity of others to action". In other words, all he
> wanted to
> > > do was complain. He is his own worst enemy. He's a loser.
> >
> >
> > Gawd Steve, THAT is priceless! He put the best spin on complaining that
> > I've ever heard. I wonder if he'd mind if I made a poster of that
saying?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
>

3273. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 15:44:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bd9ritirv1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69423

I know Steve....Ive got a recommendation on what to spike him with.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4cap@aol.com> wrote in message
news:a08ca5a.0306240507.5c4428a7@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bd837c$o9n$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...
>
> > What meds are those Lennie the loser? Can you be specific, or do you
need
> > time to check with the lying bastards of the Stumpers? Get your fact
right
> > before opening your mouth ####head.
>
> I shouldn't have let him draw me in on my service career, Dan.
> He can't stand it that others have actually DONE something he can only
> read about in a Clancy novel or have USED some of the gear he spouts
> off about. Oh well...
>
> But that's OK...Word's out that Mrs. Lennie's gonna spike his
> pablum with Geritol from now on and calm him down a bit...Or at least
> we can hope so.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP
>
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030623145915.23406.00000446@mb-m27.aol.com...
> > > In article <20030623021450.23044.00001703@mb-m13.aol.com>,
k4yz@aol.com
> > > (Steamy, Mighty Warrior of the CAP) shouts with spittle drooling:
> > >
> > > >>In article <bd5et0$3fa$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > >><w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > > >>
> > > >>>Hey Lennie.....if we want any crap out of you we will squeeze your
> > head.
> > > >>
> > > >> Dannie, you couldn't do it with help from the Gang of Four.
> > > >
> > > > All it takes is nine ounces of pressure, Lennie, and we'll be

> > cleaning
> > > >LennieCrap off the walls for weeks.
> > >
> > > Sounds like a THREAT to me, Steamy.
> > >
> > > Is that the way you "fought" in those "seven hostile actions?"
> > >
> > > You mouthed off at all those "hostiles" and they capitulated?
> > >
> > > Wow, I'll bet you got lots of preety MEDALS on your uniform
> > > for that! :-)
> > >
> > > >>Now, go take your meds like a good boy, Dannie. You'll feel
> > > >> much better in the morning.
> > > >
> > > > You should know. Is your correspondence school shrink wife
writing
> > > >scripts for you, Lennie?
> > > >
> > > > She should......
> > >
> > > My wife has a MASTERS DEGREE in BOTH Education and Social
> > > Work, granted by the UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS. If you still think
> > > that is a "correspondence school" then you are just a dime-a-
> > > dozen military medical drop-out witless jerk who thinks his
> > > beloved amateur radio license is some kind of "doctorate" in
> > > physics.
> > >
> > > The best degree you can claim is a "98" on a warm day.
> > >
> > > Go back to shouting from under the bridge, Troll.

3274. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 16:01:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306240801.3aef0d11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69424

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com>...

>
> So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code,

Horsepucky, PSK-31 hasn't even "muscled out" ancient RTTY let alone
Morse and PSK itself is being muscled out by MFSK and others. As
Cootie Boy would put it "Get a rife Teaze."

> - Stewart (N0MHS)

After this morning's calibration runs . . .

K3LT Troll-O-Meter = 0.25
K2ASP Bozo Meter = 14.7

3275. Re: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 16:51:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306240851.5c0cd605@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69425

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message news:<bctejb$ue1$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0306191320.52e89f31@posting.google.com...
> > "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:<bcklpg$f6p$1@nd.eastky.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> > Problem is, FCC seems to think all that regulatory stuff has to be
> > there. Since a licensee is responsible for adherence to the rules, the
> > exams are full of questions about those rules. FCC is satisfied with
> > questions that require that you know that 50-54 MHz is a ham band. I
> > don't think they'd be satisfied if the exams said "look it up".
>
> Probably not...;) Hopefully I made it clear later on - I'm on-board
> with testing on the safety/emergency regulatory portion.

Which is what most of the test is, nowadays.

Which brings us back to the question of why must ALL hams be tested on
things some may never use? Band edges are just one example.

> > There's a bunch of historical reasons, too. Reading the old License
> > Manual study guides from decades ago, it's interesting to note how
> > many questions there are on specific topics like band edges, power
> > supply filters and harmonic reduction, and how little there is on
> > other areas like receivers. The obvious reason is that FCC focused the
> > exams on the areas where hams had problems.
>
> How did enforcement and self-policing evolve during the same period?

Several ways:

- Equipment got better and less expensive.
- The general level of knowledge among hams rose.
- It became clear to amateurs that if they dodn't police themselves,
there would be no more amateur radio.

> I can understand gearing testing towards problem areas - I'm wondering how
> the problem(s) start and if testing or enforcement/peer pressure solve them.
> Any ideas?

The problems start in two general areas: ignorance and apathy (don't
know and don't care). Ignorance is solved by education, but apathy is
tougher.

In the bad old days most violations in the ARS were technical in
nature and often the result of technical ignorance on the part of the

ham. For example, the ham who unknowingly strayed out of band because
he/she didn't know how to adjust a transmitter to keep it in the band.

Today most violations are for operational things like intentional
interference, obscenity/profanity, uncoordinated repeaters, etc.

> > Also, once upon a time, FCC issued licenses in another service with no
> > exam at all. All a licensee had to do was sign a form certifying that
> > they had read and understood the rules for that radio service, and
> > would abide by them. The reality was somewhat different....
>
> Ahem. ;)

Exactly!

> But, was it a lack of testing (not that I'm advocating
> doing away with testing in the least) or lack of enforcement that caused CB
> to spiral out of control?
>
I think it was due to several things:

1) Lack of testing meant that someone could just sign the form without
actually reading the rules, let alone remembering or understanding
them.

2) Lack of enforcement meant that people soon learned they could break
the rules without much chance of a penalty.

3) Lack of testing (and inexpensive equipment) also meant that the
licensee had very little investment of money, time or effort in that
radio service.

4) The sudden creation of the service meant there was no built-up
tradition of rules or practices.

5) Rapid growth meant that the enforcement capacity was soon
overwhelmed by sheer numbers.

Put them all together and you have a recipe for trouble.

> > > > OK, fine - then it makes sense for there to ba a test of basic
> operating
> > > > skill.
> > > > And Morse/CW skill is a basic operating skill in amateur radio.
> > >
> > > But there's no practical test of any _other_ operating skill.
> >
> > Maybe there should be!
> >
> > However, note that most would-be hams already know how to understand
> > the spoken word and how to read. (I don't think a totally illiterate
> > person can be licensed in the USA). The Morse test is a basic skills
> > test, akin to being able to understand 41 words in a new language when
> > spoken slowly and clearly, or being able to read at the first-grade

> > level.
>
> I'm not buying the argument that Morse is a "basic" skill, sorry.

I apologize if the above wasn't clear, because the word "basic" is
used in two different contexts. Here's another go:

In HF/MF amateur radio, Morse/CW is so widely used that to be without
any skill in the mode is to be cut off from a very big part of what
goes on there.

The Morse/CW TEST used here in the USA is a very low-level "basic"
test. IOW it does not require a high degree of skill to pass that
test.

Try this: Listen to the CW/data parts of the HF ham bands this coming
weekend. See how much CW activity there is by hams on, say, 40 meters
on Saturday evening.

> > I'll play devil's advocate on this one. Use a common anticodetest
> > argument against the phonetic alphabet test
> >
> > If someone doesn't intend to operate 'phone, why require that they
> > learn the phonetic alphabet? And which one is THE correct one? Use of
> > any particular phonetics is not required by the regs, so why REQUIRE
> > that hams learn Alfa, Bravo, Charlie....?
>
> Standardization, for one thing. (And I think the regs should specify
> this, myself.)

So you want it to be a violation of the rules to use nonstandard
phonetics?
>
> > Besides, it should be a spoken test, because the skill is to be able
> > to say the phonetics, not write them.
> >
> > See?
>
> I think it has more general application than that.

The only reasonable use of phonetics is to clarify the spoken word
under less-than-perfect conditions. That means voice modes only.

> > > > Perhaps - but there are plenty of folks who would say Morse/CW skill
> > > > is part of the very definition of amateur radio, too.
> > >
> > > Yes, in the past.
> >
> > Not just in the past - today. Take a listen on the HF ham bands -
> > Morse/CW all over the place.

See above.
>

> And I suppose it's good that some people keep a tradition alive -
> that's not an argument for maintaining the testing requirement.

Morse/CW is used for many reasons beyond just keeping a tradition
alive.

> > > > >Anyway....theory applies across the board, to all
> > > > >radios, all bands, all antennas and feedlines and what-have-you.
> > > > >
> > > > But not all of the theory. To operate HF CW, I don't really need to
> > > > know very much about VHF propagation,
> > >
> > > You don't need to know anything about propagation to operate any
> > > radio in any mode, but that knowledge will make your operation more
> > > effective.
> >
> > Sure - but why REQUIRE it if someone isn't going to USE it? Why can't
> > they just look it up, same as the band edges?
>
> Because it's one of those core, basic skills - radio theory.

I'd define it as knowledge, not skill. But in any case, that doesn't
mean we MUST test for it! What harm results from a ham who doesn't
know much about propagation?

> Any specific band edge/plan what-have-you is specific enough that _I_ don't
> see a need to test for it.

Sure - but we don;t get to pick and choose what is tested for and what
isn't. One person's "core basic skill/knowledge" is another's "hazing
ritual" or "something I'm never going to use" or "I'll learn that when
I need it".
>
> > Go down that road a ways and there's not much left of the writtens.
>
> Your arguments are unconvincing for me - you haven't demonstrated
> that knowledge of Morse contributes _anything_ to producing good operators

I have found that USE of Morse/CW contributes greatly to producing
good amateur radio operators. That doesn't mean that all good ops MUST
know and use Morse, however.

> and your argument(s) regarding the written test are bordering on reductio
> absurdum.

Reductio ad absurdum is a valid way of proving or disproving an
assertion. In this case, I have shown that if the assertion "Don't
require anyone to learn something they may never use" is applied to
the written test in a fashion similar to the way it is applied to the
code test, we wind up with an absurdly-brief written test. Hence the
assertion is faulty.

> Frankly, there's no rebuttal to the idea that propagation theory
> isn't a fundamental concept,

Of course it's a fundamental concept, but why MUST it be tested? Why
MUST hams know about propagation on bands they may never use?

>so I'm not buying.
>
> > > > FM repeaters, satellites,
> > > > and a whole lot of other stuff that's on the test. But those things
> are
> > > > a big part of passing the written test.
> > >
> > > There's that imbalance again. Chicken and egg - the first radio
> I
> > > bought was a 2-meter, and it's hard to argue that I didn't go that route
> > > _because_ of a certain amount of emphasis. And now, my existence as a
> user
> > > of 2-meter increases the number of users - which in the long haul
> (generally
> > > speaking) could lead to even more emphasis on the test, because gee whiz
> > > we're getting all these people on 2-meter, gotta be sure they know what
> > > they're doing.....hhmmm.
> >
> > So what's the alternative - test all subjects equally? Example - some
> > hams still use mercury-vapor rectifiers, so let's have some test
> > questions on mercury-vapor rectifiers.
>
> More emphasis on core fundamentals, I would say.

Which are? Besides Ohm's Law and propagation?

> > > > How much theory is needed to operate an HT?
> > >
> > > None, but that's true of any radio.
> >
> > Not true of some that I use!
>
> Indeed - OK, spill.

Most of my equipment is homebrew and has to be tuned up in order to
operate. It takes some understanding of what makes my rigs tick in
order to get them to work. This was once generally true of almost all
radio gear, but over time the adjustments have been reduced and
automated to the point that no real radio knowledge is needed anymore.

> > > The argument here is, really, do
> > > you want just operators, or _skilled_ operators? Learning and knowing
> > > theory promotes operator _skill_,
> >
> > whoa there! How does THEORY promote operating skill? Does knowing
> > Ohm's Law make someone understand SSB better?
>

> You know the answer(s) as well or better than I do - propagation,
> carrier wave creation/suppression, etc.

All of which can be learned on-the-job, so to speak.

> Hell, just see the thread on 5 Mhz
> going on right now - unless you can argue that knowing what's going on
> inside the radio and out at the antenna is of no help in understanding that.

Merely a matter of definitions. Not theory in the sense of real
understanding of how the rigs or antennas actually work.

> > > while CW/Morse simply does not, if it did, it'd
> > > be required for that reason alone for professionals.

> > Ya lost me there. The pros don't require Morse/CW skill because they
> > don't use the mode much, if at all, any more. Hams do.
>
> Some hams do; some have no interest in the subject.

Take a listen around 7030 kHz this coming Saturday evening...
>
> > Some of the most skilled operators today are air traffic controllers.
> > Are they required to know much theory about how radios work? I don't
> > think so. They have to know procedure and rules and how to keep cool
> > under pressure, plus a lot of other skills. But their technical radio
> > theory knowledge doesn't have to be very good at all.
>
> It's going to depend on your definition of "skilled operator", isn't
> it? Yeah, if you've got a technical staff on hand to deal with whatever
> problems might crop up, maintenance people to maintain the equipment, and
> very narrow, limited and defined area of operations, then yeah, sure.

OK then.

> Basically, this is just your "modern radios that don't break"
> argument, and more of a narrow look when we need a broader outlook. Is an
> ATC guy ever going to be installing his own antenna and need to realize that
> standing in spot "A" when he keys up 1000 watts is probably a Bad Idea? Of
> course not - engineers take care of that for him. Not so a ham - and being
> aware of these little things are what go into making a good operator.

Only if you include a lot of technical stuff in the definition of
"operator".

But our licenses are for operating, not doing technical stuff. No
license is needed to build a station - the license is only needed to
use it on the air.

What it really comes down to is that you define "hams" as "radio
operator/technicians" who should be skilled in operating and
knowledgeable in technical stuff.

Which is a pretty good definition, I'd say.

> > > That it's being phased out across the board is sufficient proof that
> > > it's irrelevant to having good operators;
> >
> > Not at all! It's being phased out by professionals because their are
> > other modes with a lower bottom line. Example: By implementing GMDRSS,
> > the maritime folks could get rid of having radio officers on board
> > ship.
> >
> > >a lot of that other 'stuff', on the other hand, isn't.
> >
> > I've got a list of operating skills you might like. Want me to repost
> > it?
>
> Sure, or e-mail it.

Spun off into a new thread, which see.

> > > > Sorry, that "laws of physics" line is a red herring. Practical radio
> > > > is more about technology and engineering than about physics and science.
> > >
> > > I'm not sure what you mean by 'practical' radio.
> >
> > I mean actually being able to build, and fix radio sets that work on
> > the air. As opposed to just basic principles.
> >
> > IOW it's one thing to understand a block diagram, or even a basic
> > schematic, and quite another to actually build a working set that
> > meets all the requirements.

Some of us actually design and build our own rigs. But with
manufactured equipment getting more inexpensive-for-what-you-get every
year, homebrewing
has become a niche activity.

In fact there are very probably far more hams operating Morse/CW than
homebrewing nowadays.

> *shrug* FCC will do what FCC does.

A lot of that can be influenced by hams.

> > Not at all. I'm simply applying the same argument to other parts of
> > the test.
>
> It's only the same argument if you accept that practical Morse
> knowledge is as fundamentally applicable as propogation theory.

40 CW in the evening....

> > > > Perhaps - but why test for those formulas at all? Our licenses are for
> > > > operating, not solving problems in theory.
> > >
> > > The testing is supposed to be creating a 'pool of skilled
> > > operators

> > > and technicians', if I remember correctly. A skilled operator/technician
> > > understands theory, and if a person understands theory, they can easily
> > > solve problems in it, hence testing for it would be a valid requirement.
> >
> > Morse/CW is an operating skill widely used by hams, though...
>
> And this is really the only argument you have that goes anywhere; in
> and of itself it's insufficient.

Why is it insufficient if the mode is widely and extensively used by
hams?

> > > > And there's no requirement
> > > > to use any particular technology, just as there's no requirement to
> > > > use any particular mode.

> > > Actually, there is. To use that HF technology, I have to use
> > > Morse Code at least once.

> > Only at a basic skill level, and only one skill.

> > It's like having to solve a couple of simple Ohm's Law problems.

> Yeah, but all radios obey Ohm's Law.

Sure - but does everyone who uses a radio have to know Ohm's Law?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3276. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 16:53:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306240853.425dacae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69426

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306240351.7e755bf@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030623210356.25815.00000887@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > > What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
> > > of modern transceivers?
> >
> > No problem for me!
>
> Good. Wanna take a whack at my 940?

How old is that thing - 20 years? Hardly "modern"...

You got the manuals?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3277. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 16:58:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306240858.3ab128d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69427

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgyc733.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 23 Jun 2003 11:02:36 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >"negotiating" via bully politics. The question as far as S25.5 is
> >concerned could well be whether or not the thrust for a consensus to
> >abolish S25.5 will collapse in the face the bully politics. The easy
> >way out of that quagmire for everybody of course would be to do
> >absolutely nothing about S25.5 and take a hike on it.
>
> The "chicken" way is to take what is known as a footnote exception,
> which would read something like "Countries A, B, and C reserve
> the option to not require blah-de-blah". Had Japan done that at
> the last W(A)RC, there would be no question that their no-code
> license is in full conformance with the IRR.

Doesn't that make a mockery of the whole process??

3278. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 16:59:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306240859.323477a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69428

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgycf44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 23 Jun 2003 12:22:56 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Is China really "communist" any more? Seems like we import a lot of
> >consumer goods from them. They're also the #1 source of foreign
> >adoptions to the USA.
>
> That's because "mainland" Chinese families are forbidden to have more
> than one child, and those who produce more face prison camps if they
> do not place the "extra" child for out-of-country adoption.

I don't think that's true anymore, Phil. There was an excellent
article in the Philly Inquirer about it this past Sunday. IIRC, the
"one-child" rule was mostly for urban folks. I think the rule has been
changed to "one son or two children".

The result has been a large number of abortions, and a large number of
baby girls in orphanages. Usually the babies were abandoned in places
where there was a high probability that they would be found quickly.

> We have
> several friends who have adopted such children, because healthy
> Caucasian newborns are virtually unavailable for adoption in the US
> any more.

Same here. Were any of the adopted Chinese babies boys?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3279. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 17:05:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306240905.78d5f7f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69429

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bd9jub$q1lkt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> My comments regarding the "retardation" of the digital capabilities in ham
> radio were based upon a recent meeting we had with the local emergency
> services director and "served agencies." What they need is not at the level
> it could and/or should be of what we can offer as hams........ Its gone
> beyond simple message-grams.
>

OK, so finish it, don't leave it dangling, what do they need??

> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX

w3rv

3280. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 17:14:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgzklfe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69430

On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 01:14:33 -0400, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>My comments regarding the "retardation" of the digital capabilities in ham
>radio were based upon a recent meeting we had with the local emergency
>services director and "served agencies." What they need is not at the level
>it could and/or should be of what we can offer as hams........ Its gone
>beyond simple message-grams.

OTOH, the emergency management folks as well as the "served agencies" here are delighted at the services that we provide, which go beyond the message-grams to include packet tranmission of anything that can be digitized into 256-bit characters and SSTV of sheets of things like road closure maps, etc. Voice circuits are used primarily for tactical status reporting and dispatch to back up the agencies' "FailSoft" simplex systems (the base stations are in the buildings of the agency, not on some mountaintop or remote tower) which themselves are backup of the County-wide trunked system. Folks assigned to specific agencies get training in the dispatch systems and needs of that agency and many can run the FailSoft dispatch points if need be. We're not limited only to operating our ham radios in push-to-talk mode.

We're even looking into phone-patching into the internal telephone systems of the EOC and the hospital's command center to enable real user-to-user comms through ham radio (it's certainly not new technology - we had that in Los Angeles in 1958) but that may be a ways down the road.

It pays to note that all of the served facilities are connected by a dedicated 100 MB buried fiber system separate from the "consumer" cable TV system, with microwave backup. They fully understand that during a disaster this may not be available.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
Washington County OR
ARES/RACES Member and Tech Advisor

3281. Re: Answer THIS, Ya Putz.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 17:27:33 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306240927.49ccf789@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69431

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bd9jdg$4cc$0@208.206.142.110>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> >
> > >Len Anderson
> > > ex-RA16408336 (1952-1960)
> >
> > I am sure that meant something once upon a time. In a USENET group
> > dedicated to Amateur Radio policy, it's meaningless.
> >
>
> Haven't you got it yet, Steve? Lennie's *life* is meaningless. Why else would he
> waste his time in a continuous troll of a ham radio NG where he has no intention
> of ever involving himself otherwise?

It's not >completely< wasted, Dick...Look at all the fun we have
watching the miserable old putz humiliate himself in a public forum !

At first I was dead serious...then he got annoying...then it
actually got to be fun. In my profession, you take a good laugh when
and where you can get it, and Lennie sure provides more than his fair
share!

73

Steve, K4CAP

3282. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 17:29:13 UTC
From: Dave Shrader <david.shrader@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3EF889FD.9000207@attbi.com>
Source record: 69432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

I have no problem with experimenting, even experimenting with wide SSB.

The problem is doing it on 75 or 20 meters where it causes un-necessary interference. The un-necessary interference is the problem.

Experiment on a band with plenty of 'space'.

Deacon Dave, W1MCE
+ + +

Red Cloud wrote:
> On 23 Jun 2003 13:48:25 -0700, richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote:
>
>
>>More whining hambos! I always thought amateur radio was all about
>>experimenting.
>
>
> Yeah right! Maybe 40-50 years ago.
>

3283. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 17:35:26 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306240935.6c50fcd1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69433

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3EF66545.70503@adelphia.net>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Wayne's lame and snivvling answer was that "I am only interested in
> > spawning the creativity of others to action". In other words, all he wanted to
> > do was complain. He is his own worst enemy. He's a loser.
>
>
> Gawd Steve, THAT is priceless! He put the best spin on complaining that
> I've ever heard. I wonder if he'd mind if I made a poster of that saying?

He'd just sue you for the rights, make a mess of it, sell it to
get out of bankruptcy, then tell everyone how he was just doing it to
jack up the price.

I've met this guy in person too. He was at a club meeting in
Fountain Valley, CA in 1980 or 81. He started out with a pretty good
room full of folks, and by the time I'd had enough to leave, there
wasn't enough people left in the room to play a game of volley ball.

I'll tell ya one thing, though...this guy is the Energizer Bunny
of pessimists.

Steve, K4CAP

3284. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 17:41:45 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306240941.63e0472a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0306211927.1e74815@posting.google.com>...

> The July 73 magazine just came and what I read has made me think twice
> about joining ARRL. It has a three page story written by a former ARRL
> employee named John J. Phillips K2QAI and shows an ARRL that cares
> very little about the average ham and even less about its employees.
> Go read it and see what you think.

What I am wondering is what your real name is...There's no "Louis
C LeVine" in the FCC database. Joining the League without a valid
Amateur license wouldn't give you voting privileges anyway.

Steve, K4CAP

3285. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 17:49:07 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A48C8C2A115elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69435

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bd8ka6$19n$1@208.206.142.93:

>
>
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0306230526.560dd2ad@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns93A340F52BB59elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in
>> >> news:bd4nbn$rev$1@nd.eastky.net:
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>> >> >
>> >> >> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are
>> >> >> putting up a fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these
>> >> >> goofs big time.
>> >> >
>> >> > Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test
>> >> > contingent's
>> >> > hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > ---
>> >> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>> >> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>> >> > Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/2003
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> Note that the RSGB have said that s25.5 has been agreed in
>> >> principle, i.e. it's a question of what wording will appease the
>> >> Russians and Germans, but it will just say that *they* can keep
>> >> code testing and everyone else can ditch it!
>> >
>> > The ITU sets the *minimum* requirements, it does not tell sovereign
>> > administrations like the FCC what additional requirements above &
>> > beyond those minimums may be imposed in their countries.
>>
```

>> Yet.
>>
>> Mark my words, s25.5 will still exist, but it will specify an optional
>> requirement. Just you wait and see.
>
> Alun has his crystal ball polished to a real shining sheen. And he
> hopes it
> doesn't cloud over in early July.
>
>

My crystal ball is working!

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/06/24/1/?nc=1

3286. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:34:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <0R0Ka.11326$rh7.8498@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69436
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

85 watts on twenty four Gigahertz. Not two point four Gigahertz, twenty four Gigahertz. Times have changed considerably since the 60s and 70s.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Red Cloud" <redcloud3811@ZZZZ.yahoo.com> wrote in message news:ctkffvsd18i8llqsp025igippjdbq9q0t8@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 04:12:42 GMT, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
> >Can't resist. 40 or 50 years ago? What was this moonbounce with 85 watts
> >or less?
>
> Moonbounce? I think there was an article in 73 back in about 1976 about how to
> do that, not at <85W, but still doable.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3287. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:37:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgzr7yl.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69438

On 24 Jun 2003 09:58:17 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>Doesn't that make a mockery of the whole process??

Were the ground rules of international negotiation set down by Le
Compte de Montaigne, Benjy Franklin, or by Ekaterina the Great?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3288. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:37:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgzrppn.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69437

On 24 Jun 2003 10:35:26 -0700, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> I've met this guy in person too. He was at a club meeting in
>Fountain Valley, CA in 1980 or 81. He started out with a pretty good
>room full of folks, and by the time I'd had enough to leave, there
>wasn't enough people left in the room to play a game of volley ball.

It was a number of years before but the same sort of setting that I ran into him as well. Sitting on the table, legs crossed and hanging down just like a sit-down night club entertainer, and moaning and griping about the League all the way.

> I'll tell ya one thing, though...this guy is the Energizer Bunny
>of pessimists.

And he has always been a fully-paid-up member of the ARRL so he has every right to moan and groan about the League, whether it's grounded in reality or not.

Not to be confused with others here.

--

73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3289. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:37:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgzrrbo.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69439

On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 10:40:38 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Wayne Green has been a thorn in the ARRLs side since he and they had a
>'parting of ways'. Now 40 years later he is just a bitching old fart.

It's been more than that....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3290. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:37:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hgzrblm.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69440

On 24 Jun 2003 09:59:25 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>> We have
>> several friends who have adopted such children, because healthy
>> Caucasian newborns are virtually unavailable for adoption in the US
>> any more.
>
>Same here. Were any of the adopted Chinese babies boys?

Nope. Point well made.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3291. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:47:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF89CCE.20886796@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69441

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> The thing I *do* like about Wayne is that he gets people thinking..... I
> kinda compare him as the "Rush Limbaugh" of ham radio.

As far as I know, Rush has never been into UFO nets, Bluegrass CDs,
decades of anti-ARRL rants or cold fusion.

> Whether or not you
> agree with him or not, he gets you thinking.

He certainly does. I subscribed to "73" back in 1975. In just a few
months I began thinking that I'd wasted my money. At renewal time, I
thought that I'd save my money and skip "73".

> As lethargic as ham radio has
> gotten, we need more people like him, just to wake some of the old farts up.
> (speaking in generalities here, not specifics.)

Well, look at the specifics. Wayne Green is one of the oldest farts
around.

Dave K8MN

3292. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:49:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF89D3C.814156E5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69442

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com>...
> > Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
> > were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the
> > assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
> > who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K
> > loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about
> > 104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
> > "20WPM Extras"!
> >
> > So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just
> > passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception
> > among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.
> >
> > ... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated
> > and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and
> > General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the
> > PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse
> > Code.
> >
> > So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code, the popularity of HF
> > will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices
> > and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to
> > understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for
> > so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the
> > changes.
> >
> > - Stewart (N0MHS)
>
> Troll-O-Meter = 0.3

Not even above the noise here, Brian.

Dave K8MN

3293. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 18:56:00 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <491Ka.11339$8p7.1211@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69443

Dick,

Sounds like the argument the happy HFers (freebanders) are using :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bd8j6ttsb0@208.206.142.93...
>
>
> Then again, the primary users never use it!

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3294. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 19:38:43 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <vfha63goqicg99@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69444

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in news:5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940
@posting.google.com:

> Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
> were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the
> assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
> who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K
> loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about
> 104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
> "20WPM Extras"!

Stewart,

They're not really Extras. They just think they are.

KB7ADL

3295. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 19:42:19 UTC
From: Henry Kolesnik <wd5jfr@oklahoma.net>
Message-ID: <vfhad2tkahnm3d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Fox News would be great if they would get rid of all the audio whooshs!
The whoosh is overused and very annoying and so distracting that I've
stopped watching Fox New!
hank wd5jfr
"Frank Todd" <k3eko@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3EF6CD1B.2040007@yahoo.com...
> And just what is wrong with Fox News?
>
> Frank
>
>
> Joe S. wrote:
> > Let's see -- 73 magazine, Wayne Green, and a disgruntled former ARRL
> > employee -- who was let go from ARRL.
> >
> > Has Fox "News" now taken over 73?
> >
>

3296. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:08:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdab3f$kq3$0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 69446

Brian Kelly wrote:

> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com>...
> > Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
> > were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the
> > assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
> > who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K
> > loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about
> > 104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
> > "20WPM Extras"!
> >
> > So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just
> > passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception
> > among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.
> >
> > ... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated
> > and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and
> > General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the
> > PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse
> > Code.
> >
> > So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code, the popularity of HF
> > will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices
> > and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to
> > understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for
> > so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the
> > changes.
> >
> > - Stewart (N0MHS)
>
> Troll-O-Meter = 0.3

Naw. .25 for a two-bit ham.

3297. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:15:06 UTC
From: Dave Holford <holford@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <3EF8B14A.4840172@sympatico.ca>
Source record: 69447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Red Cloud wrote:
>
> On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 04:12:42 GMT, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
> >Can't resist. 40 or 50 years ago? What was this moonbounce with 85 watts
> >or less?
>
> Moonbounce? I think there was an article in 73 back in about 1976 about how to
> do that, not at <85W, but still doable.

I seem to remember a series of articles on one of the Ham mags using
BC-348 surplus HF receivers with simple converters for moonbounce, not
easy but doable with a little ingenuity and persistence.

Mind you that was when I was home brewing 14 tube HF SSB rigs - now I
can afford and use commerical rigs which are somewhat more versatile and
smaller.
Still have a pile of parts including mechanical and crystal SSB filters
for 'the next one', but I doubt I'll live long enough - got lazy like so
many of us. But, it most definitely ain't anywhere near as much fun or
nearly as satisfying

73
Dave VE3HLU

3298. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:44:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF8B846.7090801@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69448

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Yeah we sure are. How many of the 100K plus extra lights know how to put up
>a dipole? My guess. 3.
>
>
>
Probably around the same number of 20 wpm extras can do that task.....
Sure.
They didn't change significantly the material one needs to know to pass
the writtens.
Oh sure, fewer questions, but the amount of material is the same. Which
test is
easier, ten really hard questions, or 100 very easy questions (assume
you have all the
time you want to finish)?

>
>

3299. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:45:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EF8B878.9030707@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 69462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Robert Casey wrote:

>>
> I don't see a need to ban wide SSB entirely. Just assert a rule saying
> that it is a secondary
> type of transmission, afforded no protection from QRM, and that it not
> QRM other users.
> A way of saying "If the band is empty, go ahead and play with it, but if
> things are crowded,
> forget it". This could also open up other wide band modes like spread
> spectrum on HF,
> "okay to experiment if the band is empty". IF these modes can be shown
> to not trash more
> traditional modes, then they could be permitted in more crowded times.

This would require those hams to act like gentlemen, something
that is beyond a lot of hams today.

3300. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:46:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdad8kpcb1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

But it beats all the Hillary ass kissing on CNN.

Dan/W4NTI

"Henry Kolesnik" <wd5jfr@oklahoma.net> wrote in message
news:vfhad2tkahnm3d@corp.supernews.com...
> Fox News would be great if they would get rid of all the audio whooshs!
> The whoosh is overused and very annoying and so distracting that I've
> stopped watching Fox New!
> hank wd5jfr
> "Frank Todd" <k3eko@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3EF6CD1B.2040007@yahoo.com...
> > And just what is wrong with Fox News?
> >
> > Frank
> >
> >
> > Joe S. wrote:
> > > Let's see -- 73 magazine, Wayne Green, and a disgruntled former ARRL
> > > employee -- who was let go from ARRL.
> > >
> > > Has Fox "News" now taken over 73?
> > >
> >
>
>

3301. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:49:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdadgg$9p9$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

I see no reason why a 348 couldn't be used as a IF. If the noise figure was decent enough on the converter.

I don't remember that article, but Id say they were using a 417a, or a 416B triode tube for the RF side of things and possibly a 6J6 for the osc/mult chain. eh?

Dan/W4NTI

"Dave Holford" <holford@sympatico.ca> wrote in message news:3EF8B14A.4840172@sympatico.ca...
>
>
> Red Cloud wrote:
> >
> > On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 04:12:42 GMT, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> >
> > >Can't resist. 40 or 50 years ago? What was this moonbounce with 85 watts
> > >or less?
> >
> > Moonbounce? I think there was an article in 73 back in about 1976 about how to
> > do that, not at <85W, but still doable.
>
>
>
> I seem to remember a series of articles on one of the Ham mags using
> BC-348 surplus HF receivers with simple converters for moonbounce, not
> easy but doable with a little ingenuity and persistence.
>
> Mind you that was when I was home brewing 14 tube HF SSB rigs - now I
> can afford and use commerical rigs which are somewhat more versatile and
> smaller.
> Still have a pile of parts including mechanical and crystal SSB filters
> for 'the next one', but I doubt I'll live long enough - got lazy like so
> many of us. But, it most definitely ain't anywhere near as much fun or
> nearly as satisfying
>
> 73
> Dave VE3HLU

3302. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:53:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF8BA37.5020708@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69451
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Dave Welby wrote:

>Newsline has the following report on the problems being caused by
>those hi-fi SSB operators and a petition to run them off the airwaves:
>
>
>
I don't see a need to ban wide SSB entirely. Just assert a rule saying
that it is a secondary
type of transmission, afforded no protection from QRM, and that it not
QRM other users.
A way of saying "If the band is empty, go ahead and play with it, but if
things are crowded,
forget it". This could also open up other wide band modes like spread
spectrum on HF,
"okay to experiment if the band is empty". IF these modes can be shown
to not trash more
traditional modes, then they could be permitted in more crowded times.

3303. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:56:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306241256.46e070b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69453

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030623082256.01814.00000019@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <bd4nbnrev1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
>
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
> >
> >> I hear the Russians and some of the ex Eastern Block folks are putting up
> >> a
> >> fight to keep CW. Bet thats gonna tick of these goofs big time.
>
> Test or no test, CW/Morse USE will continue.

It damn well better after all of your noise for the past 8 years on
the subject.

> > Nah, but we're endlessly amused that the pro-code-test contingent's
> >hopes are pinned on nations like communist Red China.
>
> Is China really "communist" any more? Seems like we import a lot of consumer
> goods from them. They're also the #1 source of foreign adoptions to the USA.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

They're also the #1 source of animal diseases crossing over to humans.
McDonald's happy meal prizes and SARS. They've come a long way,
baby.

But that's hardly relavent. We'll see how communist they are when
Bush tries to shut down North Korea's alleged nuclear program.

bb

3304. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:57:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdadt6$5rt$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69452

The thing about learning CW up to around 20WPM is that even IF you don't use it....you keep it. Sure you may slow down, but you keep it.

I was up to around 35 a few years back. Then spent several years OFF CW completely. But with just a small amount of practice I was right back up to it.

In otherwords...once you really LEARN it...it stays with you. One cant say that is true of the 5 wpm 'pre-learned' catagory.

Dan/W4NTI

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3EF8B846.7090801@ix.netcom.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >Yeah we sure are. How many of the 100K plus extra lights know how to put up
> >a dipole? My guess. 3.
> >
> >
> >
> Probably around the same number of 20 wpm extras can do that task.....
> Sure.
> They didn't change significantly the material one needs to know to pass
> the writtens.
> Oh sure, fewer questions, but the amount of material is the same. Which
> test is
> easier, ten really hard questions, or 100 very easy questions (assume
> you have all the
> time you want to finish)?
>
> >
> >
>
>

3305. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 20:58:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdae2r$kg4$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69454

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hgzrppn.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 24 Jun 2003 10:35:26 -0700, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > I've met this guy in person too. He was at a club meeting in
> >Fountain Valley, CA in 1980 or 81. He started out with a pretty good
> >room full of folks, and by the time I'd had enough to leave, there
> >wasn't enough people left in the room to play a game of volley ball.
>
> It was a number of years before but the same sort of setting that I
> ran into him as well. Sitting on the table, legs crossed and hanging
> down just like a sit-down night club entertainer, and moaning and
> griping about the League all the way.
>
> > I'll tell ya one thing, though...this guy is the Energizer Bunny
> >of pessimists.
>
> And he has always been a fully-paid-up member of the ARRL so he has
> every right to moan and groan about the League, whether it's
> grounded in reality or not.
>
> Not to be confused with others here.
>
> --
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

And there it is....another on target zinger by Phil.

Dan/W4NTI

3306. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 21:30:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030624173042.25052.00000789@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 69455

In article <d22b54c3.0306221832.dc91692@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:<hlnJa.82$eh3.74@news01.roc.ny>...
>> Whew. Jim, I never sent well with a Vibroplex. I ended up using an HA1-TO
>> keyer (back when). I like my CW to be indistinguishable from machine sent,
>> and never could send decent CW above about 25 on a straight key nor CW at
>> any speed on a Vibroplex :)
>
>Neither can anybody else . . wishful thinking to the contrary.

That's not what hundreds of hams tell me.....
>
>Bug swings are *not* beautiful things although much to their credit
>they absolutely will drive CW decoders outta their weenie little
>digicrap minds.

Never had one. Most of the time, knowledgeable ops on the other end don't know it's a bug. "Does he...or doesn't he...?"
>
>I'd already given up straight keys as too much work before I even took
>the test and went into the 80M Novice band with my WW2 surplus ARC-5
>TX (from a 1943/44 24vdc Willys Jeep Euro Theatre Turbo GT Edition)
>with a beat-to-crap bug of unknown parentage.

Prolly a prewar Vibroplex or imitation...

>I took said bug to the
>FCC office to take my General sending test. Examiner rolled his eyes
>upward when I whipped it out and did not give me a sending test. 1954
>. . something like that. 1625 PA toobs cathode keying daze.
>
Oh yez

>Not too much later QST pumped out a construction article on a very
>early solid state keyer which required laying out the artwork then
>exposing and developing the circuit board, scounging all the parts and
>stuffing it yerself. Which I did. Helluva lotta fun & education and it
>worked tits coming off the bench. After I solder-coated every trace on
>the board of course. The iambic Mode A paddles was a pair of
>back-to-back J-38s mounted vertically on a mongo brass base.

ICs or discrete transistors?
>
>I don't think that in a half century in this game I've managed to pull

>off a total of five q's with a straight key.

I used nothing else for seven years. Still have it. Use it once a year on Straight Key Night to remind me of why I got a bug...

>I won't bore you about
>what I think should be done with the few remaining bugs which are not
>in collector's museums.

We'll see how well one of them works this weekend...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3307. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 21:50:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306241350.18805d37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69456

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgzr7yl.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 24 Jun 2003 09:58:17 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >Doesn't that make a mockery of the whole process??
>
> Were the ground rules of international negotiation set down by Le
> Compte de Montaigne, Benjy Franklin, or by Ekaterina the Great?

. . Machiavelli . .

3308. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 21:55:47 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bdahd3$oe9$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 69458
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" (w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com) writes:
> I see no reason why a 348 couldn't be used as a IF. If the noise figure was
> decent enough on the converter.
>
> I don't remember that article, but Id say they were using a 417a, or a 416B
> triode tube for the RF side of things and possibly a 6J6 for the osc/mult
> chain. eh?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
No, I think the article being referred to came later. It was in the November
1972 issue of 73 (it was the thickest issue to that point, and had an article
about "building" a computer). The article, by someone named Brown, was
more an idea article about low cost moonbounce. So by that point it
was transistorized converters. There was an article or two that followed
about some conversions he did to the 348, and he wrote a slew of articles
that in some way referenced the main project. But, the moonbounce seemed
to be a pipe dream, while he persued all kinds of other things.

Michael VE2BVW

> "Dave Holford" <holford@sympatico.ca> wrote in message
> news:3EF8B14A.4840172@sympatico.ca...
>>
>>
>> Red Cloud wrote:
>> >
>> > On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 04:12:42 GMT, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
> wrote:
>> >
>> > >Can't resist. 40 or 50 years ago? What was this moonbounce with 85
> watts
>> > >or less?
>> >
>> > Moonbounce? I think there was an article in 73 back in about 1976 about
> how to
>> > do that, not at <85W, but still doable.
>>
>>
>>
>> I seem to remember a series of articles on one of the Ham mags using
>> BC-348 surplus HF receivers with simple converters for moonbounce, not
>> easy but doable with a little ingenuity and persistence.
>>

>> Mind you that was when I was home brewing 14 tube HF SSB rigs - now I
>> can afford and use commerical rigs which are somewhat more versatile and
>> smaller.
>> Still have a pile of parts including mechanical and crystal SSB filters
>> for 'the next one', but I doubt I'll live long enough - got lazy like so
>> many of us. But, it most definitely ain't anywhere near as much fun or
>> nearly as satisfying
>>
>> 73
>> Dave VE3HLU
>
>

3309. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 21:59:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306241359.263eef55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69457

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306240859.323477a8@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgycf44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...

> The result has been a large number of abortions, and a large number of
> baby girls in orphanages. Usually the babies were abandoned in places
> where there was a high probability that they would be found quickly.

They put 'em in the woods to die is what they've done and last I heard
they still do. When foreign visitors find these babies here and there
and scoop them up the Chinese consider it a quaint reaction.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3310. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 22:16:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306241416.65631de7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69459

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306240853.425dacae@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306240351.7e755bf@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030623210356.25815.00000887@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > In article <20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > > (Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > > > What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
> > > > of modern transceivers?
> > >
> > > No problem for me!
> >
> > Good. Wanna take a whack at my 940?
>
> How old is that thing - 20 years?

I dunno, it's not an original 1980 version, prolly 15-20 yrs.

> Hardly "modern"...

30 years more modern than yer 866s.

> You got the manuals?

Two copies of the users manual with two-page Excedrin headache
detailed schematics, do not have the service manual. But I could
probably dredge one up.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3311. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 22:34:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NI4Ka.1616$Vx2.932704@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69460

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Va1Ka.10687$C83.1058683@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> On 23 Jun 2003 22:15:49 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >Given that in the year 2000,
>
> I have more bad news for you. In about 3 years people on the ham bands
will
> ask, "What the hell is morse code?" :-0
>

I doubt it. Just dial into the morse sections and there will be plenty of it. Lately I've found more going on in the morse sections than voice due to the absolutely dreadful propagation conditions. And 3 years from now, we will be at the nadir of the sunspot cycle. So I expect to see increased activity.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3312. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 22:38:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Dp4Ka.1618$Vx2.933281@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69461

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bdadt6$5rt$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> The thing about learning CW up to around 20WPM is that even IF you don't
use
> it....you keep it. Sure you may slow down, but you keep it.
>
> I was up to around 35 a few years back. Then spent several years OFF CW
> completely. But with just a small amount of practice I was right back up
to
> it.
>
> In otherwords...once you really LEARN it...it stays with you. One cant
say
> that is true of the 5 wpm 'pre-learned' catagory.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

I've been reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy" recently and the author, who appears to have done considerable research in the area, considers the 13wpm to be the break point between remembering it (even if one gets rusty) and losing it.

As with you, I was off the air for several years, but found my code was there even though it was slow.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3313. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 23:41:18 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yk5Ka.11431$XJ1.9548@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69463

Excellent point, Dan. I had 'learned' American land line Morse years ago (1968) and actually used it once. I had to have the other op slow down to about 16 words per minute as I was using a mental look-up table for the other characters (such as 'c') whilst I understood the 'normal' characters (same as international Morse). After going QRT in 1970 and deciding to retest and get my license back in 1993, I found the 20 WPM test easy, but I do *not* recall the land line Morse - except for 'c' and 'q' LOL. BTW, the Morse was well sent in the movie 'Fantastic Voyage' which I copied just fine in the 70s. It does slow a bit, but if you really had CW ability, it doesn't evaporate overnight (nor, as I found out, over a couple of decades). I simply walked in and passed all of the tests (except for the 5 and 13 word per minute code tests - I only took element 1C .... 20 per).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3314. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-24 23:58:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdaoh2$k73$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69464

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Nl4Ka.1616$Vx2.932704@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:Va1Ka.10687$C83.1058683@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > On 23 Jun 2003 22:15:49 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
> >
> > >Given that in the year 2000,
> >
> > I have more bad news for you. In about 3 years people on the ham bands
> will
> > ask, "What the hell is morse code?" :-0
> >
>
> I doubt it. Just dial into the morse sections and there will be plenty of
> it. Lately I've found more going on in the morse sections than voice due
to
> the absolutely dreadful propagation conditions. And 3 years from now, we
> will be at the nadir of the sunspot cycle. So I expect to see increased
> activity.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Good observations Dee D....when the going gets tough...then CW prevails. Of course it takes two things to communicate. A operator at both ends.

Dan/W4NTI

3315. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 00:01:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdaom5$7n3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69465

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Dp4Ka.1618$Vx2.933281@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bdadt6$5rt$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > The thing about learning CW up to around 20WPM is that even IF you don't
> use
> > it....you keep it. Sure you may slow down, but you keep it.
> >
> > I was up to around 35 a few years back. Then spent several years OFF CW
> > completely. But with just a small amount of practice I was right back
up
> to
> > it.
> >
> > In otherwords...once you really LEARN it...it stays with you. One cant
> say
> > that is true of the 5 wpm 'pre-learned' catagory.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> I've been reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy" recently and the
> author, who appears to have done considerable research in the area,
> considers the 13wpm to be the break point between remembering it (even if
> one gets rusty) and losing it.
>
> As with you, I was off the air for several years, but found my code was
> there even though it was slow.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Yep....the international standard was 10 to 12. And the FCC put it at 13.
Thanks when the FCC wanted hams to actually know CW.

Dan/W4NTI

3316. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 00:05:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdaospdua1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69466

Excellent Jim....I wished I had learned landline Morse. Years ago...think early 60s, there was a group of ll morse types on 40cw. Used to listen in.

But military got in the way and by the time I got back stateside and on CW again they had all gone SK or something.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:yk5Ka.11431$XJ1.9548@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> Excellent point, Dan. I had 'learned' American land line Morse years ago
> (1968) and actually used it once. I had to have the other op slow down to
> about 16 words per minute as I was using a mental look-up table for the
> other characters (such as 'c') whilst I understood the 'normal' characters
> (same as international Morse). After going QRT in 1970 and deciding to
> retest and get my license back in 1993, I found the 20 WPM test easy, but
I
> do *not* recall the land line Morse - except for 'c' and 'q' LOL. BTW,
the
> Morse was well sent in the movie 'Fantastic Voyage' which I copied just
fine
> in the 70s. It does slow a bit, but if you really had CW ability, it
> doesn't evaporate overnight (nor, as I found out, over a couple of
decades).
> I simply walked in and passed all of the tests (except for the 5 and 13
word
> per minute code tests - I only took element 1C .... 20 per).
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>
>

3317. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 00:22:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030624202245.24390.00000774@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 69467

In article <0R0Ka.11326$rh7.8498@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>85 watts on twenty four Gigahertz. Not two point four Gigahertz, twenty >four Gigahertz.

Yup - using relatively small dishes, too (I think the big one was a 12 footer).

Both were 7 land hams. Both were long-time-licensed codetested hams, too. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3318. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 01:09:02 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306241709.45745d38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69468

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306240853.425dacae@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306240351.7e755bf@posting.google.com>...

> > Good. Wanna take a whack at my 940?
>
> How old is that thing - 20 years? Hardly "modern"...
>
> You got the manuals?

Anymore "modern" is defined by days...sometimes hours!

73

Steve, K4CAP

3319. Re: SAQ On The Air June 29

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 01:15:55 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306241715.41beff32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69469

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306231301.690c03c6@posting.google.com>...
> Radio station SAQ in Grimeton, Sweden will be activated on June 29.
> SAQ is the last operational Alexanderson alternator transmitter in the
> world.

Not to be confused with an "Andersonian Transmitter", which has
yet to be created.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3320. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 01:51:46 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Se7Ka.10461$Bg.6048@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 69470

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EF89CCE.20886796@earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > The thing I *do* like about Wayne is that he gets people thinking.....
I
> > kinda compare him as the "Rush Limbaugh" of ham radio.
>
> As far as I know, Rush has never been into UFO nets, Bluegrass CDs,
> decades of anti-ARRL rants or cold fusion.
>
>
> > Whether or not you
> > agree with him or not, he gets you thinking.

Yep like the lymphatic cleasnsing with electrical stimulation for AIDS
patients ...thats when my interest and dollars left 73 magazine.

KI3R Tom Belle Vernon Pa ....see all of you on 40 CW this weekend de
W3CSL Monessen ARC.

3321. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 02:09:51 UTC
From: Frank Todd <k3eko@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3EF9046E.7090609@yahoo.com>
Source record: 69471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Fox News is great...I watch it everyday...Best 24hr news source on the
planet! Period!

73

Frank

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> But it beats all the Hillary ass kissing on CNN.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Henry Kolesnik" <wd5jfr@oklahoma.net> wrote in message
> news:vfhad2tkahnm3d@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>Fox News would be great if they would get rid of all the audio whooshs!
>>The whoosh is overused and very annoying and so distracting that I've
>>stopped watching Fox New!
>>hank wd5jfr
>>"Frank Todd" <k3eko@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:3EF6CD1B.2040007@yahoo.com...
>>
>>>And just what is wrong with Fox News?
>>>
>>>Frank
>>>
>>>
>>>Joe S. wrote:
>>>
>>>>Let's see -- 73 magazine, Wayne Green, and a disgruntled former ARRL
>>>>employee -- who was let go from ARRL.
>>>>
>>>>Has Fox "News" now taken over 73?
>>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

3322. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 03:24:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdb4kqjla0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 69472

N2EY wrote:

> In article <d22b54c3.0306221832.dc91692@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> >news:<hlnJa.82$eh3.74@news01.roc.ny>...
> >> Whew. Jim, I never sent well with a Vibroplex. I ended up using an HA1-TO
> >> keyer (back when). I like my CW to be indistinguishable from machine sent,
> >> and never could send decent CW above about 25 on a straight key nor CW at
> >> any speed on a Vibroplex :)
> >
> >Neither can anybody else . . wishful thinking to the contrary.
>
> That's not what hundreds of hams tell me.....
> >
> >Bug swings are *not* beautiful things although much to their credit
> >they absolutely will drive CW decoders outta their weenie little
> >digicrap minds.
>
> Never had one. Most of the time, knowledgeable ops on the other end don't know
> it's a bug. "Does he...or doesn't he...?"
> >
> >I'd already given up straight keys as too much work before I even took
> >the test and went into the 80M Novice band with my WW2 surplus ARC-5
> >TX (from a 1943/44 24vdc Willys Jeep Euro Theatre Turbo GT Edition)
> >with a beat-to-crap bug of unknown parentage.
>
> Prolly a prewar Vibroplex or imitation...
>
> >I took said bug to the
> >FCC office to take my General sending test. Examiner rolled his eyes
> >upward when I whipped it out and did not give me a sending test. 1954
> >. . something like that. 1625 PA toobs cathode keying daze.
> >
> Oh yez
>
> >Not too much later QST pumped out a construction article on a very
> >early solid state keyer which required laying out the artwork then
> >exposing and developing the circuit board, scounging all the parts and
> >stuffing it yerself. Which I did. Helluva lotta fun & education and it
> >worked tits coming off the bench. After I solder-coated every trace on
> >the board of course. The iambic Mode A paddles was a pair of
> >back-to-back J-38s mounted vertically on a mongo brass base.

>
> ICs or discrete transistors?
> >
> >I don't think that in a half century in this game I've managed to pull
> >off a total of five q's with a straight key.
>
> I used nothing else for seven years. Still have it. Use it once a year on
> Straight Key Night to remind me of why I got a bug...
>
> >I won't bore you about
> >what I think should be done with the few remaining bugs which are not
> >in collector's museums.
>
> We'll see how well one of them works this weekend...

Keyers just cannot have the personality of a bug.

3323. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 04:15:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EF921D4.6030904@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

JJ wrote:

>
> This would require those hams to act like gentlemen, something that is
> beyond a lot of hams today.
>
>
You mean that I don't need to off tune my rig a few KHz off of some
interesting DX
to tune up the rig into my antenna? Didn't want to "carrier chuck" on
top of other
QSOs......

3324. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 06:58:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdc556$qci45$11@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69483

Yeah right.... I doubt it at least with the figure of 3 years. Maybe in 50 years but morse code will have use for at least 20 to 30 more years as long as there are hams that do enjoy it, regardless of if it is being used as a testing method or not.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Va1Ka.10687$C83.1058683@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> On 23 Jun 2003 22:15:49 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >Given that in the year 2000,
>
> I have more bad news for you. In about 3 years people on the ham bands
will
> ask, "What the hell is morse code?" :-0
>
>
>
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/

3325. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 07:03:15 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdc558$qci45$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69484

I am sure he is a thorn in the CQ magazines' side as well too eh? I have read most of the 73 magazines from the 70's through the 90's and the magazine itself is still pretty good, regardless of the editorial. Wayne has had *some* good ideas, but in the real world the "stick in the mud" types would never allow any of that stuff to happen.

As far as a "bitching old fart" he doesn't stand alone.... there are plenty more in ham radio with him.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bd9rb3$d3u$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> Wayne Green has been a thorn in the ARRLs side since he and they had a
> 'parting of ways'. Now 40 years later he is just a bitching old fart.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bd9jua$q1lkt$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > The thing I *do* like about Wayne is that he gets people thinking......
I
> > kinda compare him as the "Rush Limbaugh" of ham radio. Whether or not
you
> > agree with him or not, he gets you thinking. As lethargic as ham radio
> has
> > gotten, we need more people like him, just to wake some of the old farts
> up.
> > (speaking in generalities here, not specifics.)
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EF66545.70503@adelphia.net...
> > > Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> > >
> > > > Wayne's lame and snivvling answer was that "I am only
interested
> in
> > > > spawning the creativity of others to action". In other words, all
he
> > wanted to
> > > > do was complain. He is his own worst enemy. He's a loser.
> > >
> > >
> > > Gawd Steve, THAT is priceless! He put the best spin on complaining
that
> > > I've ever heard. I wonder if he'd mind if I made a poster of that
> saying?
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

3326. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 07:09:59 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdc559$qci45$13@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69485

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EF89CCE.20886796@earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > The thing I *do* like about Wayne is that he gets people thinking......
I
> > kinda compare him as the "Rush Limbaugh" of ham radio.
>
> As far as I know, Rush has never been into UFO nets, Bluegrass CDs,
> decades of anti-ARRL rants or cold fusion.

True.... but as I predicted to myself, you have proven a point about someone not fully reading the text.... see where it said about speaking in generalities, not specifics. They are both agitators.

>
>
> > Whether or not you
> > agree with him or not, he gets you thinking.
>
> He certainly does. I subscribed to "73" back in 1975. In just a few
> months I began thinking that I'd wasted my money. At renewal time, I
> thought that I'd save my money and skip "73".
>
>

Well.... I don't agree with his editorials, but from the issues I have read from somewhere in the 70's till the late 90's there were alot of articles, project and construction plans etc. that was not written by him, that were actually good. To discount a whole mag due to who writes the editorial is kinda foolish, but is a persons option. I hate the editor of a local newspaper, and cannot stand their editorials, but I still read the paper.

> > As lethargic as ham radio has
> > gotten, we need more people like him, just to wake some of the old farts
up.
> > (speaking in generalities here, not specifics.)
>
> Well, look at the specifics. Wayne Green is one of the oldest farts
> around.
>

So you are saying Wayne is responsible for the lethargy?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3327. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 07:14:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdc55a$qci45$14@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69486

As long as I have a schematics, I can figure it out. Service/tech manuals
are even nicer.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030623210356.25815.00000887@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
> > of modern transceivers?
>
> No problem for me!
>

3328. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 07:40:50 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdc55b$qci45$15@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69487

Here are a few of the things that would be of interest:

*Full motion video (i.e. ATV) that could be remote-control deployed in the field by some form of a device that can also be remote controlled to the scene. This would help keep people safer if it is a haz-mat related situation.

*File sharing capabilities-not just talking about little files here. Possibly sending scans of important documentation or digital camera pictures or a couple of other things as well.

*Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until it is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to HIPAA regulations now, patient information is a concern.

*Speed of getting message information from point A to point B etc., in a faster, timely means, as well as tracking of that information as to who and where that information went and also, the follow up on that information as to "did that really get done?"

These were some of the points referred to as being important.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306240905.78d5f7f1@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bd9jub$q1lkt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> > My comments regarding the "retardation" of the digital capabilities in
ham
> > radio were based upon a recent meeting we had with the local emergency
> > services director and "served agencies." What they need is not at the
level
> > it could and/or should be of what we can offer as hams........ Its gone
> > beyond simple message-grams.
> >
>
> OK, so finish it, don't leave it dangling, what do they need??
>
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
>
> w3rv

3329. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 10:29:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306250229.5f7512f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69474

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030624173042.25052.00000789@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0306221832.dc91692@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >Bug swings are *not* beautiful things although much to their credit
> >they absolutely will drive CW decoders outta their weenie little
> >digicrap minds.
>
> Never had one. Most of the time, knowledgeable ops on the other end don't know
> it's a bug. "Does he...or doesn't he...?"

Not exactly and I can cite the example, I wuz there but I'll spare ya.
This time.

> >Not too much later QST pumped out a construction article on a very
> >early solid state keyer which required laying out the artwork then
> >exposing and developing the circuit board, scounging all the parts and
> >stuffing it yerself. Which I did. Helluva lotta fun & education and it
> >worked tits coming off the bench. After I solder-coated every trace on
> >the board of course. The iambic Mode A paddles was a pair of
> >back-to-back J-38s mounted vertically on a mongo brass base.
>
> ICs or discrete transistors?

Fuzzy at this point . . now that I think about it there were two of
'em. The first one was via discrete devices on a Vectorboard, worked
but not anywhere near as well as the one I described which used 7400
series chips, I think the timer was a 555 and came several years
after the first one. The second one was every bit as good as my
current MFJ keyer and wasn't much bigger plus it had a 110vac P/S
built in.

> >I won't bore you about
> >what I think should be done with the few remaining bugs which are not
> >in collector's museums.
>
> We'll see how well one of them works this weekend...

Yes we will.

Back to the soddering arns . . it's coming . . ! It's coming!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3330. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 10:59:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306250259.47b32051@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69475

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgwr4m0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 22 Jun 2003 19:32:14 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >with a beat-to-crap bug of unknown parentage. I took said bug to the
> >FCC office to take my General sending test. Examiner rolled his eyes
> >upward when I whipped it out and did not give me a sending test. 1954
>
> We had a set of clip les which we used to connect those folks who
> brought their own kets/bugs/keyers but forgot to bring the leads.

I forget how PHL connected to "customer keys". One thing I do
remember though was that Joe was definitely not up for my crap that
morning.

> >.. . something like that. 1625 PA toobs cathode keying daze.
>
> The All American rig - first the tubes went red, then white, then
> blew.....750 V on the plates at 100 mills.

I couldn't hit mine that hard. I trash-picked a TV rcvr on my way home
from school one afternoon for use as the P/S, yanked all the tubes
except the 5U4, powered it up and went poking for volts. Best I could
do was 450 vdc and 12 vac.

> Didn't EVERYONE start with one in thise days?

If they didn't they should have. Those who came after ARC-5 days are
sorta . . well, you know . . junior ops, newbies, etc.

The things are radio engineering masterpieces, the epitome
demonstration of the power of the KISS theory.

> I just ran a quick
> search on eBay for "ARC 5" and there were a couple posted.

They were designed to never quit. And they haven't.

w3rv

3331. Re: Fox and other biased news networks (was: INSIDE THE ARRL ...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 11:44:54 UTC
From: Donnie <"look me up"@qrz.com>
Message-ID: <8k2jfv87k407pftrov7n49ievtfsf839a8@4ax.com>
Source record: 69476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 25 Jun 2003 10:22:53 GMT, "Lloyd/AB4NW" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote:

>On Wed, 25 Jun 2003 02:09:51 GMT, Frank Todd <k3eko@yahoo.com> wrote:
>> Fox News is great...I watch it everyday...Best 24hr news source on the
>> planet! Period!
>
>Fox seems just as bad as any of the others but just biased in a
>diferent direction. they are chearleaders for Busch and his bunch
>just like CNN was chearleeding for the Clintons. It all depends on
>which chearleader you like to watch, but none of the networks are fair
>and balenced like Fox lies that they are. It used to be that the BBC
>was balenced but now even they are biased and even the UK Navy hates
>them. Their is no one left who does unbiased news any more.
>
>We even found out that the PC New York Times let its black reporters
>just make stuff up and that pple who prescribed to it were wasting
>there hard earned money buying a paper full of fiction.
Lloyd,
Does your newsreader have a spell check? If so please use it.

Momma Always Said:"Life is like a box of chocolates, Forrest. You never know what you're gonna get"

3332. Re: Morse Code Test is Gonna Die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 12:22:21 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vfj52jgtgj7ca2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69478

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:DC%Ja.62995$Io.5926710@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> No Morse Code Controversy at WRC-03
>
> NEWINGTON, CT, Jun 24, 2003--Whatever else happens at World
> Radiocommunication Conference 2003 (WRC-03), there's no mystery about the
> delegates' direction regarding the Morse code requirement. Morse code
> proficiency will disappear as a treaty obligation for high-frequency
access
> when the International Telecommunication Union (ITU)-sponsored gathering
> under way in Geneva concludes early next month.
>
> "One matter on which there appears to be no disagreement is the Morse
> requirement," said International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) Secretary (and
> ARRL CEO) David Sumner, K1ZZ, in a report on the second week of activity
at
> WRC-03. "It is clear that the outcome will be to leave it to
> administrations' discretion whether or not to have a Morse receiving and
> sending requirement. No administration participating in the sub-working
> group spoke in favor of retaining the Morse code treaty requirement."
>
> Sumner reports that the wording to modify Article 25.5 of the
international
> Radio Regulations on June 24 cleared Working Group 4C, which is dealing
with
> this and other proposals relating to Article 25.

According to am IARU report, Working Group 4C has until the June 27 to
finish
their work. The Sub-working Group 4C3 had until June 23 to finish.

> It says, "Administrations
> shall determine whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an
> amateur station shall prove the ability to send and receive texts in Morse
> code signals."

It is a meaningless regulation. The adminstration would have that authority
if
S25.5 was simple deleted. As soon as WRC 2003 is finished, most
administration
will make the determination. A few like Belgian and the Netherlands have
already made the determination.

I would personally prefer the rule "Administrations shall determine
whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an amateur station

shall prove the ability solder and test fire-bottles." :-)

Larry, kc8epo

3333. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 12:22:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030625082237.04207.00001095@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 69477

In article <Va1Ka.10687$C83.1058683@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> writes:

>On 23 Jun 2003 22:15:49 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
>>Given that in the year 2000,

Not a valid "given"...
>
> I have more bad news for you. In about 3 years people on the ham bands will
>ask, "What the hell is morse code?" :-0

Three years, huh? Are you willing to make a promise on that?

I recall someone who posted here back on April 2, 1998, and promised to do something very special if the number of hams five years later was greater than the number on that date. We're still waiting for him to make good on his promise.....

The test may disappear, but CW/Morse USE will continue. Use may even increase.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3334. Re: Morse Code Test is Gonna Die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 12:28:04 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vfj5db1hfjt3ff@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69480

Keith,

Thank for the information, but what is the source?
Can not find it on either the ARRL or IARU
web sites.

Larry
~~~~~~

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:DC%Ja.62995$Io.5926710@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> No Morse Code Controversy at WRC-03
>
> NEWINGTON, CT, Jun 24, 2003--Whatever else happens at World
> Radiocommunication Conference 2003 (WRC-03), there's no mystery about the
> delegates' direction regarding the Morse code requirement. Morse code
> proficiency will disappear as a treaty obligation for high-frequency
access
> when the International Telecommunication Union (ITU)-sponsored gathering
> under way in Geneva concludes early next month.
>
> "One matter on which there appears to be no disagreement is the Morse
> requirement," said International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) Secretary (and
> ARRL CEO) David Sumner, K1ZZ, in a report on the second week of activity
at
> WRC-03. "It is clear that the outcome will be to leave it to
> administrations' discretion whether or not to have a Morse receiving and
> sending requirement. No administration participating in the sub-working
> group spoke in favor of retaining the Morse code treaty requirement."
>
> Sumner reports that the wording to modify Article 25.5 of the
international
> Radio Regulations on June 24 cleared Working Group 4C, which is dealing
with
> this and other proposals relating to Article 25. It says, "Administrations
> shall determine whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an
> amateur station shall prove the ability to send and receive texts in Morse
> code signals."
>
> Sumner said it's possible but unlikely that the text would be tinkered
with
> further at the committee level or even in the Plenary, which considers
items
> for adoption. Sumner said delegates continue to wrangle over other aspects
> of Article 25, which defines Amateur Radio operation.
~~~~~~

>
>
> --
> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/

3335. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 12:29:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306250429.71ccf108@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69479

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bcv2tcfql1@208.206.142.69>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0306180943.53208fc9@posting.google.com>...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306180529.25d2c69c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns939AE89B4C9D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > > Not just that there isn't enough of it. If I hear a DX station I can't
> > > > > call him back unless he is listening up, and if I call listening down most
> > > > > of the DX never listen where I can transmit. Yes, I only use phone, but I
> > > > > think you probably guessed that already.
> > > >
> > > > From the perspective of the DX that problem is not all bad. In a
> > > > scenario where everybody can transcieve with everybody they would have
> > > > nowhere to hide and be able to work each other without getting pounded
> > > > by the hordes of Yanks calling them. Particularly given the usual weak
> > > > signals on 40. This could be a case of being careful about what they
> > > > ask for because they might get it.
> > > >
> > > > w3rv
> > >
> > > Like having to beam across Japan to work Europe from Guam. I would
> > > have to work hundreds of JA's hoping the band didn't close before I
> > > got thru them all.
> > >
> > > Or I would call Europe only, and the JA's were very respectful and
> > > polite. No problems. When I would slip and leave Europe out of the
> > > CQ, there the JAs were again. Again, no problem.
> > >
> > > If only the Yanks were as well behaved, your premonition of DX having
> > > to hide...
> >
> > Exactly my point. Thankew.
>
> Should we go into the reasons why so many Yanks are not well behaved?

Because they've been hams for 40+ years and think they own all of hamdom?

3336. The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 12:31:59 UTC
From: "twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <44176N919@web2news.com>
Source record: 69481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Like many Alpha Tango members I have DXed over 100 confirmed countries on 12 whiskey SSB, worldwide without the need for license or expense of ham radio.

I have everything a man could ask for without the additional volunteer headache Uncle Charlie could induce by means of harassment. Besides,,I like the freeband way better than the HF hammie bands and repeaters.

And I do it barefoot 99% of the time..only time I use power, is when it's something really rare and I have exhausted myself with my 3 watts..then, and only then, I may elect to toss out a hundred watts,,,maximum. That "crime" is less than the fine and imprisonment that you can get for taping a movie from HBO.

No cber has been prosecuted (during this or the last administration) for merely operating an amp or talking DX or freebanding without receiveing a warning. So, to set the record straight, a warning letter outlining the infractions is to be issued to the offending station as a warning. Fail to heed the warning and you may find yourself facing a fine. Underline the word "may". This reduces the relative risk and associated penalty to a petty infraction comparable to jaywalking.

I have spoken to Mr. Hollingsworth personally, and I can assure you, even if he thinks that slightly exceeding power limits is ok, he can't verbalize it due his present position.

There are many hammies on the freeband...and guess what? They are cool as all get out!!! Us cbersare a friendlier lot. We really don'tgive a rat's azz if a hammie talks on cb,,,we'lll talk to him anyways...probably why they come on down in the first place,,,so they can escape the frequency fuzz and just......enjoy radio.

RS 1175, FL

No flames answered.
Emails only:
twistedhed@hotmail.com

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3337. The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 12:33:28 UTC
From: "twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <44177N008@web2news.com>
Source record: 69482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Like many Alpha Tango members I have DXed over 100 confirmed countries on 12 whiskey SSB, worldwide without the need for license or expense of ham radio.

I have everything a man could ask for without the additional volunteer headache Uncle Charlie could induce by means of harassment. Besides,,I like the freeband way better than the HF hammie bands and repeaters.

And I do it barefoot 99% of the time..only time I use power, is when it's something really rare and I have exhausted myself with my 3 watts..then, and only then, I may elect to toss out a hundred watts,,,maximum. That "crime" is less than the fine and imprisonment that you can get for taping a movie from HBO.

No cber has been prosecuted (during this or the last administration) for merely operating an amp or talking DX or freebanding without receiveing a warning. So, to set the record straight, a warning letter outlining the infractions is to be issued to the offending station as a warning. Fail to heed the warning and you may find yourself facing a fine. Underline the word "may". This reduces the relative risk and associated penalty to a petty infraction comparable to jaywalking.

I have spoken to Mr. Hollingsworth personally, and I can assure you, even if he thinks that slightly exceeding power limits is ok, he can't verbalize it due his present position.

There are many hammies on the freeband...and guess what? They are cool as all get out!!! Us cbersare a friendlier lot. We really don'tgive a rat's azz if a hammie talks on cb,,,we'lll talk to him anyways...probably why they come on down in the first place,,,so they can escape the frequency fuzz and just......enjoy radio.

RS 1175, FL

No flames answered.
Emails only:
twistedhed@hotmail.com

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3338. Re: Morse Code Test is Gonna Die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 13:03:32 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A55C1C71552elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69488

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in
news:vfj5db1hfjt3ff@corp.supernews.com:

> Keith,
>
> Thank for the information, but what is the source?
> Can not find it on either the ARRL or IARU
> web sites.
>
> Larry
> ~~~~~~
>
> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:DC%Ja.62995$Io.5926710@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>> No Morse Code Controversy at WRC-03
>>
>> NEWINGTON, CT, Jun 24, 2003--Whatever else happens at World
>> Radiocommunication Conference 2003 (WRC-03), there's no mystery about
>> the delegates' direction regarding the Morse code requirement. Morse
>> code proficiency will disappear as a treaty obligation for
>> high-frequency access when the International Telecommunication Union
>> (ITU)-sponsored gathering under way in Geneva concludes early next
>> month.
>>
>> "One matter on which there appears to be no disagreement is the Morse
>> requirement," said International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) Secretary
>> (and ARRL CEO) David Sumner, K1ZZ, in a report on the second week of
>> activity at WRC-03. "It is clear that the outcome will be to leave it
>> to administrations' discretion whether or not to have a Morse
>> receiving and sending requirement. No administration participating in
>> the sub-working group spoke in favor of retaining the Morse code
>> treaty requirement."
>>
>> Sumner reports that the wording to modify Article 25.5 of the
>> international Radio Regulations on June 24 cleared Working Group 4C,
>> which is dealing with this and other proposals relating to Article 25.
>> It says, "Administrations shall determine whether or not a person
>> seeking a license to operate an amateur station shall prove the
>> ability to send and receive texts in Morse code signals."
>>
>> Sumner said it's possible but unlikely that the text would be tinkered
>> with further at the committee level or even in the Plenary, which
>> considers items for adoption. Sumner said delegates continue to
>> wrangle over other aspects of Article 25, which defines Amateur Radio

>> operation.
>>
>>
>> --
>> NW Oregon Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
>> http://home.earthlink.net/~kilowattradio/
>
>

It's buried right at the end of the news on the ARRL's site, and it
contains a link to the IARU news release

3339. Re: Morse Code Test is Gonna Die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 13:05:17 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A55C68AAA7Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69489

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in
news:vfj52jgtgj7ca2@corp.supernews.com:

> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:DC%Ja.62995$Io.5926710@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>> No Morse Code Controversy at WRC-03
>>
>> NEWINGTON, CT, Jun 24, 2003--Whatever else happens at World
>> Radiocommunication Conference 2003 (WRC-03), there's no mystery about
>> the delegates' direction regarding the Morse code requirement. Morse
>> code proficiency will disappear as a treaty obligation for
>> high-frequency access when the International Telecommunication Union
>> (ITU)-sponsored gathering under way in Geneva concludes early next
>> month.
>>
>> "One matter on which there appears to be no disagreement is the Morse
>> requirement," said International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) Secretary
>> (and ARRL CEO) David Sumner, K1ZZ, in a report on the second week of
>> activity at WRC-03. "It is clear that the outcome will be to leave it
>> to administrations' discretion whether or not to have a Morse
>> receiving and sending requirement. No administration participating in
>> the sub-working group spoke in favor of retaining the Morse code
>> treaty requirement."
>>
>> Sumner reports that the wording to modify Article 25.5 of the
>> international Radio Regulations on June 24 cleared Working Group 4C,
>> which is dealing with this and other proposals relating to Article 25.
>
> According to am IARU report, Working Group 4C has until the June 27 to
> finish
> their work. The Sub-working Group 4C3 had until June 23 to finish.
>
>> It says, "Administrations
>> shall determine whether or not a person seeking a license to operate
>> an amateur station shall prove the ability to send and receive texts
>> in Morse code signals."
>
> It is a meaningless regulation. The adminstration would have that
> authority if
> S25.5 was simple deleted.

This language was necessary to appease the few countries that are
retaining the test, such as Germany and Russia

> As soon as WRC 2003 is finished, most
> administration
> will make the determination. A few like Belgian and the Netherlands
> have already made the determination.
>
> I would personally prefer the rule "Administrations shall determine
> whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an amateur station
> shall prove the ability solder and test fire-bottles." :-)
>
> Larry, kc8epo
>
>

3340. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 13:56:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF9A9FE.2AFF229A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69490

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> I am sure he is a thorn in the CQ magazines' side as well too eh? I have
> read most of the 73 magazines from the 70's through the 90's and the
> magazine itself is still pretty good, regardless of the editorial. Wayne
> has had *some* good ideas, but in the real world the "stick in the mud"
> types would never allow any of that stuff to happen.

You do realize, don't you, Ryan, that Wayne was editor of CQ for a time?
He was fired and that set off his anti-CQ vendetta.

Dave K8MN

3341. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 14:05:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF9AC03.A5D0DE08@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69491

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EF89CCE.20886796@earthlink.net...
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> > >
> > > The thing I *do* like about Wayne is that he gets people thinking......
> I
> > > kinda compare him as the "Rush Limbaugh" of ham radio.
> >
> > As far as I know, Rush has never been into UFO nets, Bluegrass CDs,
> > decades of anti-ARRL rants or cold fusion.
>
> True.... but as I predicted to myself, you have proven a point about someone
> not fully reading the text.... see where it said about speaking in
> generalities, not specifics. They are both agitators.

I read what you wrote and I disagreed. I don't think of Rush as an
agitator and I don't think of Wayne Green as stable.

> >
> >
> > > Whether or not you
> > > agree with him or not, he gets you thinking.
> >
> > He certainly does. I subscribed to "73" back in 1975. In just a few
> > months I began thinking that I'd wasted my money. At renewal time, I
> > thought that I'd save my money and skip "73".
> >
> >
>
> Well.... I don't agree with his editorials, but from the issues I have read
> from somewhere in the 70's till the late 90's there were alot of articles,
> project and construction plans etc. that was not written by him, that were
> actually good. To discount a whole mag due to who writes the editorial is
> kinda foolish, but is a persons option. I hate the editor of a local
> newspaper, and cannot stand their editorials, but I still read the paper.

Actually, 73's construction articles were better in the early 1960's.
Much of the later stuff is quite basic. There was also a tendency to
swerve toward computers rather than amateur radio in the mid-1970's and
beyond. I recall telling Wayne at Dayton that I would have subscribed
to a computer magazine if I'd wanted a computer magazine.

> > > As lethargic as ham radio has
> > > gotten, we need more people like him, just to wake some of the old farts
> up.
> > > (speaking in generalities here, not specifics.)
> >
> > Well, look at the specifics. Wayne Green is one of the oldest farts
> > around.
> >
>
> So you are saying Wayne is responsible for the lethargy?

First we'd have to establish that there is lethargy. To quote you, "but
as I predicted to myself, you have proven a point about someone
not fully reading the text....". I wrote that Wayne is one of the
oldest farts around.

Dave K8MN

3342. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 14:11:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EF9AD82.2C24EBEC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69492

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Here are a few of the things that would be of interest:
>
> *Full motion video (i.e. ATV) that could be remote-control deployed in the
> field by some form of a device that can also be remote controlled to the
> scene. This would help keep people safer if it is a haz-mat related
> situation.

ATV is available now. I prefer to leave hazardous material situations
to trained professionals.

> *File sharing capabilities-not just talking about little files here.
> Possibly sending scans of important documentation or digital camera pictures
> or a couple of other things as well.

Such things are available now, though they use COTS units over pretty
short distances.

> *Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until it
> is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to HIPAA
> regulations now, patient information is a concern.

What you're proposing is illegal in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

3343. License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 15:27:51 UTC
From: thomas <word_pass@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <bdcf45$r0os7$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69493
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I just bought a 2-way radio that supports both GMRS and FRS:

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/B000093IK8

I actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all. My question is: If I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?

When I placed the order, I was told: "GMRS channels require FCC license. ". I assume this means FRS channels do not require FCC license, unless the Amazon.com description is misleading.

Please help me with this issue so that I can start to use my radio!

Thanks!
Thomas

3344. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 15:36:29 UTC
From: James Williams <no@thankyou.org>
Message-ID: <1kjKa.150830$cm4.2988134@twister.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 69495
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote :
>
> If
> I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?

No.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3345. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 15:45:34 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <ysjKa.79947$Pc5.13298@fed1read01>
Source record: 69494
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The FCC page at URL:
http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/family/
Will answer your questions
Better to get it from the Horse's mouth rather than any guesses you may
receive.

Although you "actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all". Why
not get the license and make full use of your radio ??? Comes the day you
may want or need it.

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:bdcf45$r0os7$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de...
> I just bought a 2-way radio that supports both GMRS and FRS:
>
> http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/B000093IK8
>
> I actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all. My question is:
If
> I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?
>
> When I placed the order, I was told: "GMRS channels require FCC license.
".
> I assume this means FRS channels do not require FCC license, unless the
> Amazon.com description is misleading.
>
> Please help me with this issue so that I can start to use my radio!
>
> Thanks!
> Thomas
>
>

3346. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 16:01:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306250801.25212083@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69496

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306241359.263eef55@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306240859.323477a8@posting.google.com>...
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgycf44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>
> > The result has been a large number of abortions, and a large number of
> > baby girls in orphanages. Usually the babies were abandoned in places
> > where there was a high probability that they would be found quickly.
>
> They put 'em in the woods to die is what they've done and last I heard
> they still do.

Not according to the Inky story, though it's possible that still goes
on.

> When foreign visitors find these babies here and there
> and scoop them up the Chinese consider it a quaint reaction.

They now have an extensive system of state-run orphanages that handle
foreign adoptions. Prospective parents submit an app and wait an
average of 14 months, then spend two weeks in China to get the kid.
Newborn adoptions are rare, usually the kids are 1-1/2 to 2 years old.

Yet they are already beginning to see the repercussions of decades of
the one-kid rules and the obsession with having sons. Main one is a
shortage of potential brides.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3347. Re: Operator Skills (was: WRC (Was Re: 5MHZ authorized JULY 3))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 16:42:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306250842.746c0895@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69497

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<I3_Ja.12758$Kg7.6113@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030623210356.25815.00000888@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > In article <seHJa.9236$Kg7.5329@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
> > <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
> >
> > >Amusing.
> > >
> > Bert,
> >
> > Do you recognize who I was responding to in that post with the original
> list?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> That's what made it so amusing.

Indeed.

> I also took note that the subject's USENET
> etiquette was a tad more abrasive than the moe recently displayed polish.
> IOW, a budding pseudo-politician.

Only a tad more abrasive, as seen in this post:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=keV_9.2605%24N5.1476932%40nnrp1.ptd.net&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain

And my reply:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20030201163653.12173.00000313%40mb-mr.aol.com&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain

Note the comment about what "folks in the minority" should do when
told no. And my reply...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3348. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 18:00:01 UTC
From: "Renboov, Noraa, Rs." <markunread.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <44351N601@web2news.com>
Source record: 69498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> <snip>
> troll bait

sorry that does not sound like akc generated material, it may be a 3rd rogue Geo clone operating indepentdently, or from the looks of it they are twistys actual words so it could be a post by him using another acct.

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3349. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 18:34:10 UTC
From: thomas <word_pass@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <bdcq1j$qni7q$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69499
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thank you!

I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:

"If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
detachable antennas."

If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
seems to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
clarifies for me?

The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The radio is
very cheap even with GMRS support.

Thomas

"AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> wrote in message
news:ysjKa.79947$Pc5.13298@fed1read01...
> The FCC page at URL:
> http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/family/
> Will answer your questions
> Better to get it from the Horse's mouth rather than any guesses you may
> receive.
>
> Although you "actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all". Why
> not get the license and make full use of your radio ??? Comes the day you
> may want or need it.
>
>
> "thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:bdcf45$r0os7$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de...
> > I just bought a 2-way radio that supports both GMRS and FRS:
> >
> > http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/B000093IK8
> >
> > I actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all. My question
is:
> If
> > I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?
> >

> > When I placed the order, I was told: "GMRS channels require FCC
license.
> ".
> > I assume this means FRS channels do not require FCC license, unless the
> > Amazon.com description is misleading.
> >
> > Please help me with this issue so that I can start to use my radio!
> >
> > Thanks!
> > Thomas
> >
> >
>
>

3350. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 19:26:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF9F77D.5010608@psu.edu>
Source record: 69500

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Here are a few of the things that would be of interest:
>
> *Full motion video (i.e. ATV) that could be remote-control deployed in the
> field by some form of a device that can also be remote controlled to the
> scene. This would help keep people safer if it is a haz-mat related
> situation.

That would be cool!

> *File sharing capabilities-not just talking about little files here.
> Possibly sending scans of important documentation or digital camera pictures
> or a couple of other things as well.

Perhaps in a few years.

> *Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until it
> is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to HIPAA
> regulations now, patient information is a concern.

hmmmmmm, now you're getting into a really gray area. The amateur bands
are by definition open to whoever has a radio. Anyone can listen.

> *Speed of getting message information from point A to point B etc., in a
> faster, timely means, as well as tracking of that information as to who and
> where that information went and also, the follow up on that information as
> to "did that really get done?"

Sounds like they need full time, professional communicators.

How much faster doya need? I'm not sure how to speed up RF! (cheap one,
I know 8^))

Tracking of messages seems like something that is their responsibility.
I mean the Hams can send what they are told to. Just set up a protocol.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3351. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 19:54:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EF9FDE8.5070604@psu.edu>
Source record: 69501

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940@posting.google.com...
>
>>Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
>>were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the
>>assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
>>who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K
>>loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about
>>104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
>>"20WPM Extras"!
>>
>>So - CONGRATULATIONS to the ham community in general, we've just
>>passed another big milestone on the way to erasing the perception
>>among the general community, that ham radio is obsolete.
>>
>>... and in that light... With the increasing amount of sophisticated
>>and low-cost HF rigs becoming available, many more of us "Extra and
>>General Lights" have been getting the chance to play around with the
>>PSK-31 lately - which EVERYONE knows is more efficient than Morse
>>Code.
>>
>>So, as PSK-31 begins to "MUSCLE OUT" Morse Code, the popularity of HF
>>will resurge, HF rig capabilities will continue to expand, and prices
>>and sizes of these radios will continue to drop... it is hard to
>>understand why the sourpuss 13WPM/20WPM diehards fought so hard, for
>>so long - when it is SO CLEAR that we are all now benefitting from the
>>changes.
>>
>>- Stewart (N0MHS)
>
>
> Yeah we sure are. How many of the 100K plus extra lights know how to put up
> a dipole? My guess. 3.

And I'm one of them! 8^)

But hey! I never had the chance to become otherwise, as I only became
interested at a late date. They still had the old regs when I became a
tech, but had dropped to 5wpm by the time I upgraded.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3352. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 20:20:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306251220.7e3feb18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69502

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306250229.5f7512f9@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030624173042.25052.00000789@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0306221832.dc91692@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > >Not too much later QST pumped out a construction article on a very
> > >early solid state keyer which required laying out the artwork then
> > >exposing and developing the circuit board, scounging all the parts and
> > >stuffing it yerself. Which I did. Helluva lotta fun & education and it
> > >worked tits coming off the bench. After I solder-coated every trace on
> > >the board of course. The iambic Mode A paddles was a pair of
> > >back-to-back J-38s mounted vertically on a mongo brass base.
> >
> > ICs or discrete transistors?
>
> Fuzzy at this point . . now that I think about it there were two of
> 'em. The first one was via discrete devices on a Vectorboard, worked
> but not anywhere near as well as the one I described which used 7400
> series chips, I think the timer was a 555 and came several years
> after the first one. The second one was every bit as good as my
> current MFJ keyer and wasn't much bigger plus it had a 110vac P/S
> built in.
>
Perhaps you are thinking of the "Accu-keyer"

There were all sorts of designs out there. I recall April 1968, third
QST in my subscription, cover article used RTL chips for a keyer
powered by two D cells.

For many hams, building a keyer was their intro to logic design.

> > >I won't bore you about
> > >what I think should be done with the few remaining bugs which are not
> > >in collector's museums.
> >
> > We'll see how well one of them works this weekend...
>
> Yes we will.
>
> Back to the soddering arns . . it's coming . . ! It's coming!

I've almost got the "FD in a shopping bag" thing going. Let's
see...K2, big gell cell, 'phones, dipole w/coax & rope, homebrew

launcher (P51 slingshot w/Zebco 202 reel and 1 oz weights painted flourescent orange), ropes, tent, folding table, wad of various cables, clock, lantern, logpapers and pencils, toolkit, cooler of eatables....and oh yeah, a bug.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3353. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 20:27:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306251227.7d9a448c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69503

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A2E23C78588elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> <SNIP>
> >
> > Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to run
> > SSB down to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I mistaken,
> > Alun?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Yes, you're mistaken, I only want to go down to 7.045, as per IARU
> recommendations for regions 1 and 2 (it's 7.030 for region 3), and I have
> never asked even for that, as I know we won't get it. In the earlier
> thread I only suggested SSB down to 7.075, which is what US licenced hams
> in region 3 already have.

TNX for the update.

Trouble is, if we get worldwide 7000-7200 or even 7000-7300, and the
SWBCs move, the argument for US hams getting 'phone down to 7045 or
even 7075 gets weaker because there will be lots of spectrum where US
and DX hams can work each other nonsplit if they so desire.

Which leaves us with three questions:

1) How will the 40 meter situation work out?

2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?

3) What other changes should be made in the US license structure and
regs?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3354. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 21:05:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFA0EA3.80605@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
trollometer: ||||||.........................
```

3355. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 21:34:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdd4ereve1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69505

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0306250801.25212083@posting.google.com...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306241359.263eef55@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306240859.323477a8@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgycf44.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> >
> > > The result has been a large number of abortions, and a large number of
> > > baby girls in orphanages. Usually the babies were abandoned in places
> > > where there was a high probability that they would be found quickly.
> >
> > They put 'em in the woods to die is what they've done and last I heard
> > they still do.
>
> Not according to the Inky story, though it's possible that still goes
> on.
>
> > When foreign visitors find these babies here and there
> > and scoop them up the Chinese consider it a quaint reaction.
>
> They now have an extensive system of state-run orphanages that handle
> foreign adoptions. Prospective parents submit an app and wait an
> average of 14 months, then spend two weeks in China to get the kid.
> Newborn adoptions are rare, usually the kids are 1-1/2 to 2 years old.
>
> Yet they are already beginning to see the repercussions of decades of
> the one-kid rules and the obsession with having sons. Main one is a
> shortage of potential brides.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Somehow I have a problem with 'foreign' tourists wandering in and out of the
Chinese Flora and Fauna without a 'official tour guide'.

As they say What is wrong with this picture ?

Dan/W4NTI

3356. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 21:45:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306251345.3820970@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69506

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bdc55b$qci45$15@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> Here are a few of the things that would be of interest:
>
> *Full motion video (i.e. ATV) that could be remote-control deployed in the
> field by some form of a device that can also be remote controlled to the
> scene. This would help keep people safer if it is a haz-mat related
> situation.

The ATV is no particular problem but a reliable self-propelled
all-terrain RC robot is another whole story. They already exist (bomb
squads) and I've been involved in the mechanical design of such
widgets at the professional level for decades and I can tell you
somebody better have very deep pockets and a bunch of expertise well
beyond just the electronics a la AMSAT. The electronics would be the
easy part.

> *File sharing capabilities-not just talking about little files here.
> Possibly sending scans of important documentation or digital camera pictures
> or a couple of other things as well.

Hellschreiber for document & photo scans.

> *Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until it
> is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to HIPAA
> regulations now, patient information is a concern.

That's not a ham function and I wouldn't touch it with a ten foot pole
even if it was.

> *Speed of getting message information from point A to point B etc., in a
> faster, timely means, as well as tracking of that information as to who and
> where that information went and also, the follow up on that information as
> to "did that really get done?"

That's mostly an organization design problem, I pass.

> These were some of the points referred to as being important.

Interesting shopping list, tnx Ryan.

> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)

w3rv

3357. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 22:00:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306251400.18ef6112@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69507

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bdc55a$qci45$14@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> As long as I have a schematics, I can figure it out. Service/tech manuals
> are even nicer.

Really? Then you might get . . . But N2EY has first dibs, he stuck his
foot in it first plus he's in the neighborhood. Frigging thing weighs
55 pounds, UPS loves it.

>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX

w3rv

3358. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 22:04:38 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <W%oKa.81303$Pc5.40158@fed1read01>
Source record: 69508

What cave are you in -- here in CA the 20M band is loaded with RTTY, PSK31, PACKET, ETC. The 10M, 12M, and 15M bands are kaput due to declining solar cycle and summer conditions. But having worked almost all 50 states and mucho DX on PSK31 on 20M -- I can tell you that there is a LOT of activity

3359. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 22:08:06 UTC
From: "twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <44441N486@web2news.com>
Source record: 69509

Robert Casey wrote:
> trollometer: ||||||.....................

No it's not a troll, it's a fact, and I have been saying the same thing for years. Why should I get a hammie license and let Uncle Sam gather info on me and dictate my free speech make me adhere to rules etc. when I can freeband and have the same worldwide DX as you hams do? For one tenth the cost and one zeroeth the trouble. Most hams don't care what we freebanders do as long as we stay at 29.999 and only certain failed no code types who suffer communication deficits like Nad and Frankie howl and strain at the leash I keep them on.

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3360. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 22:15:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh1osda.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69510

On 25 Jun 2003 03:59:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> The All American rig - first the tubes went red, then white, then
>> blew.....750 V on the plates at 100 mills.
>
>I couldn't hit mine that hard. I trash-picked a TV rcvr on my way home
>from school one afternoon for use as the P/S, yanked all the tubes
>except the 5U4, powered it up and went poking for volts. Best I could
>do was 450 vdc and 12 vac.

That was more like what we ran most of the time....anything above
550 V hastened the Fourth of July light show, specs on the 1625s
notwithstanding.

>> Didn't EVERYONE start with one in thise days?
>
>If they didn't they should have. Those who came after ARC-5 days are
>sorta . . well, you know . . junior ops, newbies, etc.
>
>The things are radio engineering masterpieces, the epitome
>demonstration of the power of the KISS theory.
>
>> I just ran a quick
>> search on eBay for "ARC 5" and there were a couple posted.
>
>They were designed to never quit. And they haven't.

Amen. Still haven't found the Q5er, though. There were a couple of
FRG 7700s and the Icom equivalent (R71) at about $400+ which is $300+
more than I want to invest in that project, if that much.

Just gave my never-been-used 40-20-15-10 parallel dipole to the
AREC/RACES group to put up at the EOC (never had enough room to put
it up withourt a noticeable sag onto the rear deck superstructure).
Someone else donated the wire for an 80-m dipole.

The Sheriff just bought us two brand-new 45 foot telephone poles
which the power company 'sposed to set next week. We insisted on
two pulley and halyard sets per pole although we do have "dibs" on
the local fire department's bucket/ ladder truck (which we
affectionately call "The Intimidator") if we need it.

I may play around with converting my three-sided long wire to a
horizontal loop for NVIS. That ought to work well for state-wide
60-m RACES comms if I ever get a HF transceiver.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3361. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-25 23:50:23 UTC
From: John Passaneau <w3jxp@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3zqKa.17805$Jw6.7300828@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 69511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Why not use a dummy load, then you don't need to tune of at all.

--
John Passaneau W3JXP
State College, Pa
w3jxp@adelphia.net

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EF921D4.6030904@ix.netcom.com...
> JJ wrote:
>
> >
> > This would require those hams to act like gentlemen, something that is
> > beyond a lot of hams today.
> >
> >
> You mean that I don't need to off tune my rig a few KHz off of some
> interesting DX
> to tune up the rig into my antenna? Didn't want to "carrier chuck" on
> top of other
> QSOs......
>

3362. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 00:07:55 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.com>
Message-ID: <vPqKa.14716$XV.1179833@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 69512
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Typical dumbass ham attempt at humor.....sigh.

"John Passaneau" <w3jxp@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3zqKa.17805$Jw6.7300828@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Why not use a dummy load, then you don't need to tune of at all.
>
>
>
>
> --
> John Passaneau W3JXP
> State College, Pa
> w3jxp@adelphia.net
>
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3EF921D4.6030904@ix.netcom.com...
> > JJ wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > This would require those hams to act like gentlemen, something that is
> > > beyond a lot of hams today.
> > >
> > >
> > > You mean that I don't need to off tune my rig a few KHz off of some
> > > interesting DX
> > > to tune up the rig into my antenna? Didn't want to "carrier chuck" on
> > > top of other
> > > QSOs......
> > >
>
>

3363. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 00:09:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFA399C.1010807@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69513

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>The thing about learning CW up to around 20WPM is that even IF you don't use
>it....you keep it. Sure you may slow down, but you keep it.
>
>
But does it help when you want to put a dipole up?

:-)

3364. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 00:39:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFA40B4.4070000@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69514
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

John Passaneau wrote:

>Why not use a dummy load, then you don't need to tune of at all.
>
>
>
>
>
>
Normally yes, but I have to tune the rig to load into the imperfect
antenna I have.

3365. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 00:51:34 UTC
From: Daniel Martin <dwmartin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <vfkg78f2m28i80@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69515
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If you operate a radio under the rules
that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license

If it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, you better get a duck license.

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:bdcq1j$qni7q$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de...
> Thank you!
>
> I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
>
> "If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
> that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have
a
> maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
> integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
> that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
> transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
> detachable antennas."
>
> If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
> **seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
> clarifies for me?
>
> The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The radio is
> very cheap even with GMRS support.
>
> Thomas
>
>
>
>
>
> "AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> wrote in message
> news:ysjKa.79947$Pc5.13298@fed1read01...
> > The FCC page at URL:
> > http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/family/
> > Will answer your questions
> > Better to get it from the Horse's mouth rather than any guesses you may
> > receive.
> >
> > Although you "actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all".
Why
> > not get the license and make full use of your radio ??? Comes the day

you
> > may want or need it.
> >
> >
> > "thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:bdcf45$r0os7$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de...
> > > I just bought a 2-way radio that supports both GMRS and FRS:
> > >
> > > http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/B000093IK8
> > >
> > > I actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all. My question
> is:
> > If
> > > I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?
> > >
> > > When I placed the order, I was told: "GMRS channels require FCC
> license.
> > ".
> > > I assume this means FRS channels do not require FCC license, unless
the
> > > Amazon.com description is misleading.
> > >
> > > Please help me with this issue so that I can start to use my radio!
> > >
> > > Thanks!
> > > Thomas
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

3366. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 01:16:28 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306251716.940105c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69516
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<bdcq1j$qni7q$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>...
> Thank you!
>
> I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
>
> "If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
> that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
> maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
> integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
> that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
> transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
> detachable antennas."
>
> If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
> **seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
> clarifies for me?
>
> The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The radio is
> very cheap even with GMRS support.
>
> Thomas

Look - the GMRS feature on these radios is a USELESS GIMMICK. Forget
about using those frequencies or getting a license for them.

3367. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 01:18:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh1zszd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69517

On 25 Jun 2003 14:45:42 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> *Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until it
>> is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to HIPAA
>> regulations now, patient information is a concern.
>
>That's not a ham function and I wouldn't touch it with a ten foot pole
>even if it was.

Public-key data encryption w/128-bit keys is freeware (PGP) - a
no-brainer. STU-III equivalent phones are available for purchase
legally if you have enough bucks (The Big Emm really gets you for
those). Not legal on ham radio, though.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3368. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 01:18:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh1yacc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69518
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 25 Jun 2003 14:34:10 -0400, thomas wrote:

>I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
>
>"If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
>that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
>maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
>integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
>that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
>transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
>detachable antennas."
>
>If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
>**seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
>clarifies for me?

If it operates exclusively on the 14 FRS channels and is type certified
as an FRS-only radio you do not need a license.

If it operates on more than the 14 FRS channels (which are shared
with the GMRS) it is not a FRS radio and you do need a GMRS license
even if you operate it only on the FRS channels.

It's that simple.

&75 for a five year license = $15 per year, $1.25 per month, less
than one large soft drink at the fast food place per month.

Small Change.

--
73 de K2ASP/KAE9605 - Phil Kane
Communications Attorney

3369. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 01:25:48 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <jqikfvsv6mkc8c18nh02t1tkp1912du0r8@4ax.com>
Source record: 69519
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 25 Jun 2003 14:34:10 -0400, "thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com>
wrote:

>Thank you!
>
>I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
>
>"If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
>that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
>maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
>integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
>that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
>transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
>detachable antennas."
>
>If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
>**seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
>clarifies for me?
>
>The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The radio is
>very cheap even with GMRS support.
>
>Thomas

On FRS channels 8 - 14 the radio IS an FRS radio. You do not need a
license to operate it on those channels.

Mike

3370. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 02:05:22 UTC
From: thomas <word_pass@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <bddkfm$r775c$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69520
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The spec of my radio says: 1. "Output Power 500mW Conducted" 2. Antenna is non-detachable.

These conflicts with the FCC text:

>>GMRS radios generally transmit at higher power levels
>>(1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have detachable antennas.

Also how can you interpret the verb "operate" in the FCC text? Doesn't the using of this word mean I can own but not operate?

>>If you operate a radio under the rules that apply to GMRS

You tried to divide the fee evenly. Actually I only use the radio several times a year. The per-use cost is high, as least for me.

Thomas

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message news:cuvyxnansvbet.hh1yacc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 25 Jun 2003 14:34:10 -0400, thomas wrote:
>
> >I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
> >
> >"If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
> >that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
> >maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
> >integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
> >that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
> >transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
> >detachable antennas."
> >
> >If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
> >**seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
> >clarifies for me?
>
> If it operates exclusively on the 14 FRS channels and is type certified
> as an FRS-only radio you do not need a license.
>
> If it operates on more than the 14 FRS channels (which are shared
> with the GMRS) it is not a FRS radio and you do need a GMRS license
> even if you operate it only on the FRS channels.

>
> It's that simple.
>
> &75 for a five year license = $15 per year, $1.25 per month, less
> than one large soft drink at the fast food place per month.
>
> Small Change.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP/KAE9605 - Phil Kane
> Communications Attorney
>

3371. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 02:36:25 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86u1adh8eu.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 69521

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

The one thing I took away from that article that truly fascinates me
is that this is the third time a section manager has been recalled --
and that all three of the recalls have taken place in the past fifteen
years. Does that say anything about "the state of the hobby"?

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE++lwuGPFSfAB/ezgRAi3xAJ0SdvKfAipuIK/CQcsfzIO3w0Tz5wCgwtdg
Gvc9rMYpRm3rEIDM0URbjBM=
=nKQT
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3372. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 02:40:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <H2tKa.2233$Vx2.1145172@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69522

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:aXjKa.11972$C83.1174575@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> [snip]
> In America there should 2 to 3 million ham radio operators at minimum and
> if we don't increase the number of ham radio operators that are active on
> the bands ham radio will be just another bookmark in the radio or wireless
> history book.

Since the number of hams is growing faster than the general population,
there is not a problem.

Why should we have 2 to 3 million? What purpose would it serve? To create
an artificial interest and pull in a large number of hams won't help. They
might get licensed but then would drop it in favor of something else.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3373. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 02:43:32 UTC
From: John Passaneau <w3jxp@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <o5tKa.18078$Jw6.7351051@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 69523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Well it may be dumb ass ham humor, but I wish I could kick the ass of all the dumb asses that tune up for minutes on end on the air on or near a weak DX station. As for tuning into an imperfect antenna, you can use a dummy load to get close, then touch it up on the air QUICKLY! The ham bands would be a nicer place to listen to if everyone had a dummy load and used it. So stupid is as stupid does....

--
John Passaneau W3JXP
State College, Pa
w3jxp@adelphia.net

"Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote in message
news:vPqKa.14716$XV.1179833@twister.austin.rr.com...
> Typical dumbass ham attempt at humor.......sigh.
>
>
> "John Passaneau" <w3jxp@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3zqKa.17805$Jw6.7300828@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Why not use a dummy load, then you don't need to tune of at all.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > John Passaneau W3JXP
> > State College, Pa
> > w3jxp@adelphia.net
> >
> >
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3EF921D4.6030904@ix.netcom.com...
> > > JJ wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > This would require those hams to act like gentlemen, something that
is
> > > > beyond a lot of hams today.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > You mean that I don't need to off tune my rig a few KHz off of some
> > > > interesting DX
> > > > to tune up the rig into my antenna? Didn't want to "carrier chuck"
on

> > > top of other
> > > QSOs......
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

3374. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 02:54:03 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.com>
Message-ID: <fftKa.25210$hV.1282065@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 69524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EFA40B4.4070000@ix.netcom.com...
> John Passaneau wrote:
>
> >Why not use a dummy load, then you don't need to tune of at all.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> Normally yes, but I have to tune the rig to load into the imperfect
> antenna I have.
>

At least someone understands the concept.

3375. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 02:56:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030625225625.16033.00001238@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 69525

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)

> Do you have a degree or certificate as an RD or nutritionist?

No. It is obvious that what that the food was very bad for you. Alot of fat and alot of calories.

> You seem to want to go to radio activities and do ANYTHING except operate >radios!
>

I operated radios during the day. I would not like it if I hadn't operated radios at all.

There is a time and place. Would you wear a suit at the beach or the reverse? By analogy, Hams often wear a suit at the beach. If this were different, there would be alot more Hams. And there would be more people operating radios.

Also, there are other interesting <radio> activities one can do. I can suggest them, but there never seems a proper time to make suggestions. Hams don't seem to be interested in other radio activities besides contesting.

3376. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 02:58:33 UTC
From: JAS <maxleonard@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <bddnhe01668@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 69530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
TROLL-O-METER
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 +10 +20
||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

BULLSHIT-O-METER
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 +10 +20
||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

DUMBASS-O-METER
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 +10 +20
||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Move along folks. Nothing to see here. Just a troll having a seizure.
Show's over. Keep it moving.

--
----
***
"twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in
message news:44176N919@web2news.com...
>
[ Nothing of value snipped. ]
```

3377. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:01:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bddnm9gic0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 69526

Maybe, but it sure helps explain why NTIA was silent till long past the cutoff date for comments. One has to wonder how they finally got woke up to what was going on. Probably some Lennie type alerted them to the fact that those nasty ol' ghastly hams were about to intrude on their turf which they never use.
.But hey, why let someone else have it that actually might make come constructive use of it just because of that?

Dick

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Dick,
>
> Sounds like the argument the happy HFers (freebanders) are using :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bd8j6ttsb0@208.206.142.93...
> >
> >
> > Then again, the primary users never use it!
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3378. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:03:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bddnqbgic1@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 69527

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:

> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in news:5f4fe4c2.0306232115.795a3940
> @posting.google.com:
>
> > Given that in the year 2000, just before the last restructuring, there
> > were probably only about 55,000 "real" 20WPM Extras (based on the
> > assumption that there were at least 20K medical waivers and "cheats"
> > who were simply handed their Extra papers), and figuring about a 3K
> > loss in numbers due to attrition... and given that we now have about
> > 104K Extras today - that means we now have more "Extra Lights" than
> > "20WPM Extras"!
>
> Stewart,
>
> They're not really Extras. They just think they are.

April 1, 2000 was the day that the Extra class ceased to be anything extra.

3379. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:06:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh2ayzi.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69528

On Wed, 25 Jun 2003 19:36:25 -0700, Jack Twilley wrote:

>The one thing I took away from that article that truly fascinates me
>is that this is the third time a section manager has been recalled --
>and that all three of the recalls have taken place in the past fifteen
>years. Does that say anything about "the state of the hobby"?

There was a lot more involved than "Keith's" message brought out but
that's all in the past now. I was surprised at the vote, though - I
thought that it would have been closer.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3380. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:17:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bddojpgic2@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 69529

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:aXjKa.11972$C83.1174575@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > [snip]
> > In America there should 2 to 3 million ham radio operators at minimum and
> > if we don't increase the number of ham radio operators that are active on
> > the bands ham radio will be just another bookmark in the radio or wireless
> > history book.
>
> Since the number of hams is growing faster than the general population,
> there is not a problem.
>
> Why should we have 2 to 3 million? What purpose would it serve? To create
> an artificial interest and pull in a large number of hams won't help. They
> might get licensed but then would drop it in favor of something else.

Check Japan's stats for the proof of that.The "easy" HF license drew 'em in droves, and they soon abandoned ship the same way.

Dick

3381. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:37:41 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69531

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0306251227.7d9a448c@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93A2E23C78588elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> <SNIP>
>> >
>> > Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to
>> > run SSB down to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I
>> > mistaken, Alun?
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Yes, you're mistaken, I only want to go down to 7.045, as per IARU
>> recommendations for regions 1 and 2 (it's 7.030 for region 3), and I
>> have never asked even for that, as I know we won't get it. In the
>> earlier thread I only suggested SSB down to 7.075, which is what US
>> licenced hams in region 3 already have.
>
> TNX for the update.
>
> Trouble is, if we get worldwide 7000-7200 or even 7000-7300, and the
> SWBCs move, the argument for US hams getting 'phone down to 7045 or
> even 7075 gets weaker because there will be lots of spectrum where US
> and DX hams can work each other nonsplit if they so desire.
>

Agreed. I think some may push for phone down to 7100, in place of the
Novices.

> Which leaves us with three questions:
>
> 1) How will the 40 meter situation work out?

Three proposals are being sent on by the sub-comittee to the main
comittee. Two give 100 kHz now and the other 100 later, but the earliest
either of them starts is 2007. The third gives 50 in 2018 and another 50
in 2033. Obviously that one is lousy as it makes us wait 30 years for a DX
window! Lets hope at the next stage that one is rejected. I think it may
be, because it is so inadequate that it encourages attempts to put 40 back
on the agenda before then. Knowing bureaucrats, they won't want to see
this come back a second time.

>
> 2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
>

I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen quicker.

There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the FCC will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.

Quite a few other countries already have provisional dates next month or the month after for abolishing code testing.

> 3) What other changes should be made in the US license structure and
> regs?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for Novice and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There is also the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting rid of the Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the latter, and keeping track of their code credit indefinitely after getting rid of element 1 seems illogical. One way out may be to make the Tech licence simply 28 MHz and above. Any thoughts on that?

3382. Re: PETITION FILED TO OUTLAW HI-FI SSB ON THE HF BANDS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:38:44 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.com>
Message-ID: <8VtKa.25221$hV.1289969@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 69532
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030625225518.272$hs@newsreader.com...
> "Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote:
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3EFA40B4.4070000@ix.netcom.com...
> > > John Passaneau wrote:
> > >
> > > >Why not use a dummy load, then you don't need to tune of at all.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Normally yes, but I have to tune the rig to load into the imperfect
> > > antenna I have.
> > >
> >
> > At least someone understands the concept.
> >
> Yea, but you watch toilets..

It's as exciting as neckcar. I'm sorry, maybe Jim Rome has skewed my view a
bit. Sorry that you can watch a motor spin and be entertained.

3383. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:43:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFA6BF8.9030005@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69533

>
>
>>
>>They're not really Extras. They just think they are.
>>
>>
>
> April 1, 2000 was the day that the Extra class ceased to be anything extra.
>
>
>
That's April 15th, 2000. I got my extra lite that day..... :-)

3384. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:49:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306251949.4de5f4f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69534

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bdd4ereve1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0306250801.25212083@posting.google.com...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message

> > > 'em in the woods to die is what they've done and last I heard
> > > they still do.
> >
> > Not according to the Inky story, though it's possible that still goes
> > on.

I read about it within the last couple years and the article was
written in the present tense. There are a lot of variations in the
local cultures & customs within China, they are not nearly as
"homogenized" as we are. It's probably a case of what is done out in
the boonies - and there are some very remote boonies in Red China - is
not acceptable in Peking or Shanghai.

> >
> > > When foreign visitors find these babies here and there
> > > and scoop them up the Chinese consider it a quaint reaction.
> >
> > They now have an extensive system of state-run orphanages that handle
> > foreign adoptions. Prospective parents submit an app and wait an
> > average of 14 months, then spend two weeks in China to get the kid.
> > Newborn adoptions are rare, usually the kids are 1-1/2 to 2 years old.
> >
> > Yet they are already beginning to see the repercussions of decades of
> > the one-kid rules and the obsession with having sons. Main one is a
> > shortage of potential brides.

Yeah, all their "brides" are here working on their PhD's and M.D.'s.
Heh.

> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Somehow I have a problem with 'foreign' tourists wandering in and out of the
> Chinese Flora and Fauna without a 'official tour guide'.
>
> As they say What is wrong with this picture ?

'Snot the way it is today Dan. One if my brothers has been to China
several times mostly on biz and was able to move around quite freely
without escorts, etc. The biggest problem is not access, it's
transportation and finding accomodations in the Chinese outback. A 300

mile trip in any direction from any of their urban centers on your own is not a matter of having government permission, it's much more a matter of a nightmare logistics planning exercise.

They have huge tracts of wilderness too and a lot of it heavily protected by the gummint as natural preserves. Some of it is completely verboten to tourists because it's home to endanagered species and only accredited researchers allowed into it. The Chinese National Forest Service or whatever it is is not required by law to entertain debates over whether or not ATVs and skimobiles can have access, they just lock those idiots up. Their system ain't all bad.

> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

3385. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 03:53:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69535

>
>
>
>
>
>>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
>>
>>
>>
>
>I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
>quicker.
>
>There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
>bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the FCC
>will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.
>
>
Whatever the crackpots suggest in reguards to dropping the code test,
the FCC could just
say "element 1 is no longer required after Oct 31, 2003" or such date
that adds up to the
usual comment period and publish it in the federal register process.

>>
>>
>>
>If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for Novice
>and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There is also
>the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting rid of the
>Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the latter, and keeping
>track of their code credit indefinitely after getting rid of element 1
>seems illogical. One way out may be to make the Tech licence simply 28 MHz
>and above. Any thoughts on that?
>
>
When the sunspots are out of season, 28MHz is just another VHF band.
Let the techs have a
portion of 15 meters, so they get a taste of HF DX.

3386. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 04:22:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EFA74F1.DB4AF014@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69536

Vshah101 wrote:

> There is a time and place. Would you wear a suit at the beach or the reverse?

The reverse--wearing a beach at the suit?

> By analogy, Hams often wear a suit at the beach.

By way of comment, you need work on analogies.

If this were different, there
> would be alot more Hams. And there would be more people operating radios.

Start a campaign, Vipul. Make it your life's work. Everyone needs a
passion. Make this yours.

> Also, there are other interesting <radio> activities one can do.

Nothing is stopping you.

> I can suggest them, but there never seems a proper time to make suggestions.

The proper time is never when a group of hams are gathered specifically
to participate in a contest.

> Hams don't seem to be interested in other radio activities besides
> contesting.

Many hams are not interested in contesting at all. Those who are
interested in contesting and who have gathered to operate in a contest
may not enjoy having you attempt to become a cruise director.

You're a very strange individual.

Dave K8MN

3387. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 04:24:56 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0306252024.5fe3278@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69537

"twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in message news:<44441N486@web2news.com>...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > trollometer: ||||||.........................
>
> No it's not a troll, it's a fact, and I have been saying the same thing
> for years. Why should I get a hammie license and let Uncle Sam gather
> info on me and dictate my free speech make me adhere to rules etc. when
> I can freeband and have the same worldwide DX as you hams do? For one
> tenth the cost and one zeroeth the trouble. Most hams don't care what we
> freebanders do as long as we stay at 29.999 and only certain failed no
> code types who suffer communication deficits like Nad and Frankie howl
> and strain at the leash I keep them on.

check it out twist......a hammie on a cb newsgroup talking about trolls....man don't that beat all...........

3388. BPL / PLC is a gross polluting legacy technology - file a comment with the FCC to stop it

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 05:21:25 UTC
From: robkemp90210@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <6114e4af.0306252121.51dc27d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69538

BPL is a gross polluting legacy technology that has been banned in Japan and Finland.

The FCC has issued a NoI concerning the deployment of BPL (Broadband over Power Line) in the US. BPL operates between 2 and 80MHz and if deployed under conditions advocated by the BPL lobbyists would turn the 2 to 80MHz spectrum into a waste ground of noise at S9 or higher.

It is important to bring to the attention of the FCC (by filing a comment on the NoI) that this spectrum is used for many diverse purposes and is very valuable. There are many better ways of deploying broadband.

Full details are here;
http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2003/06/19/2/?nc=1

Comments are due on or before July 7, 2003. The FCC now is accepting electronically filed comments via its Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS).
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
In the "Proceeding" field, enter "03-104" and complete the required fields. Comments may be typed into a form or you may attach a file containing your comments.

Many good comments have been filed, one you may like to review is here;
http://makeashorterlink.com/?C5C931A05

Please forward this email to anyone who would be interested in preventing gross pollution of the shortwave spectrum.

3389. Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 08:32:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB2027D4.1D787%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69539

At this point in the ITU conference, it does not look good for a change in the Morse Code proficiency requirement as a treaty obligation for high-frequency access. As some may remember, during the last conference, many issues were being addressed by Working Groups at this period of the conference. Virtually none of those, especially the ones relating to ham radio, made it to the floor in time to be voted on by the delegates and were instead put off to be addressed at some later date. If this conference goes the same way, this conference may not be the end of Morse Code testing.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

P.S. Gee, it really is fun to stir up rumors and controversy with raw speculation and half-truths. None of us know what is going to happen at the conference, but that hasn't stopped dozens of messages from being posted on exactly that. My message above is just as reliable as any of the others being posted.

3390. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 10:46:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030626064642.09955.00000420@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 69540

In article <Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>news:c2356669.0306251227.7d9a448c@posting.google.com:
>
>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns93A2E23C78588elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>> <SNIP>
>>> >
>>> > Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to
>>> > run SSB down to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I
>>> > mistaken, Alun?
>>> >
>>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>> Yes, you're mistaken, I only want to go down to 7.045, as per IARU
>>> recommendations for regions 1 and 2 (it's 7.030 for region 3), and I
>>> have never asked even for that, as I know we won't get it. In the
>>> earlier thread I only suggested SSB down to 7.075, which is what US
>>> licenced hams in region 3 already have.
>>
>> TNX for the update.
>>
>> Trouble is, if we get worldwide 7000-7200 or even 7000-7300, and the
>> SWBCs move, the argument for US hams getting 'phone down to 7045 or
>> even 7075 gets weaker because there will be lots of spectrum where US
>> and DX hams can work each other nonsplit if they so desire.
>
>Agreed. I think some may push for phone down to 7100, in place of the
>Novices.

The trouble is that unless other privs are given to Novices and Tech Pluses, it
sets a bad precedent.

>
>> Which leaves us with three questions:
>>
>> 1) How will the 40 meter situation work out?
>
>Three proposals are being sent on by the sub-comittee to the main
>comittee. Two give 100 kHz now and the other 100 later, but the earliest
>either of them starts is 2007. The third gives 50 in 2018 and another 50
>in 2033. Obviously that one is lousy as it makes us wait 30 years for a DX
>window! Lets hope at the next stage that one is rejected. I think it may
>be, because it is so inadequate that it encourages attempts to put 40 back

>on the agenda before then. Knowing bureaucrats, they won't want to see
>this come back a second time.

Thanks for that info - I agree with your analysis. Seems to me that many developed countries do not see their SWBC needs being as large as they once were. Developing countries are a different story.

2007 is only three years, tho.
>
>> 2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?

>I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
>quicker.

>There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
>bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the FCC
>will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.

IIRC, historically the FCC can't/won't do anything until The Congress ratifies the revised treaty. That will take some time, and petitioning before that time may just works against the petitioners' goal because it shows they don't understand the process.

>Quite a few other countries already have provisional dates next month or
>the month after for abolishing code testing.

Sure, but other countries' ratification methods are different.
>
>> 3) What other changes should be made in the US license structure and
>> regs?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for Novice
>and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There is also
>the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting rid of the
>Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the latter, and keeping
>track of their code credit indefinitely after getting rid of element 1
>seems illogical. One way out may be to make the Tech licence simply 28 MHz
>and above. Any thoughts on that?

Several:

1) As part of its 1998 restructuring petition (has it really been 5 years!?), ARRL proposed auto upgrading of existing Novices and Tech Pluses to General. FCC said no. I also recall a QCWA petition to effectively upgrade pre-1968 Generals and Advanceds to Extra, which also went nowhere with FCC. Even Tech Pluses who were licensed before March 21 1987 have to show up at a VE session to get a General, even though they don't need any more test credits. Seems FCC just doesn't want to do auto upgrades and doesn't care about the closed-off license classes.

2) Without Element 1, there's no reason to differentiate between Techs and Tech Pluses, so the two license classes should be made equivalent in the rules.

3) I'd propose that Technicians get about half of General bandspace on all HF/MF bands, at the current Novice/Tech Plus power level, plus an assortment of modes on HF/MF. Maybe even give them all of 160 and the WARC bands. And since Novices currently have the same HF/MF privs as Tech Pluses, Novices should get the same additional privs.

This solves the "refarming" question and makes the privileges more balanced. It also substitutes one set of subbands for another, so overall rules complexity is about the same.

Some might say "Why the giveaway?", but note how many Novices and Techs with Code 1 credit haven't upgraded in over 3 years.

Historical note: I recall that one of the main reasons Tech Pluses and Novices got 10 meter SSB was an attempt to populate the band and impede its use by freeband/cb folks. The freeband/cb folks' argument was "nobody's using those frequencies"

Thoughts?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3391. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 11:54:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306260354.23c3495@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69541

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh1osda.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 25 Jun 2003 03:59:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >
> >> I just ran a quick
> >> search on eBay for "ARC 5" and there were a couple posted.
> >
> >They were designed to never quit. And they haven't.
>
> Amen. Still haven't found the Q5er, though. There were a couple of
> FRG 7700s and the Icom equivalent (R71) at about $400+ which is $300+
> more than I want to invest in that project, if that much.

Hmm . . Gotta be some out there. There were thousands of 'em in the
various radio rows. I'll snoop around this area for both a Q5er and a
decent $100 rcvr. Lotta old coot pack rats around here.

> Just gave my never-been-used 40-20-15-10 parallel dipole to the
> AREC/RACES group to put up at the EOC (never had enough room to put
> it up withourt a noticeable sag onto the rear deck superstructure).

I've modeled some parallel-wires tri-banders and it's not too hard to
imagine how the weight can build up fast. Especially if you feed one
with fullsize RG-8.

> Someone else donated the wire for an 80-m dipole.
>
> The Sheriff just bought us two brand-new 45 foot telephone poles
> which the power company 'sposed to set next week. We insisted on
> two pulley and halyard sets per pole although we do have "dibs" on
> the local fire department's bucket/ ladder truck (which we
> affectionately call "The Intimidator") if we need it.

Seems like you folk have a real organization going, everybody is into
it. Not the case here. I don't know if we even have a local RACES
operation. If we do it really works at being invisible. Political
jungle, the pros don't like anybody messing with their turf, etc. I
butted heads politically with the Main Moose 25 years ago when he was
running the county dispatch operation and he lost. Then the FCC busted
his kid for VHF freebanding with the help of some hams. Now he's the
county gummint EC. Not a particularly good climate for ham
volunteerism.

> I may play around with converting my three-sided long wire to a
> horizontal loop for NVIS.

I have what seems to be a lot of electrical noise around here and am also thinking along those lines

> That ought to work well for state-wide
> 60-m RACES comms if I ever get a HF transceiver.

I just ran into an excellent Ten-tec Paragon which is available for $400. NICE rig.

And I just found out that my FT-847 can operate on the Alaska Emergency freq so I can get on 60m given a snip or two without toasting the TX.

Busy, busy, I'm bailing outta the 'net until after FD.

w3rv

3392. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 11:58:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0306260358.48b2b67d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69542

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306251220.7e3feb18@posting.google.com>...
N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0306251220.7e3feb18@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0306250229.5f7512f9@posting.google.com>...

> >
> > Back to the soddering arns . . it's coming . . ! It's coming!
>
> I've almost got the "FD in a shopping bag" thing going. Let's
> see...K2, big gell cell, 'phones, dipole w/coax & rope, homebrew
> launcher (P51 slingshot w/Zebco 202 reel and 1 oz weights painted
> flourescent orange), ropes, tent, folding table, wad of various
> cables, clock, lantern, logpapers and pencils, toolkit, cooler of
> eatables....and oh yeah, a bug.

I have the equipment end pretty under control except for not being
able to find my collection of coax jumpers but the remaining biggie is
trimming the dipoles to length. Which is today's mission. It's ONLY
gonna be 100F . . Arrrgh . . !

You been tuning around? OhMiGawd . . every q is gonna take some work,
it's hideous.

I'm outta RRAP until Monday.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3393. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 12:22:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030626082214.00871.00000376@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 69544

In article <bddojpgic2@208.207.71.139>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> news:aXjKa.11972$C83.1174575@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>> > [snip]
>> > In America there should 2 to 3 million ham radio operators at minimum and
>> > if we don't increase the number of ham radio operators that are active on
>> > the bands ham radio will be just another bookmark in the radio or
>wireless
>> > history book.
>>
>> Since the number of hams is growing faster than the general population,
>> there is not a problem.
>>
>> Why should we have 2 to 3 million? What purpose would it serve? To create
>> an artificial interest and pull in a large number of hams won't help. They
>> might get licensed but then would drop it in favor of something else.
>
> Check Japan's stats for the proof of that.The "easy" HF license drew 'em in
>droves, and they soon abandoned ship the same way.
>
Note the wide disparity between the number of Japanese operator licenses (which
are free and never expire) and Japanese station licenses. Note also the decline
in the past 8 years.

http://www.ah0a.org

73 de Jim, N2EY

3394. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 12:22:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030626082215.00871.00000377@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 69543

In article <86u1adh8eu.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
<jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:

>The one thing I took away from that article that truly fascinates me
>is that this is the third time a section manager has been recalled --
>and that all three of the recalls have taken place in the past fifteen
>years. Does that say anything about "the state of the hobby"?

Let's see - 3 recalls in 15 years, and there are 80 ARRL sections.

Perhaps it says that most SMs are pretty decent, and the incompetent ones get
removed quickly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3395. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 12:42:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306260442.373ffb8a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69545

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hgzklfe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On Tue, 24 Jun 2003 01:14:33 -0400, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >My comments regarding the "retardation" of the digital capabilities in ham
> >radio were based upon a recent meeting we had with the local emergency
> >services director and "served agencies." What they need is not at the level
> >it could and/or should be of what we can offer as hams........ Its gone
> >beyond simple message-grams.
>
> OTOH, the emergency management folks as well as the "served
> agencies" here are delighted at the services that we provide, which
> go beyond the message-grams to include packet tranmission of
> anything that can be digitized into 256-bit characters and SSTV of
> sheets of things like road closure maps, etc.

Why not get a free copy of ArcExpolorer from ESRI's website and let
them look at the actual road files?

Voice circuits are
> used primarily for tactical status reporting and dispatch to back up
> the agencies' "FailSoft" simplex systems (the base stations are in
> the buildings of the agency, not on some mountaintop or remote
> tower) which themselves are backup of the County-wide trunked
> system. Folks assigned to specific agencies get training in the
> dispatch systems and needs of that agency and many can run the
> FailSoft dispatch points if need be. We're not limited only to
> operating our ham radios in push-to-talk mode.
>
> We're even looking into phone-patching into the internal telephone
> systems of the EOC and the hospital's command center to enable real
> user-to-user comms through ham radio (it's certainly not new
> technology - we had that in Los Angeles in 1958) but that may be a
> ways down the road.
>
> It pays to note that all of the served facilities are connected by
> a dedicated 100 MB buried fiber system separate from the "consumer"
> cable TV system, with microwave backup. They fully understand that
> during a disaster this may not be available.

We could really impress them with some Morse communications. Morse/CW
gets through when everything else will.

3396. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 12:45:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306260445.23d8b7d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69546

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0306230440.3fffeeb8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Or alternatively, the manufacturer could have applied for
> >> certification of the transmitter in services other than amateur but
> >> that's doubtful.
> >
> >I can't imagine any other service using the 7800. The beast redefines
> >the meaning of "complex equipment", ya need 40 hours in the manual to
> >get it up and running right.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."too technical" for you "skilled operators" constrained
> to the outside of the front panels? :-)
>
> What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
> of modern transceivers?

Len, play nice. Besides, I thought these guys had superior wetware
developed from emulating a modem?

3397. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 14:57:41 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306260657.75d4dcb5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69547

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86u1adh8eu.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...

> The one thing I took away from that article that truly fascinates me
> is that this is the third time a section manager has been recalled --
> and that all three of the recalls have taken place in the past fifteen
> years. Does that say anything about "the state of the hobby"?

What does this have to do with "the hobby"...?!?!

If anything, I consider it to be a "gold star" for the ARRL in
that it truly is a democratic organization, and that mediocre or
incompetent elected officals will not be tolerated.

73

Steve, K4CAP

3398. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:00:30 UTC
From: Sister Weasels <greenbean3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3efb36c5@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 69565

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:bdcq1j$qni7q$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de...
> Thank you!
>
> I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
>
> "If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
> that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
> maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
> integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
> that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
> transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
> detachable antennas."
>
> If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
> **seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
> clarifies for me?
>
> The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The radio is
> very cheap even with GMRS support.
>
> Thomas

Last I checked the FCC fee for a GMRS Licence was $17 per Year.
Not really that much change when you consider that the ham
magazines (like QST for example - which is now OVER 70%
advertising content) charge much more than this per year for a subscription
which usually ends up get tossed out in the paper recycler bin
after a few Years collecting dust mites and mold. :) :) :) :)

Get the GMRS Licence and broaden your radio horizons.

"You'd pay to know what you really think!"
- J.R. "Bob" Dobbs, 1962

www.subgenius.com

3399. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:07:57 UTC
From: Sister Weasels <greenbean3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3efb36c6@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 69566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in
message news:86u1adh8eu.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
>
> The one thing I took away from that article that truly fascinates me
> is that this is the third time a section manager has been recalled --
> and that all three of the recalls have taken place in the past fifteen
> years. Does that say anything about "the state of the hobby"?
>
> Jack.

It says alot about how things are likely
run in the Oregon ARRL Section. (grin)

But then again, as the average active
amateur population in any given area
which are either ARRL members or
representative of the same, rarely exceeds
20% of the aggregate, the whole affair
in the O.S. likely boils down to the usual
state of affairs....

Likely, a collection of grouchy old men who
still smoke tobacco in large amounts, who have
nothing better to do but rag on about esoteric
ham radio related issues, which have no substance
in real life, except that they provide a diversion
from their boring lives, in-between their trips to
McDonalds to get "their" free coffee refills of course
or untill the Manager kicks em out after he's
re-stoked the coffee urn

"You'd pay to know what you really think!"
- J.R. "Bob" Dobbs, 1962

www.subgenius.com

Dr. Onan's Wotan Band

3400. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:14:14 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306260714.d42ceaf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69548
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<bdcq1j$qni7q$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>...
> Thank you!
>
> I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
>
> "If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
> that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
> maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
> integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
> that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
> transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
> detachable antennas."

The "FRS" channels were interstitial frequencies of the GMRS in
the first place. That's why GMRS can still use them.

Only a radio specifically designed for FRS applications may be
used license free. Any other radio is GMRS and must be licensed.

> If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
> **seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
> clarifies for me?
>
> The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The radio is
> very cheap even with GMRS support.

I agree with Phil...Pop for the GMRS license...One day you'll
need it and it will save your bacon...Or at least save you from an FCC
NAL!

73

Steve, K4CAP

3401. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:25:09 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A674231DEAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69549

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com:

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
>>quicker.
>>
>>There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
>>bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the
>>FCC will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.
>>
>>
> Whatever the crackpots suggest in reguards to dropping the code test,
> the FCC could just
> say "element 1 is no longer required after Oct 31, 2003" or such date
> that adds up to the
> usual comment period and publish it in the federal register process.
>

I thought the comment period was longer. Can anyone here give us a
definitve answer to that?

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for
>>Novice and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There
>>is also the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting
>>rid of the Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the
>>latter, and keeping track of their code credit indefinitely after
>>getting rid of element 1 seems illogical. One way out may be to make
>>the Tech licence simply 28 MHz and above. Any thoughts on that?
>>
>>
> When the sunspots are out of season, 28MHz is just another VHF band.
> Let the techs have a

> portion of 15 meters, so they get a taste of HF DX.
>
>

3402. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:25:25 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <FfEKa.13964$er2.11173@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69550

Dwight,

My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see how long this thread gets :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03

3403. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:27:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306260727.4ebc8f9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69551

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030625225625.16033.00001238@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>
> > Do you have a degree or certificate as an RD or nutritionist?
>
> No. It is obvious that what that the food was very bad for you.
> Alot of fat and alot of calories.

Probably a lot of bad carbs, too.

So here's what you do about it, Vipul. Next time such an activity is proposed, YOU step up to the plate and VOLUNTEER to do the food. Then make good. Show 'em how it's done.

Several years back, some local clubs banded together for a Field Day effort. At the first organizing meeting, in late March/early February, a local ham stood up and offered to do the food. He had already lined up helpers and a planned menu. Besides the usual hamburgers and hot dogs, he proposed providing fresh fruits, vegetables, salads, made-to-order omelets and pancakes in the AM, fruit drinks and iced teas as well as the usual sodas, and many other healthy alternatives.

And he made good on everything he proposed. Some hams brought food to share, such as home-made hummus with pita bread.

He did this for several years. Sadly, he passed away unexpectedly about 2 years ago, but the job was taken over by another ham who does an excellent job.

> > You seem to want to go to radio activities and do ANYTHING except operate
> >radios!

> I operated radios during the day. I would not like it if I hadn't operated
> radios at all.

Then what's the problem?

For some ham radio groups, outings are partly social and partly radio. For others, the focus is radio and everything else is secondary. The time to find out what an outing is intended to be is BEFORE you decide to go.
>
> There is a time and place.

Yes, and that outing was the time and place for operating radios, making contacts, and running up the score.

> Would you wear a suit at the beach or the reverse?

I'd wear a swimsuit at the beach.

> By analogy, Hams often wear a suit at the beach. If this were different, there
> would be alot more Hams. And there would be more people operating radios.

I have no idea what you are trying to say.
>
> ---
> ---
>
> Also, there are other interesting <radio> activities one can do.

Like what?

> I can suggest
> them, but there never seems a proper time to make suggestions.

The proper time is well ahead of the suggested activity. For example,
if you want healthy food on Field Day, the time to suggest it is at
the first planning meeting, not when you show up at the site on
Saturday morning.

Also, you have to back up your suggestions with WORK. Seems to me you
want to be the idea guy but have others do the heavy lifting. Not
gonna happen.

> Hams don't seem
> to be interested in other radio activities besides contesting.

During a contest, the focus is on the contest and making points
according to the rules of the contest. If you want different rules,
the time to get them changed is well in advance of the NEXT contest.

Field Day is this weekend. I'll be out in Class 1B-1 Battery, making
as many contacts and points as conditions allow. I won't be doing any
homebrewing or ragchewing during FD. Those things will wait for
another time and place.

What will others be doing?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3404. Bogus Solicitors Hawking QST Subs to Glean Credit Card Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:31:23 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306260731.c063752@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69552

Guess no one is exempt from credit card thieves.

QUOTE FROM ARRL WEBSITE

League Warns of Bogus Solicitation (Jun 25, 2003) -- NEWINGTON, CT. Somebody out there is trying to "sell" subscriptions to QST, but it's not the ARRL. ARRL Customer Service/Circulation Manager Kathy Capodicasa, N1GZO, said she has received several phone calls and e-mails from members reporting the scam."Apparently, there is some kind of bogus telephone solicitor out there trying to get people's names, addresses and credit card numbers," she said. "ARRL does not solicit for 'subscriptions' to QST. Under no circumstances should a member give out their credit card numbers to someone trying to sell them QST."QST is the official membership journal of the ARRL and is not available to the general public from a magazine distributor or publishing house. Should you receive a call from the phony solicitor, Capodicasa asks that you try to get the solicitor's name and check the caller ID box, if one is installed, for the caller's number. The information can be e-mailed to her at n1gzo@arrl.org, or you can reach her at 860-594-0257.

END QUOTE

3405. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:41:03 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A676D50D55Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69553

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030626064642.09955.00000420@mb-m21.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:c2356669.0306251227.7d9a448c@posting.google.com:
>>
>>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>> news:<Xns93A2E23C78588elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>>> <SNIP>
>>>> >
>>>> > Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to
>>>> > run SSB down to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I
>>>> > mistaken, Alun?
>>>> >
>>>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>> Yes, you're mistaken, I only want to go down to 7.045, as per IARU
>>>> recommendations for regions 1 and 2 (it's 7.030 for region 3), and I
>>>> have never asked even for that, as I know we won't get it. In the
>>>> earlier thread I only suggested SSB down to 7.075, which is what US
>>>> licenced hams in region 3 already have.
>>>
>>> TNX for the update.
>>>
>>> Trouble is, if we get worldwide 7000-7200 or even 7000-7300, and the
>>> SWBCs move, the argument for US hams getting 'phone down to 7045 or
>>> even 7075 gets weaker because there will be lots of spectrum where US
>>> and DX hams can work each other nonsplit if they so desire.
>>
>>Agreed. I think some may push for phone down to 7100, in place of the
>>Novices.
>
> The trouble is that unless other privs are given to Novices and Tech
> Pluses, it sets a bad precedent.

True

>>
>>> Which leaves us with three questions:
>>>
>>> 1) How will the 40 meter situation work out?
>>

>>Three proposals are being sent on by the sub-comittee to the main
>>comittee. Two give 100 kHz now and the other 100 later, but the
>>earliest either of them starts is 2007. The third gives 50 in 2018 and
>>another 50 in 2033. Obviously that one is lousy as it makes us wait 30
>>years for a DX window! Lets hope at the next stage that one is
>>rejected. I think it may be, because it is so inadequate that it
>>encourages attempts to put 40 back on the agenda before then. Knowing
>>bureaucrats, they won't want to see this come back a second time.
>
> Thanks for that info - I agree with your analysis. Seems to me that
> many developed countries do not see their SWBC needs being as large as
> they once were. Developing countries are a different story.
>
> 2007 is only three years, tho.

Four, but who's counting?

>>
>>> 2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
>
>>I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
>>quicker.
>
>>There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
>>bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the
>>FCC will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.
>
> IIRC, historically the FCC can't/won't do anything until The Congress
> ratifies the revised treaty. That will take some time, and petitioning
> before that time may just works against the petitioners' goal because
> it shows they don't understand the process.
>

I hadn't thought about that. Clearly you are right.

>>Quite a few other countries already have provisional dates next month
>>or the month after for abolishing code testing.
>
> Sure, but other countries' ratification methods are different.

I know. Ironically, the relatively open nature of FCC rule-making also
slows things down.

>>
>>> 3) What other changes should be made in the US license structure and
>>> regs?
>>>
>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for
>>Novice and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There
>>is also the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting

>>rid of the Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the
>>latter, and keeping track of their code credit indefinitely after
>>getting rid of element 1 seems illogical. One way out may be to make
>>the Tech licence simply 28 MHz and above. Any thoughts on that?
>
> Several:
>
> 1) As part of its 1998 restructuring petition (has it really been 5
> years!?), ARRL proposed auto upgrading of existing Novices and Tech
> Pluses to General. FCC said no. I also recall a QCWA petition to
> effectively upgrade pre-1968 Generals and Advanceds to Extra, which
> also went nowhere with FCC. Even Tech Pluses who were licensed before
> March 21 1987 have to show up at a VE session to get a General, even
> though they don't need any more test credits. Seems FCC just doesn't
> want to do auto upgrades and doesn't care about the closed-off license
> classes.
>
> 2) Without Element 1, there's no reason to differentiate between Techs
> and Tech Pluses, so the two license classes should be made equivalent
> in the rules.
>

That's probably the thorniest issue arising from this. Maybe the fairest
and simplest thing to do is to give all the Techs the privileges of a
Tech+?

> 3) I'd propose that Technicians get about half of General bandspace on
> all HF/MF bands, at the current Novice/Tech Plus power level, plus an
> assortment of modes on HF/MF. Maybe even give them all of 160 and the
> WARC bands. And since Novices currently have the same HF/MF privs as
> Tech Pluses, Novices should get the same additional privs.
>
> This solves the "refarming" question and makes the privileges more
> balanced. It also substitutes one set of subbands for another, so
> overall rules complexity is about the same.
>
> Some might say "Why the giveaway?", but note how many Novices and Techs
> with Code 1 credit haven't upgraded in over 3 years.
>
> Historical note: I recall that one of the main reasons Tech Pluses and
> Novices got 10 meter SSB was an attempt to populate the band and impede
> its use by freeband/cb folks. The freeband/cb folks' argument was
> "nobody's using those frequencies"
>
> Thoughts?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>

I think that for the latter reason any solution should give all the Techs at least the part of 10m that the Novice and Tech+ already have.

I'm surprised how much we agree on most of this.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3406. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 15:51:06 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A67889BFFB5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69554

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
news:FfEKa.13964$er2.11173@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net:

> Dwight,
>
> My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
> questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when the
> code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few
> years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are
> correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know.
> Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>
>
>

The modification of s25.5 (making code testing optional) was approved
unanimously at the subcomittee level (announced 2 days ago), so is likely
to pass in the plenary session. I am guessing it might take the FCC 12
months to implement, and element credit is good for 12 months. So, maybe
your students ought to be studying theory? Then again, if they can't wait
that long for HF, then by all means they should study code.

3407. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 16:05:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdf5id$oe2$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69555

Just because you don't hear any transmitting does not mean it is not in use.
There are a large number of guburment users in the 5 Mhz range. FEMA,
SHARES, Homeland Security, US Military. MARS. Just as an example.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bddnm9gic0@208.207.71.139...
> Maybe, but it sure helps explain why NTIA was silent till long past the
> cutoff date for comments. One has to wonder how they finally got woke up
> to what was going on. Probably some Lennie type alerted them to the fact
> that those nasty ol' ghastly hams were about to intrude on their turf
> which they never use.
> .But hey, why let someone else have it that actually might make come
> constructive use of it just because of that?
>
> Dick
>
> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> > Dick,
> >
> > Sounds like the argument the happy HFers (freebanders) are using :)
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bd8j6ttsb0@208.206.142.93...
> > >
> > >
> > > Then again, the primary users never use it!
> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>

3408. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 16:08:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdf5n1$pu6$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69556

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EFA399C.1010807@ix.netcom.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >The thing about learning CW up to around 20WPM is that even IF you don't
use
> >it....you keep it. Sure you may slow down, but you keep it.
> >
> >
> But does it help when you want to put a dipole up?
>
> :-)
>

Only if its midnight on a moonless night and you need to send information
back and forth with a flashlight.

Dan/W4NTI

3409. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 16:11:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdf5sn$c44$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69557

I'm more interested in whats happening on the 40 meter 'realignment'.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB2027D4.1D787%stewart@say.net...
>
> At this point in the ITU conference, it does not look good for a change
in
> the Morse Code proficiency requirement as a treaty obligation for
> high-frequency access. As some may remember, during the last conference,
> many issues were being addressed by Working Groups at this period of the
> conference. Virtually none of those, especially the ones relating to ham
> radio, made it to the floor in time to be voted on by the delegates and
were
> instead put off to be addressed at some later date. If this conference
goes
> the same way, this conference may not be the end of Morse Code testing.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
> P.S. Gee, it really is fun to stir up rumors and controversy with raw
> speculation and half-truths. None of us know what is going to happen at
the
> conference, but that hasn't stopped dozens of messages from being posted
on
> exactly that. My message above is just as reliable as any of the others
> being posted.
>

3410. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 16:24:24 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86llvohknb.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 69558

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Jim" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:

Jack> The one thing I took away from that article that truly
Jack> fascinates me is that this is the third time a section manager
Jack> has been recalled -- and that all three of the recalls have
Jack> taken place in the past fifteen years. Does that say anything
Jack> about "the state of the hobby"?

Jim> Let's see - 3 recalls in 15 years, and there are 80 ARRL
Jim> sections.

I was trying to call attention to 0 recalls for 75 years, then 3
recalls in 15 years.

Jim> Perhaps it says that most SMs are pretty decent, and the
Jim> incompetent ones get removed quickly.

It might also be a cultural thing -- that recalls weren't socially
acceptable methods of resolution until recently.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE++x4+GPFSfAB/ezgRAu48AJ0eM9HXzK3Rq/x7xWOut71DuuEl7QCghx+m
n36i2JdCmjODuxxMDkePxiA=
=lqWq
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3411. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 16:52:27 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <exFKa.83220$Pc5.80258@fed1read01>
Source record: 69559
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gee guys/gals -- he has so many OPINIONS that by now he is probably really confused. As I told him -- -- write the FCC and get an answer in written form and carry it along with the radio. E-Mail: fccinfo@fcc.gov

It should be obvious the owner doesn't want to spring for the GMRS license fee -- even though he should.

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4cap@aol.com> wrote in message news:a08ca5a.0306260714.d42ceaf@posting.google.com...
> "thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<bdcq1j$qni7q$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>...
> > Thank you!
> >
> > I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more confused:
> >
> > "If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the rules
> > that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios have a
> > maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
> > integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the rules
> > that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios generally
> > transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
> > detachable antennas."
>
> The "FRS" channels were interstitial frequencies of the GMRS in
> the first place. That's why GMRS can still use them.
>
> Only a radio specifically designed for FRS applications may be
> used license free. Any other radio is GMRS and must be licensed.
>
> > If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
> > **seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
> > clarifies for me?
> >
> > The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The radio is
> > very cheap even with GMRS support.
>
> I agree with Phil...Pop for the GMRS license...One day you'll
> need it and it will save your bacon...Or at least save you from an FCC
> NAL!
>

> 73
>
> Steve, K4CAP

3412. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 17:35:02 UTC
From: thomas <word_pass@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <bdfaup$qt3uk$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69560
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

thank you for your information. I did write 24 hours ago and get no
response so far. Do I need to wait for 6 months or longer to get it if
ever, normally?

you are quite right -- if you have to pay the fee even though i don't use
it, i would rather throw the device into trash cans. after all they are
only $9.99 each, shipped!

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/B000093IK8

thomas

"AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> wrote in message
news:exFKa.83220$Pc5.80258@fed1read01...
> Gee guys/gals -- he has so many OPINIONS that by now he is probably
really
> confused. As I told him -- -- write the FCC and get an answer in written
> form and carry it along with the radio. E-Mail: fccinfo@fcc.gov
>
>
>
> It should be obvious the owner doesn't want to spring for the GMRS license
> fee -- even though he should.
>
>
>
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4cap@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:a08ca5a.0306260714.d42ceaf@posting.google.com...
> > "thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<bdcq1j$qni7q$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>...
> > > Thank you!
> > >
> > > I read the official FCC text carefully. But I'm now even more
confused:
> > >
> > > "If you operate a radio that has been approved exclusively under the
> rules
> > > that apply to FRS, you are not required to have a license. FRS radios
> have a
> > > maximum power of ? watt (500 milliwatt) effective radiated power and
> > > integral (non-detachable) antennas. If you operate a radio under the
> rules
> > > that apply to GMRS, you must have a GMRS license. GMRS radios
generally

> > > transmit at higher power levels (1 to 5 watts is typical) and may have
> > > detachable antennas."
> >
> > The "FRS" channels were interstitial frequencies of the GMRS in
> > the first place. That's why GMRS can still use them.
> >
> > Only a radio specifically designed for FRS applications may be
> > used license free. Any other radio is GMRS and must be licensed.
> >
> > > If my radio has been approved under both FRS and GMRS, the text above
> > > **seems** to suggest that I may need a license. Can you or someone
> > > clarifies for me?
> > >
> > > The only reason I don't want to use GMRS is the license fee. The
radio
> is
> > > very cheap even with GMRS support.
> >
> > I agree with Phil...Pop for the GMRS license...One day you'll
> > need it and it will save your bacon...Or at least save you from an FCC
> > NAL!
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4CAP
>
>

3413. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 17:44:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB3128.9060402@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69561

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Dwight,
>
> My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
> questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when the code
> will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few years rather
> than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are correct in that
> the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see how long this
> thread gets :)

Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested in
the ARS. This is separate to any argument of whether or not there should
be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.

When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new hams,
who will probably drop out almost as quickly.

The overall effect is likely to be underwhelming.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3414. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 18:01:01 UTC
From: Phil Stripling <phil_stripling@cieux.zzn.com>
Message-ID: <3qd6h0hg6a.fsf@shell4.tdl.com>
Source record: 69562
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> writes:

> thank you for your information. I did write 24 hours ago and get no
> response so far. Do I need to wait for 6 months or longer to get it if
> ever, normally?

The only time I sent an email to the FCC, it took a couple of weeks to get
a reply.

--
Philip Stripling | email to the replyto address is presumed
Legal Assistance on the Web | spam and read later. email to philip@
http://www.PhilipStripling.com/ | civex.com is read daily.

3415. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 18:02:29 UTC
From: Phil Stripling <phil_stripling@cieux.zzn.com>
Message-ID: <3qadc4hg3u.fsf@shell4.tdl.com>
Source record: 69563
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> writes:

> It should be obvious the owner doesn't want to spring for the GMRS license
> fee -- even though he should.

It should be obvious that some people don't want to let go of the "even
though he should" part of your comment. He _should_ get the license to
operate those radios.

--
Philip Stripling | email to the replyto address is presumed
Legal Assistance on the Web | spam and read later. email to philip@
http://www.PhilipStripling.com/ | civex.com is read daily.

3416. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 18:06:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB3675.5080407@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69564

Alun Palmer wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
> news:FfEKa.13964$er2.11173@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net:
>
>
>>Dwight,
>>
>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when the
>>code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few
>>years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are
>>correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know.
>>Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>>
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>Jim AA2QA
>>
>>
>>
>>---
>>Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>>Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>>Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> The modification of s25.5 (making code testing optional) was approved
> unanimously at the subcomittee level (announced 2 days ago), so is likely
> to pass in the plenary session. I am guessing it might take the FCC 12
> months to implement, and element credit is good for 12 months. So, maybe
> your students ought to be studying theory? Then again, if they can't wait
> that long for HF, then by all means they should study code.

When I became interested in Ham radio, I didn't want to wait until they dropped Morse, because I wanted to enjoy it and I wanted to enjoy it soon. Why a person would avoid learning something is beyond my comprehension.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3417. Re: BPL / PLC is a gross polluting legacy technology - file a comment with the FCC to stop it

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 18:13:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB3807.9080107@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69567

Rob Kemp wrote:
> BPL is a gross polluting legacy technology that has been banned in
> Japan and Finland.

It is nothing short of amusing and disgustiing to see how people can become so single minded in pursuit of something that they will destroy everything else in their way.

No one would ever be allowed to design a system this way, why on earth should they be allowed to do this sort of thing just because the "wires are already there?"

> The FCC has issued a NoI concerning the deployment of BPL (Broadband
> over Power Line) in the US. BPL operates between 2 and 80MHz and if
> deployed under conditions advocated by the BPL lobbyists would turn
> the 2 to 80MHz spectrum into a waste ground of noise at S9 or higher.

What was that, a projected 70 db increase, IIRC?

> It is important to bring to the attention of the FCC (by filing a
> comment on the NoI) that this spectrum is used for many diverse
> purposes and is very valuable. There are many better ways of
> deploying broadband.
>
> Full details are here;
> http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2003/06/19/2/?nc=1
>
> Comments are due on or before July 7, 2003. The FCC now is accepting
> electronically filed comments via its Electronic Comment Filing
> System (ECFS).
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
> In the "Proceeding" field, enter "03-104" and complete the required
> fields. Comments may be typed into a form or you may attach a file
> containing your comments.

Yup, went there, did that! Everyone here should too.

> Many good comments have been filed, one you may like to review is
> here;
> http://makeashorterlink.com/?C5C931A05
>
> Please forward this email to anyone who would be interested in
> preventing gross pollution of the shortwave spectrum.

3418. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 18:41:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB3E77.9030706@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69568

N2EY wrote:
<with Vipinations deleted>

> Field Day is this weekend. I'll be out in Class 1B-1 Battery, making
> as many contacts and points as conditions allow. I won't be doing any
> homebrewing or ragchewing during FD. Those things will wait for
> another time and place.
>
> What will others be doing?

I'll be going out tonight to make sure the site doesn't have any surprises for us.

Tomorrow, I'll be taking the afternoon off, and the team will start setting up as soon as we're allowed to. My personal responsibility is the GOTA station.

Saturday morning we'll finish the setup, and then I'll be the control op for the GOTA station. Saturday evening will be the club pic-a-nic, done up by a gracious member.

Somewhere in there, I'll try to work in a nap. because.....

...at roughly 11:00 local time, the hard core operators step in, and we run the overnight shift. I usually work 80 meter phone until I just can't stand it anymore, usually when it's starting to get light out. Then another short nap, and its back to the GOTA station.

Then comes teardown, when I'm just about worn out. Then back home for a long nap.

We have a goal this year. Last year we were second in our class during Field day.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3419. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 18:48:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030626144851.09580.00001037@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 69569

In article <f45722ac.0306260445.23d8b7d4@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0306230440.3fffeeb8@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >> Or alternatively, the manufacturer could have applied for
>> >> certification of the transmitter in services other than amateur but
>> >> that's doubtful.
>> >
>> >I can't imagine any other service using the 7800. The beast redefines
>> >the meaning of "complex equipment", ya need 40 hours in the manual to
>> >get it up and running right.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."too technical" for you "skilled operators" constrained
>> to the outside of the front panels? :-)
>>
>> What would you ever do if you were required to work on the INSIDE
>> of modern transceivers?
>
>Len, play nice. Besides, I thought these guys had superior wetware
>developed from emulating a modem?

Thanks for the heads-up, Brian. I am supposed to "play nice" by
acquiescing and capitulating to the wetware superiors. ["wetware"
meaning below the waist...] :-)

"CW gets through when everything else will."

I like that phrase! Well done. US hamdom in 2003. :-)

3420. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 19:47:42 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A6A0A619705elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69570

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:3EFB3675.5080407@adelphia.net:

>
>
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
>> news:FfEKa.13964$er2.11173@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net:
>>
>>
>>>Dwight,
>>>
>>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when
>>>the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few
>>>years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are
>>>correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know.
>>>Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>>>
>>>
>>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>>Jim AA2QA
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>---
>>>Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>>>Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>>>Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> The modification of s25.5 (making code testing optional) was approved
>> unanimously at the subcomittee level (announced 2 days ago), so is
>> likely to pass in the plenary session. I am guessing it might take the
>> FCC 12 months to implement, and element credit is good for 12 months.
>> So, maybe your students ought to be studying theory? Then again, if
>> they can't wait that long for HF, then by all means they should study
>> code.
>
>
> When I became interested in Ham radio, I didn't want to wait until

> they
> dropped Morse, because I wanted to enjoy it and I wanted to enjoy it
> soon. Why a person would avoid learning something is beyond my
> comprehension.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a knack, something that some people get easily and that others find to be extraordinarily hard. The first group often don't understand the second (not only with this skill, but also with others). None of this should be very surprising to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.

3421. Call to Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 19:52:23 UTC
From: Scott #69!!! <scott_unit_69@yahoo.slam>
Message-ID: <3EFB4EF7.F2F07BC5@yahoo.slam>
Source record: 69571

> ...at roughly 11:00 local time, the hard core operators step in, and we
> run the overnight shift. I usually work 80 meter phone until I just
> can't stand it anymore, usually when it's starting to get light out.
> Then another short nap, and its back to the GOTA station.

Our local group is going to reserve the GOTA station for technicians
this year, to allow us "lower-classmen" <: a crack at HF.

I can't wait for the abolition of S.25! Go ITU!

DISCLAIMER:
While I don't want CW, I don't have a problem with anyone who likes it.
There are many facets to amateur radio. CW is just one part of it.

Happy Field Day to all, and to all a good Field Day.

May the weather be on your side, not too hot, and not wet.

(Please try not to gouge each other's eyeballs out! :)

3422. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 19:53:39 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A6A1A7FE2DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69572

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:3EFB3128.9060402@adelphia.net:

> Jim Hampton wrote:
>> Dwight,
>>
>> My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>> questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when
>> the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few
>> years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are
>> correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know.
>> Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>
>
> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested
> in
> the ARS.

Simply not a true statement, and backed up by nothing.

> This is separate to any argument of whether or not there
> should be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.
>
> When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new
> hams,

Possibly

> who will probably drop out almost as quickly.
>

I doubt that, although I do think it may be a one-time event

> The overall effect is likely to be underwhelming.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Largely because it comes too late. If this had happened in 1992, as it
might well have if it had made the agenda and that particular conference
had not been postponed by three years, then I think the effect would have
been much bigger. Something else happened in the interim, an explosion in
Internet use, which has changed the landscape.

3423. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 20:20:31 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <jAIKa.14402$kh4.10230@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 69573

>
>
> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested in
> the ARS.

Total and complete horse manure.

Steve
N2UBP
No code tech.

Orange County, NY ARES/RACES EC/RO , County Skywarn Coordinator

3424. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 20:28:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFB5777.3090908@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69574

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Only if its midnight on a moonless night and you need to send information
>back and forth with a flashlight.
>
>
Wonder if the ability to do code by ear helps any when the code is done
by light
(like those old fashioned light flashers on Navy ships you see in WW2
sea movies....

>
>

3425. Re: Call to Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:01:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB6D6F.90705@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69575

Scott #69!!! wrote:
>> ...at roughly 11:00 local time, the hard core operators step in, and we
>>run the overnight shift. I usually work 80 meter phone until I just
>>can't stand it anymore, usually when it's starting to get light out.
>>Then another short nap, and its back to the GOTA station.
>
>
>
> Our local group is going to reserve the GOTA station for technicians
> this year, to allow us "lower-classmen" <: a crack at HF.

That isn't what it is about.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3426. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:26:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB7341.7080301@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69576

```
Alun Palmer wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:3EFB3675.5080407@adelphia.net:
>
>
>>
>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>>>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
>>>news:FfEKa.13964$er2.11173@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Dwight,
>>>>
>>>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when
>>>>the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few
>>>>years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are
>>>>correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know.
>>>>Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>>>Jim AA2QA
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>---
>>>>Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>>>>Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>>>>Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>The modification of s25.5 (making code testing optional) was approved
>>>unanimously at the subcomittee level (announced 2 days ago), so is
>>>likely to pass in the plenary session. I am guessing it might take the
>>>FCC 12 months to implement, and element credit is good for 12 months.
>>>So, maybe your students ought to be studying theory? Then again, if
>>>they can't wait that long for HF, then by all means they should study
>>>code.
```

>>
>>
>> When I became interested in Ham radio, I didn't want to wait until
>> they
>>dropped Morse, because I wanted to enjoy it and I wanted to enjoy it
>>soon. Why a person would avoid learning something is beyond my
>>comprehension.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a knack, something
> that some people get easily and that others find to be extraordinarily
> hard.

You are correct. It was very hard for me. 6 months of couple of hours
every day. My hearing problems did make it difficult to learn.

Too bad, eh?

The first group often don't understand the second (not only with
> this skill, but also with others). None of this should be very surprising
> to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.

Which group am I in? Hint, I think something worth having is worth
working for. I'm pretty sure that plenty of folk do not think the same way.

For better or worse, the code test ensured that those who became Hams,
wanted to be Hams.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3427. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:42:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <YEKKa.2429$Vx2.1283062@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69578

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> I would put in automatic upgrades for Novice
> and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There is also
> the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting rid of the
> Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the latter, and keeping
> track of their code credit indefinitely after getting rid of element 1
> seems illogical. One way out may be to make the Tech licence simply 28 MHz
> and above. Any thoughts on that?

Automatic upgrades would be inappropriate. There is material on the Tech written that was NOT included in the Novice written. They can take the test. Any Novice that wants to upgrade to Tech (with HF) should already have done so. They've had the opportunity to upgrade to Tech with a single written test for over a decade. They didn't do it so they didn't want it. There is NO need for automatic upgrades. As far as Advanced goes, again, they haven't been tested on material that was specific to the Extra class. Since the reduction of the code to 5wpm in 2000, they've had 3 years to upgrade with a single written test if they wanted to. They didn't do it so they didn't want it. Again NO need for an automatic upgrade.

Should the Element 1 requirement be dropped, the simplest thing is to simply keep the bands and privileges of Novices, Generals, Advanced and Extras exactly as they are now. Change the Tech to get the privileges that the old Tech Plus license used to have. So they would have the 10m voice and code privileges plus 15m, 40m, and 80m code privileges.

This would keep the rule changes simple and accommodate all current licensees.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3428. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:42:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB7711.2010203@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69577

Alun Palmer wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:3EFB3128.9060402@adelphia.net:
>
>
>>Jim Hampton wrote:
>>
>>>Dwight,
>>>
>>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when
>>>the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few
>>>years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are
>>>correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know.
>>>Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>>
>>
>> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested
>> in
>>the ARS.
>
>
> Simply not a true statement, and backed up by nothing.

Perhaps I should have added IMO. That's what it is, an opinion. But
it's backed up by life experiences.

I've heard many excuses for why people don't quit smoking, lose weight,
get in shape, the list goes on and on. It becomes pretty clear that in
reality, they don't really want to do these things, or else they would.
And as a former 3 pack a day smoker (now 26 years without a ciggy) I
know I did not quit until I wanted to.

And this is a FACT. Anyone who does *not* get their General or Extra
ticket until the code requirement is dropped does NOT want to get it
badly enough that they will take a Morse code test. In other words, they
are not interested if it is there, and interested if it is not,

>
>
>>This is separate to any argument of whether or not there
>>should be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.
>>
>> When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new
>> hams,

>
>
> Possibly
>
>
>>who will probably drop out almost as quickly.
>>
>
>
> I doubt that, although I do think it may be a one-time event

Look at the Japanese situation.

>
>
>> The overall effect is likely to be underwhelming.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> Largely because it comes too late. If this had happened in 1992, as it
> might well have if it had made the agenda and that particular conference
> had not been postponed by three years, then I think the effect would have
> been much bigger. Something else happened in the interim, an explosion in
> Internet use, which has changed the landscape.

Comparison of Ham radio to the internet is something that I have always
found amusing and a little suspect. You don't need any special training
or talent to surf the internet. I know, I get a lot of people out of
jams on their 'pooters. They don't know how to set up an email account,
but they can click that mouse button as good as I can.

Despite a lot of people's thoughts to the contrary, the Internet is not
terribly hi-tech. Probably 80-90 percent of Internet users would never
consider being a ham.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3429. Come See My Great Web Site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:42:39 UTC
From: "twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <45008N959@web2news.com>
Source record: 69579
Cross-posted to: uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

http://www.geocities.com/antitwisty/

--
--

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3430. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:44:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XGKKa.2432$Vx2.1283429@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69580

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for
Novice
> >and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There is also
> >the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting rid of
the
> >Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the latter, and keeping
> >track of their code credit indefinitely after getting rid of element 1
> >seems illogical. One way out may be to make the Tech licence simply 28
MHz
> >and above. Any thoughts on that?
> >
> >
> When the sunspots are out of season, 28MHz is just another VHF band.
> Let the techs have a
> portion of 15 meters, so they get a taste of HF DX.
>

No simply change it so the Techs have the privileges of the old Tech Plus
license. They can do that HF DX on the novice/tech cw subband.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3431. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:49:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB7895.8080506@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69581

Steve Fleckenstein wrote:
>>
>>Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested in
>>the ARS.
>
>
>
> Total and complete horse manure.

Hey Steve, Thanks for the respectful reply.

Answer me this:

1. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *before* the Morse test is dropped?

2. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *after* the Morse Requirement is dropped?

Answer key

1 = yes

2 = Has to be no because you already got it.

You want the ticket badly enough to take the test.

1 = no

2 = yes

You do not want the ticket badly enough to take the Morse test, and you are willing to wait until it is dropped.

1 = no

2 = no

You do not want the ticket badly enough to take the tests to gat a General or Extra at all.

Refute this.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3432. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:49:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FLKKa.2433$Vx2.1284001@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69582

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030626064642.09955.00000420@mb-m21.aol.com...
> Historical note: I recall that one of the main reasons Tech Pluses and
Novices
> got 10 meter SSB was an attempt to populate the band and impede its use by
> freeband/cb folks. The freeband/cb folks' argument was "nobody's using
those
> frequencies"
>

The freeband/cb folks were probably listening at the nadir of the sunspot
cycles. It gets real busy at the zenith of a cycle.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3433. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 22:57:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WTKKa.2437$Vx2.1285348@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69583

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93A676D50D55Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030626064642.09955.00000420@mb-m21.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> >>news:c2356669.0306251227.7d9a448c@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:<Xns93A2E23C78588elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >>>> <SNIP>
> >>>>
> >>>> > Which dream? I think what Alun wants is for US hams to be able to
> >>>> > run SSB down to 7.050 or even 7.000, so the DX can't hide. Am I
> >>>> > mistaken, Alun?
> >>>>
> >>>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>>
> >>>> Yes, you're mistaken, I only want to go down to 7.045, as per IARU
> >>>> recommendations for regions 1 and 2 (it's 7.030 for region 3), and I
> >>>> have never asked even for that, as I know we won't get it. In the
> >>>> earlier thread I only suggested SSB down to 7.075, which is what US
> >>>> licenced hams in region 3 already have.
> >>>
> >>> TNX for the update.
> >>>
> >>> Trouble is, if we get worldwide 7000-7200 or even 7000-7300, and the
> >>> SWBCs move, the argument for US hams getting 'phone down to 7045 or
> >>> even 7075 gets weaker because there will be lots of spectrum where US
> >>> and DX hams can work each other nonsplit if they so desire.
> >>
> >>Agreed. I think some may push for phone down to 7100, in place of the
> >>Novices.
> >
> > The trouble is that unless other privs are given to Novices and Tech
> > Pluses, it sets a bad precedent.
>
> True
>
> >
> >>> Which leaves us with three questions:

> >>>
> >>> 1) How will the 40 meter situation work out?
> >>
> >>Three proposals are being sent on by the sub-comittee to the main
> >>comittee. Two give 100 kHz now and the other 100 later, but the
> >>earliest either of them starts is 2007. The third gives 50 in 2018 and
> >>another 50 in 2033. Obviously that one is lousy as it makes us wait 30
> >>years for a DX window! Lets hope at the next stage that one is
> >>rejected. I think it may be, because it is so inadequate that it
> >>encourages attempts to put 40 back on the agenda before then. Knowing
> >>bureaucrats, they won't want to see this come back a second time.
> >
> > Thanks for that info - I agree with your analysis. Seems to me that
> > many developed countries do not see their SWBC needs being as large as
> > they once were. Developing countries are a different story.
> >
> > 2007 is only three years, tho.
>
> Four, but who's counting?
>
> >>
> >>> 2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
> >
> >>I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
> >>quicker.
> >
> >>There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
> >>bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the
> >>FCC will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.
> >
> > IIRC, historically the FCC can't/won't do anything until The Congress
> > ratifies the revised treaty. That will take some time, and petitioning
> > before that time may just works against the petitioners' goal because
> > it shows they don't understand the process.
> >
>
> I hadn't thought about that. Clearly you are right.
>
> >>Quite a few other countries already have provisional dates next month
> >>or the month after for abolishing code testing.
> >
> > Sure, but other countries' ratification methods are different.
>
> I know. Ironically, the relatively open nature of FCC rule-making also
> slows things down.
>
> >>
> >>> 3) What other changes should be made in the US license structure and
> >>> regs?
> >>>

> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>
> >>If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for
> >>Novice and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There
> >>is also the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting
> >>rid of the Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the
> >>latter, and keeping track of their code credit indefinitely after
> >>getting rid of element 1 seems illogical. One way out may be to make
> >>the Tech licence simply 28 MHz and above. Any thoughts on that?
> >
> > Several:
> >
> > 1) As part of its 1998 restructuring petition (has it really been 5
> > years!?), ARRL proposed auto upgrading of existing Novices and Tech
> > Pluses to General. FCC said no. I also recall a QCWA petition to
> > effectively upgrade pre-1968 Generals and Advanceds to Extra, which
> > also went nowhere with FCC. Even Tech Pluses who were licensed before
> > March 21 1987 have to show up at a VE session to get a General, even
> > though they don't need any more test credits. Seems FCC just doesn't
> > want to do auto upgrades and doesn't care about the closed-off license
> > classes.
> >
> > 2) Without Element 1, there's no reason to differentiate between Techs
> > and Tech Pluses, so the two license classes should be made equivalent
> > in the rules.
> >
>
> That's probably the thorniest issue arising from this. Maybe the fairest
> and simplest thing to do is to give all the Techs the privileges of a
> Tech+?
>
> > 3) I'd propose that Technicians get about half of General bandspace on
> > all HF/MF bands, at the current Novice/Tech Plus power level, plus an
> > assortment of modes on HF/MF. Maybe even give them all of 160 and the
> > WARC bands. And since Novices currently have the same HF/MF privs as
> > Tech Pluses, Novices should get the same additional privs.
> >
> > This solves the "refarming" question and makes the privileges more
> > balanced. It also substitutes one set of subbands for another, so
> > overall rules complexity is about the same.
> >
> > Some might say "Why the giveaway?", but note how many Novices and Techs
> > with Code 1 credit haven't upgraded in over 3 years.
> >
> > Historical note: I recall that one of the main reasons Tech Pluses and
> > Novices got 10 meter SSB was an attempt to populate the band and impede
> > its use by freeband/cb folks. The freeband/cb folks' argument was
> > "nobody's using those frequencies"
> >
> > Thoughts?

> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> >
> >
> I think that for the latter reason any solution should give all the Techs
> at least the part of 10m that the Novice and Tech+ already have.
>
> I'm surprised how much we agree on most of this.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

But don't "give away" anything to those that couldn't be bothered to upgrade. The Novices could have upgraded anytime with just a written to Tech Plus (or equivalent) for over 10 years now. If they haven't done so, don't "give" it to them. Besides, there's info on the Tech test that was never on the Novice test.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3434. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 23:06:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <90LKa.2442$Vx2.1286360@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69585

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93A6A0A619705elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a knack, something
> that some people get easily and that others find to be extraordinarily
> hard. The first group often don't understand the second (not only with
> this skill, but also with others). None of this should be very surprising
> to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.

Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy". While the very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes not only training but talent, normal levels of usage only require training. The biggest problem most people face in learning code is unrealistic expectations. They try for a week and think they are a failure when they simply haven't given it the proper amount and type of study. It takes the normal person 30 hours of study and practice (see the book "Morse Code, The Essential Language"), if done correctly, to achieve a reliable 5wpm. No talent or knack is required. The first book that I mention indicates that a very ordinary untalented person can achieve a reliable 20wpm to 25wpm if they go about it the right way.

Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with for written material (which of course they forget immediately following the test as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to 5wpm, a person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day (or nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.

No magic or talent is required to master the basics. Only if you want to be a superstar does talent come into play.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3435. Re: FLASH: Number of "Extra-Lights" tops 20WPM Extras

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 23:07:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdfu90fvc1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69584

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EFB5777.3090908@ix.netcom.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >Only if its midnight on a moonless night and you need to send information
> >back and forth with a flashlight.
> >
> >
> Wonder if the ability to do code by ear helps any when the code is done
> by light
> (like those old fashioned light flashers on Navy ships you see in WW2
> sea movies....
>
> >
> >
>
>

Depends on the training level. I did some experimenting with that a few years back. Basically I set up a LED that was fired by the sound of the CW note, via a op amp as I recall.

In anycase the LED fired in sequence with the incoming tones. I found that I could do reasonably well that way. At times almost as good as by ear.

I think with practice it would be a way to do it.

But.....trying to read 'dot and dash' off a piece of paper is incredibly slow to me.

Dan/W4NTI

3436. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 23:16:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdfuq9$qm1$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69586

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EFB7341.7080301@adelphia.net...

> For better or worse, the code test ensured that those who became Hams,
> *wanted* to be Hams.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Well put and exactly on target.

Dan/W4NTI

3437. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 23:20:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB8032.D921E97E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69587

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Jim Hampton wrote:
> > Dwight,
> >
> > My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
> > questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when the code
> > will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few years rather
> > than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are correct in that
> > the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see how long this
> > thread gets :)
>
> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested in
> the ARS. This is separate to any argument of whether or not there should
> be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.
>
> When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new hams,
> who will probably drop out almost as quickly.

An outflux?

Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?

Dave K8MN

3438. Re: Morse Code Watch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 23:38:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh3v1il.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69588

On 26 Jun 2003 04:54:15 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> The Sheriff just bought us two brand-new 45 foot telephone poles
>> which the power company 'sposed to set next week. We insisted on
>> two pulley and halyard sets per pole although we do have "dibs" on
>> the local fire department's bucket/ ladder truck (which we
>> affectionately call "The Intimidator") if we need it.
>
>Seems like you folk have a real organization going, everybody is into
>it.

It helps that the County Emergency Manager, the EM for the Sheriff's Department, the EM for the county seat city, and the EM for the county-wide fire department are all hams. As are several staff members on local hospitals and the county-wide Consolidated Communications Agency which does the 9-1-1 as well as the tactical dispatching. That's how we get them to spring for all the installed gear, and one of our movers and shakers does extremely high quality cabinet construction in his garage so the fixed installations have standardized operating consoles.

Remember, too, that the "Silicon Forest" is home to large Intel and Tektronix facilities with their attendant ham population and clubs. Intel, because of the extremely nasty stuff that their R&D chip fabrication units use, has a very extensive disaster plan using the hams on staff to provide communication. totally integrated into the County plan.

>Busy, busy, I'm bailing outta the 'net until after FD.

CUL

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3439. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 23:39:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFB8423.6040109@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69589

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy". While the
>very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes not only training
>but talent, normal levels of usage only require training. The biggest
>problem most people face in learning code is unrealistic expectations. They
>try for a week and think they are a failure when they simply haven't given
>it the proper amount and type of study. It takes the normal person 30 hours
>of study and practice (see the book "Morse Code, The Essential Language"),
>if done correctly, to achieve a reliable 5wpm.
>

>Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with for
>written material (which of course they forget immediately following the test
>as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to 5wpm, a
>person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day (or
>nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.
>
Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
average person to
learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should that
time be devoted
to something else?"

3440. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-26 23:52:59 UTC
From: k4cap@aol.com
Message-ID: <a08ca5a.0306261552.22b9ed12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69590

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030626144851.09580.00001037@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0306260445.23d8b7d4@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>...

> "CW gets through when everything else will."

Except for you, of course, Lennie. No tickee, no transmitee

> I like that phrase! Well done. US hamdom in 2003.

One more self-inflicted wound on the face of the Licenseless One.

So foolish. So sad. So Putzy.

Steve

3441. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 00:05:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdg1l7$3i0$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69591

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:YEKKa.2429$Vx2.1283062@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > I would put in automatic upgrades for Novice
> > and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There is also
> > the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting rid of
the
> > Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the latter, and
keeping
> > track of their code credit indefinitely after getting rid of element 1
> > seems illogical. One way out may be to make the Tech licence simply 28
MHz
> > and above. Any thoughts on that?
>
> Automatic upgrades would be inappropriate. There is material on the Tech
> written that was NOT included in the Novice written. They can take the
> test. Any Novice that wants to upgrade to Tech (with HF) should already
> have done so. They've had the opportunity to upgrade to Tech with a
single
> written test for over a decade. They didn't do it so they didn't want it.
> There is NO need for automatic upgrades. As far as Advanced goes, again,
> they haven't been tested on material that was specific to the Extra class.
> Since the reduction of the code to 5wpm in 2000, they've had 3 years to
> upgrade with a single written test if they wanted to. They didn't do it
so
> they didn't want it. Again NO need for an automatic upgrade.
>
> Should the Element 1 requirement be dropped, the simplest thing is to
simply
> keep the bands and privileges of Novices, Generals, Advanced and Extras
> exactly as they are now. Change the Tech to get the privileges that the
old
> Tech Plus license used to have. So they would have the 10m voice and code
> privileges plus 15m, 40m, and 80m code privileges.
>
> This would keep the rule changes simple and accommodate all current
> licensees.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

All well thought suggestions. But its all been brought out before. And
the FCC probably could care less.

This whole entire fiasco of privlidges and class was brought on by the FCC in the first place. Its called incentive licensing.

Why not just drop it all back to the 50 and early 60s? When I got on there was;

1. Novice: CW ONLY 80/40/15m. PHONE 2Meters.
2. Technician:Vhf/Uhf only. ALL amateur privlidges.
3. General: All HF and V/UHF frequencies. 1KW DC input
All modes.
4. Extra: EXACTLY SAME AS GENERAL.

There was a Advanced, renamed from 'Class A' with same privlidges as General and Extra.

Prior to my arrival there was other arrangements, such as no Novice, No Tech. etc. Someone from pre 1961 please chime in here.

The problem as I see it is INCENTIVE LICENSING and its FAILURE.

We need to drop back and punt. Go back to a three tier license structure; Class A, Class B, Class C.

A= Beginners, similar to Novice AND Technician together.
a) Delete Novice sub bands, and Novice license in 5 yrs.
B= Basic, similar to General . But with POWER limitations
instead of frequency limitations within the present HF
allocations.
C= Advanced, place ALL present Advanced and Extras into
this one. Full amateur privlidges.

Now here is the kicker. All the licenses above would grant only SSB/AM/FM privlidges.

ALL OTHER MODES would require a applicant to demonstrate profeciency in the mode he wants to be endorsed for. Test, written or other (such as CW).

So no one needs do what he don't want to.

Just some thoughts.

Dan/W4NTI

>

3442. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 00:22:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030626202236.09955.00000434@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 69592

In article <86llvohknb.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
<jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:

>>>>> "Jim" =3D=3D n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:
>
>Jack> The one thing I took away from that article that truly
>Jack> fascinates me is that this is the third time a section manager
>Jack> has been recalled -- and that all three of the recalls have
>Jack> taken place in the past fifteen years. Does that say anything
>Jack> about "the state of the hobby"?
>
>Jim> Let's see - 3 recalls in 15 years, and there are 80 ARRL
>Jim> sections.
>
>I was trying to call attention to 0 recalls for 75 years, then 3
>recalls in 15 years.

Do we really know that there were 0 recalls in 75 years?
>
>Jim> Perhaps it says that most SMs are pretty decent, and the
>Jim> incompetent ones get removed quickly.
>
>It might also be a cultural thing -- that recalls weren't socially
>acceptable methods of resolution until recently.

Perhaps. I know that in the past there have been midterm step-downs. Perhaps
some of them were the result of a "word to the wise".

73 de Jim, N2EY

3443. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 00:51:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh3z0zn.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69593
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 26 Jun 2003 11:01:01 -0700, Phil Stripling wrote:

>The only time I sent an email to the FCC, it took a couple of weeks to get
>a reply.

Hey Phil - you know who to ask for things like that.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3444. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 01:10:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh407fo.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69594

On Thu, 26 Jun 2003 19:05:19 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Prior to my arrival there was other arrangements, such as no Novice, No
>Tech. etc. Someone from pre 1961 please chime in here.

Pre 1951, you mean.

Class A - all amateur privileges
Class B - all except no phone below 10 meters
Class C - Class B exam taken before a volunteer examiner if the
applicant was more than 75 miles from the nearest FCC
quaretrly testing point. (Later changed to 175 miles)

Note that there was no 15 meter band (let alone 13 and 17 meters),
and no phone segment on 40 meters.

If we want to keep the VE program, going back to the pre-1951
scheme would result in 2 classes, A and B. B would be the beginners
license with limited privileges (maybe nothing below 28 MHz) and A
would be the full-privilege license.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3445. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 01:16:02 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306270116250.7073@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 69595
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 25 Jun 2003, AMHAM73 wrote:
> The FCC page at URL:
> http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/family/
> Will answer your questions
> Better to get it from the Horse's mouth rather than any guesses you may
> receive.
>
> Although you "actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all". Why
> not get the license and make full use of your radio ??? Comes the day you
> may want or need it.

...Maybe he doesn't want to pay $75 every 5 years....

3446. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 01:26:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB9D7A.7030906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69596

Dave Heil wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Jim Hampton wrote:
>>
>>>Dwight,
>>>
>>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when the code
>>>will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few years rather
>>>than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are correct in that
>>>the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see how long this
>>>thread gets :)
>>
>> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested in
>>the ARS. This is separate to any argument of whether or not there should
>>be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.
>>
>> When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new hams,
>>who will probably drop out almost as quickly.
>
>
> An outflux?
>
> Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
> regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?

Heh, heh. And how do we gruntle a disgruntled person? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3447. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 01:29:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFB9E3D.30003@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69597

Robert Casey wrote:
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>> Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy". While
>> the
>> very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes not only
>> training
>> but talent, normal levels of usage only require training. The biggest
>> problem most people face in learning code is unrealistic
>> expectations. They
>> try for a week and think they are a failure when they simply haven't
>> given
>> it the proper amount and type of study. It takes the normal person 30
>> hours
>> of study and practice (see the book "Morse Code, The Essential
>> Language"),
>> if done correctly, to achieve a reliable 5wpm.
>
>
>> Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with for
>> written material (which of course they forget immediately following
>> the test
>> as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to 5wpm, a
>> person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day (or
>> nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.
>>
> Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
> average person to
> learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should that
> time be devoted
> to something else?"

100 percent correct! And that brings me back to my statement that
anyone really interested in being a ham will take the effort to learn Morse.

Perhaps the astute hobbyist would rather get a computer and surf the
web? Not much effort to learn that, and they may feel their time better
spent looking at... well, whatever people look at while surfing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3448. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 01:40:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030626214010.23745.00000743@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69599

In article <1kjKa.150830$cm4.2988134@twister.tampabay.rr.com>, "James Williams" <no@thankyou.org> writes:

>
>"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote :
>>
>> If
>> I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?
>
> No.

Wrong answer. The answer is yes. If you own a radio capable of GMRS and FRS operation, you're going to use the GMRS capabilities. Period. E N D O F S T O R Y. Get the GMRS license. If I were an FCC official and I caught you with the radio and you didn't have a GMRS ticket, you'd be getting the book thrown at you.

BTW -- these combo FRS/GMRS HT's are being sold for a specific reason: to get as many owners "bootlegging" on GMRS as possible, in order to force the FCC to throw up their hands and de-regulate GMRS the same way they deregulated CB in the 70's. I hope that what they do instead is make enough "examples" out of said bootleggers with Mega-buck fines that this doesn't happen, and GMRS remains the controlled, licensed, and regulated service that it is.

73 de Larry, K3LT
FRS Channel 7, open

3449. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 01:40:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030626214011.23745.00000744@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69598

In article <bdcf45$r0os7$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>, "thomas"
<word_pass@hotmail.com> writes:

>
>I just bought a 2-way radio that supports both GMRS and FRS:
>
>http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/B000093IK8
>
>I actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all. My question is: If
>I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?
>
>When I placed the order, I was told: "GMRS channels require FCC license. ".
>I assume this means FRS channels do not require FCC license, unless the
>Amazon.com description is misleading.
>
>Please help me with this issue so that I can start to use my radio!
>
>Thanks!
>Thomas

IMHO, possession of a transceiver capable of use on GMRS frequencies
would imply that it is being used on GMRS. Therefore, the license would
be required.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3450. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 02:25:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030626222527.12501.00000475@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 69600

In article <Xns93A674231DEAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
>news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com:

(N2EY wrote:)

>>>>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?

>>>I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
>>>quicker.
>>>
>>>There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
>>>bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the
>>>FCC will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.

>> Whatever the crackpots suggest in reguards to dropping the code test,
>> the FCC could just
>> say "element 1 is no longer required after Oct 31, 2003" or such date
>> that adds up to the
>> usual comment period and publish it in the federal register process.

>I thought the comment period was longer. Can anyone here give us a
>definitve answer to that?

First, the revised treaty has to be ratified by The Congress.

Second, FCC has to decide whether dropping Element 1 requires the NPRM process.

If FCC decides to do an NPRM, somebody has to write it up, then there are
comment and reply comment periods of length decided by FCC. Probably on the
order of a few months. Then FCC processes all the comments (couple more months)
and issues an R&O that changes the rules.
>
But FCC could decide that they don;t need the NPRM process. For example,
changes like new VE fees and QPC pool changes don't get NPRMs, FCC just does
it.

Seems to me that FCC could just say, in effect, 'we considered all the codetest
arguments, pro and con, back in 98 and 99. We said back then that the treaty
was the only reason for a code test, and we reduced code testing to 5 wpm
because that's the minimum we think meets the treaty. Without the treaty,
there's no reason, so the code test is history." Element 1 gets dumped by
executive order and that's that.

But first the revised treaty has to be ratified.

>>>If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for
>>>Novice and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There
>>>is also the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting
>>>rid of the Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the
>>>latter, and keeping track of their code credit indefinitely after
>>>getting rid of element 1 seems illogical. One way out may be to make
>>>the Tech licence simply 28 MHz and above. Any thoughts on that?
>>>
>>>
>> When the sunspots are out of season, 28MHz is just another VHF band.
>> Let the techs have a
>> portion of 15 meters, so they get a taste of HF DX.
>>
Nah. Give 'em usable parts of all the HF/MF ham bands. Say half of what
Generals have, at the Novice HF power level.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3451. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 02:39:08 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <3fbnfv4hd800j8383vilmguloshlt7bukb@4ax.com>
Source record: 69601
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 25 Jun 2003 18:16:28 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>Look - the GMRS feature on these radios is a USELESS GIMMICK. Forget
>about using those frequencies or getting a license for them.

I just renewed my GMRS license (for the second time) so I could use my
new T4500.

With all that power super-gain antenna I don't want to take any
chances. :)

Mike

3452. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 02:49:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030626224931.23745.00000745@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69603

In article <3EFB9D7A.7030906@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
>> regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?
>
>
> Heh, heh. And how do we gruntle a disgruntled person? 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Actually, a "disgruntled" person would have to be "regruntled," since
he must have been "gruntled" at one time in order to become "disgruntled."

Same thing applies to "discombobulated" people.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Disaffected former HF phone operator

3453. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 02:49:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030626224931.23745.00000746@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69604

In article <3EFB8423.6040109@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with for
>>written material (which of course they forget immediately following the test
>>as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to 5wpm, a
>>person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day (or
>>nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.
>>
>Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
>average person to
>learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should that
>time be devoted
>to something else?"

Bob:

The time I spent learning the Morse code and increasing my skill in
order to upgrade to 20-WPM Extra-class status was in investment that
paid off in what has become, so far, over 20 years of enjoyable HF CW
operation. I'm certainly glad I didn't decide to devote that time to
"something else" -- especially if that may have been hours of yakking
into a microphone!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3454. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 02:49:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030626224932.23745.00000747@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69602

In article <jAIKa.14402$kh4.10230@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested in
>> the ARS.
>
>
>Total and complete horse manure.
>
>
>Steve
>N2UBP
>No code tech.
>
>Orange County, NY ARES/RACES EC/RO , County Skywarn Coordinator
>

Steve:

The only "total and complete horse manure" here is the notion that a so-called amateur radio operator who hasn't mastered the basic communications skill of Morse/CW operation is qualified to be a county Skywarn Coordinator.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3455. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 02:49:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030626224933.23745.00000748@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 69605

In article <Xns93A6A0A619705elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>
>Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a knack, something
>that some people get easily and that others find to be extraordinarily
>hard. The first group often don't understand the second (not only with
>this skill, but also with others). None of this should be very surprising
>to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.

Alun:

In that case, I guess you could say that I am one person who represents
both groups. I spent fourteen of what could have been the best years of
my ham radio career being a person who completely hated the notion of
having to learn the Morse code in order to get an amateur radio license.
I tried to learn it several times, to the point of having built homebrew
code practice oscillators on two separate occasions, years apart. You
see, I always enjoyed the technical and project construction aspect of
the electronics hobby, but I wanted to get involved in ham radio without
having to learn how to make and copy those ancient, useless beeping
noises. After all, we had just put men on the Moon and brought them
back, and we had computers that could fit into a small house! What the
heck did we need to know Morse code for, anyway? Then, one fine day,
I "found" a ham radio operator in my dormitory day room at Andrews AFB,
MD, where I was stationed in the Air Force at the time as a Sergeant.
This guy walks in and is carrying a new Tempo 2-meter HT, and we start
discussing ham radio. He takes me to his room and shows me his very
neat station setup, with 6- and 10-meter capability and an HF longwire
in the works. I told him I've wanted to get into ham radio for a long time,
but I didn't want to be bothered with the "beeping." I could never learn it,
I had a mental block or some physical problem that prevented me from
copying it, or whatever other excuse I could think of -- but I was sure I
would have no problem talking into a microphone! He said, and these
words ring in my ears to this day, "Well, Larry, a lot of people are like
that, but none of them are hams!" I kept thinking about that, and about
a year later, I decided that I'd made excuses long enough. I talked another
friend of mine into joining me in a Novice class at the local radio club, and
within a month, we both had our Novice tickets. The same day we got
our tickets on the air, I made my first CW QSO on the club station. I was
a Tech in a couple of months, General in a few more, Advanced and Extra
came very quickly due to an upgrading "race" I was in with another new
ham in our club at the time. Throughout it all, I made approximately 500
HF/CW QSO's at our club station and on my own mobile HF station I had
built out of my 1978 Plymouth Horizon.

The funny thing is, it never occurred to me until years later that I had somehow made a miraculous recovery from all of the physical and mental "problems" I had been having with learning the Morse code! In fact, I went from zero to 20 WPM in four months. What got me "hooked" was that first nervous, sweaty-palmed CW QSO, which happened to be with LU2DSL in Argentina! What kept me going was the requirement to pass the 13- and 20-WPM code tests for my General and Extra tickets. What surprised me was I passed the 20 WPM the day I went to the FCC office in Baltimore for the General, but I missed the Advanced theory test by two questions, since I had only been studying for my General up to that point. It was just over a year before I finally went for the Extra, so I had to re-take the 20-WPM test, but that was no problem by that time!

Now that it seems that the ITU will eliminate code testing soon, all I can say is that I really feel sympathy for future new hams who will never have to go through the same great process I experienced on my way to full amateur privileges. They may think that this is some kind of victory for them, but in reality, all they are is a sorry bunch of losers!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: KA3HXE, N3CRA, DA1RZ, DA1ZW, WR2F, AFA7LR, G0LYW

3456. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 03:23:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdgdbnhqo0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 69606

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Just because you don't hear any transmitting does not mean it is not in use.

I guess everyone is standing by waiting for someone to talk?

>
> There are a large number of guburment users in the 5 Mhz range. FEMA,
> SHARES, Homeland Security, US Military. MARS. Just as an example.

Yaas, none of which uses HF to any serious extent these days. It's virtually unused. Relegated to a 'secondary' or backup status. About the same as military HF usage..

>
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bddnm9gic0@208.207.71.139...
> > Maybe, but it sure helps explain why NTIA was silent till long past the
> > cutoff date for comments. One has to wonder how they finally got woke up
> > to what was going on. Probably some Lennie type alerted them to the fact
> > that those nasty ol' ghastly hams were about to intrude on their turf
> > which they never use.
> > .But hey, why let someone else have it that actually might make come
> > constructive use of it just because of that?
> >
> > Dick
> >
> > Jim Hampton wrote:
> >
> > > Dick,
> > >
> > > Sounds like the argument the happy HFers (freebanders) are using :)
> > >
> > > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > Jim AA2QA
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bd8j6ttsb0@208.206.142.93...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Then again, the primary users never use it!
> > >
> > > ---

> > > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > > Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
> >

3457. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 03:50:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdgeup$o14$0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 69607

Robert Casey wrote:

>
> Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
> average person to
> learn decent code ability really worth the investment?

Does that 'average person' want a ham radio license or does he want to sit on his duff complaining about the requriements for a couple decades or more until a weary FCC finally capitulates?

> Or should that
> time be devoted
> to something else?"

Tiddlewinks perhaps?

3458. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 04:08:41 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdgg09qek0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 69608

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <1kjKa.150830$cm4.2988134@twister.tampabay.rr.com>, "James Williams"
> <no@thankyou.org> writes:
>
> >
> >"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote :
> >>
> >> If
> >> I only use FRS, do I still need to apply for a license?
> >
> > No.
>
> Wrong answer. The answer is yes. If you own a radio capable of GMRS
> and FRS operation, you're going to use the GMRS capabilities. Period.
> E N D O F S T O R Y. Get the GMRS license. If I were an FCC official
> and I caught you with the radio and you didn't have a GMRS ticket, you'd
> be getting the book thrown at you.
>
> BTW -- these combo FRS/GMRS HT's are being sold for a specific reason:
> to get as many owners "bootlegging" on GMRS as possible, in order to force
> the FCC to throw up their hands and de-regulate GMRS the same way they
> deregulated CB in the 70's. I hope that what they do instead is make enough
> "examples" out of said bootleggers with Mega-buck fines that this doesn't
> happen, and GMRS remains the controlled, licensed, and regulated service
> that it is.

No question about the license beng required, but it's curious that FCC would
authorize a radio that could be so easily misused by so many
ordinary people who have no knowledge of the difference between FRS and GMRS. I've
heard some buyers say it's OK to use the dual radios on FRS with no license, and
one even said the radio was designed to reduce power to make it legal on FRS.

Begins to look like maybe FCC is ambivilent on the matter.

3459. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 04:11:37 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdgg5pqek1@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 69609

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > > Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
> > > regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?
>
> Heh, heh. And how do we gruntle a disgruntled person? 8^)

Whern you figure it out, apply your technique on Lennie and B. Burke, please.
They're about as disgruntled as it gets.

3460. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 04:24:12 UTC
From: Phil Stripling <phil_stripling@cieux.zzn.com>
Message-ID: <3qptl05es3.fsf@shell4.tdl.com>
Source record: 69610
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> On 26 Jun 2003 11:01:01 -0700, Phil Stripling wrote:
>
> >The only time I sent an email to the FCC, it took a couple of weeks to get
> >a reply.
>
> Hey Phil - you know who to ask for things like that.

Now that I have your email address! :-)

--
Philip Stripling | email to the replyto address is presumed
Legal Assistance on the Web | spam and read later. email to philip@
http://www.PhilipStripling.com/ | civex.com is read daily.

3461. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 04:38:05 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <8665msgmoi.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 69611

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Jim" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:

[...]

Jack> I was trying to call attention to 0 recalls for 75 years, then 3
Jack> recalls in 15 years.

Jim> Do we really know that there were 0 recalls in 75 years?

The first sentence of the article:

"For the third time in League history, an ARRL Section Manager has
been removed from office through a recall election."

Now, it's possible that recall elections haven't been part of the
bylaws for 75 years. I haven't done that research. However, I would
be surprised if recall elections were a recent innovention in the bylaws.

[...]

Jack> It might also be a cultural thing -- that recalls weren't
Jack> socially acceptable methods of resolution until recently.

Jim> Perhaps. I know that in the past there have been midterm
Jim> step-downs. Perhaps some of them were the result of a "word to
Jim> the wise".

This wouldn't surprise me in the least. That seems to be more like
the method a group of 'old school' hams might use to resolve that kind
of situation.

Jim> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE++8oyGPFSfAB/ezgRAk6IAJ4uV2/091ZdH/1zbtMSbf3McqfKpACggy9W
zRPL71qKIRT8uX8lF/k9oWA=
=jDoI
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3462. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 04:43:48 UTC
From: Phil Stripling <phil_stripling@cieux.zzn.com>
Message-ID: <3qk7b85dvf.fsf@shell4.tdl.com>
Source record: 69612
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

G. M. Alf <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> writes:

> With all that power super-gain antenna I don't want to take any
> chances. :)

I hesitate to post this, as it's about ham radio gain antennas, but it _is_
about a super-gain antenna, so I'll yield to temptation.
````````someone else's report````````````
Subject: Antenna Design

Greetings from Tokyo and all the members of TIARA (Tokyo International
Amateur Radio Association). I know I promised you a series of articles
on Japanese amateur radio, but there is something so exciting I just
have to take a break and tell you about it.

It all started with the work that Ed Coan (AH7L/7J1AAE) did on antenna
pattern plotting using his personal computer and the A-to-D converter in
his FT-1000. The circular, and even backward antenna patterns of some
of our local TIARA club members brought home the point that what a good
station needs is a good antenna. Ed's antenna looks great and the
results verify it. He works regular schedules into Colorado and Maine,
just like sunspots don't mean anything. My mini-beam just could not
compare.

Well, I got to thinking about what we Tokyo apartment dwellers could do
and realized that space is THE problem. How do you fit a full-sized beam
on a balcony? Loading coils are the answer and the problem at the same
time -- the antenna radiation resistance drops as reactance is
substituted for length. High current loops develop and the power is
dissipated in the antenna instead of being radiated. If only the antenna
didn't dissipate the power. Hmmm....let's see, P=3DE2 /R; now if R
were 0 then...

From my work, I have some contacts in research groups over at Tokyo
University. Better yet, I knew a Japanese ham that is a graduate student
there. The thought running through my head was to build a
super-conducting antenna. This requires cryogenics, i.e. temperatures
around minus 279 degrees Centigrade. I was able get the university folks
interested in the project and we built a 10-meter dipole test silicon
wafer. They put together a lot of serial coils by "re-work" on the
wafer; they were able to connect them so we had a super-conducting yagi.
I took my TS-930 transceiver down to the lab for the first tests, but
before we could test it, actual measurements showed it was resonant on
3.126 MHz. It seems that the normal equations for inductance don't work
with super-conducting materials =97 you need a lot fewer turns to get the
````````

same results compared to room temperature. Many measurements and trials later, we had a ten-meter resonant wafer. This time we put a 40-element beam on each wafer and stacked 4 wafers in the same assembly. That made a 160-element array on 10-meters in less than a half-foot cube (15 cm3).

The first test didn't go too well. I connected my TS-930 to the super-conducting wafer antenna and tuned it for 10 meters. At room temperature, we couldn't hear anything. Using a heat pump, the lab technicians started lowering the antenna's temperature toward the super-conducting region. I was really impressed by how small the equipment is, and started thinking it might all fit in the shack. Just then, the TS-930 froze solid, which had a negative effect on its operating characteristics. This wouldn't be so easy after all; the coax connection would need some study!

We reworked the wafers to put inductive coupling on them, but I could find no way to efficiently couple to it from the conducting array. Fortunately the lab technicians came up with a new ceramic material that passed RF but not heat. Probably, something that Kyocera invented just for this use. I sent the TS-930 to the ham shop in Akihabara and asked them to touch it up for me. My friend Suzuki-San, JH1WWC (store manager at the ham shop), asked exactly how the paint had been peeled off around the coax connector -- lightning maybe? No, I assured him -- just low temperature exposure, without saying how low the temperatures were. The project had to stay secret and besides, Suzuki-San can repair anything!

Since it looked like it might be a while before the TS-930 would be repaired, I brought out my TS-940. I had already placed an order for a Yaesu FT-1000 anyway. After verifying that in the super-onducting range the antenna was resonant on 10-meters, we connected the TS-940. The ceramic material worked and the rig operated well as we began the cooling cycle. The band seemed dead even with the antenna at -150 degrees C. It took another 10 minutes to get to the super-conducting range -- then the TS-940 blew up. It seems our antenna had a bit more gain than the TS-940 front-end could take. Later measurements showed 500 volts coming out of the coax. A little hard to believe, but then what do I know about cryogenic LSI antenna technology? The TS-940 was also returned to Suzuki-San, but this time he frowned a bit -- the front-end board did look like it had been hit by lightning. Not to worry, Suzuki-San can repair anything!

The FT-1000 arrived just in time to be able to continue experiments. We built a QSK attenuator to protect the receiver. With the LSI wafer antenna still inside the lab, we decided to try to make a contact on 10-meters. What a shock when we got it working! The first thing we heard was a couple of W2's talking locally on 10 meters and that was with 80 dB of attenuation. We had the antenna array on a rotatable mount; I moved it about a half-degree and the W2's disappeared. What beam width! We tuned them in again, and they were just about to sign off, so we thought we would try to work them. The rig was tuned up at 50 watts on a dummy load; we switched in the wafer antenna and gave N2BA a call. The

noise was unbelievable -- an ionized ray shot out from the antena and hit the wall of the building. Before we knocked a hole in the band, we took a piece out of the lab wall! Ever wonder what an antenna pattern looks like in three dimensions? There was a oval hole in the wall of the lab -- about 1-cm high by 2-cm wide. We cut power quickly. N2BA came back on frequency a few minutes later and said he was using his back-up rig; something had taken his main rig off the air. For some reason, the station he was talking to never came back, so we decided not to transmit again until we knew for sure what was going on.

As near as we can tell, the antenna array has 620-dB gain over a dipole, but with a beamwidth of 0.75 degrees using the 60-dB points. With 50 watts output, the effective radiated power is 55 quadrillion watts at the center of the beam (5.5 with 13 zeroes). As soon as the University realized what we had built, the entire project was taken away from us and turned over to the Japanese Self-Defense Force. Amateur radio "tinkering" has contributed to something, but I am not exactly sure what. I haven't the slightest idea what was in those wafers or how to build another set. Do you think someone may be interested in this idea for Star Wars/SDI?? What I'd give to use a much smaller set in the next CQ World Wide Contest!

A few months later, the University contacted all of us and asked just how close we had been to the antenna when operating. As best as I can figure, we were in the null behind the array. From what has been said so far, it looks like a secondary use for our antenna may be as a mass sterilizer, but confirmation will have to await the results of our medical tests. If our antenna ever hits the market, it looks like remote operation may be desirable.

As I am writing this, I have been informed that my friend Suzuki-San can't fix everything after all. He's written off the TS-930 and TS-940, and I just found out that before the university terminated the project, they tried one more time with my FT-1000, but without the 100-dB attenuator to protect the receiver. Its front-end now matches the 940's and it looks like it will be a while before I am on the air again.
``````````end of someone else's report````````````

I'm sorry to say the reporter never specifies if he's using dBi.
--
Philip Stripling | email to the replyto address is presumed
Legal Assistance on the Web | spam and read later. email to philip@
http://www.PhilipStripling.com/ | civex.com is read daily.
``````````

3463. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 04:44:11 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdi29p$suhm4$10@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69636

Yep... I am fully aware of that, I was merely adding to the list of who he
is a "thorn in the side of."

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EF9A9FE.2AFF229A@earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > I am sure he is a thorn in the CQ magazines' side as well too eh? I
have
> > read most of the 73 magazines from the 70's through the 90's and the
> > magazine itself is still pretty good, regardless of the editorial.
Wayne
> > has had *some* good ideas, but in the real world the "stick in the mud"
> > types would never allow any of that stuff to happen.
>
> You do realize, don't you, Ryan, that Wayne was editor of CQ for a time?
> He was fired and that set off his anti-CQ vendetta.
>
> Dave K8MN

3464. Re: INSIDE THE ARRL - THE REAL STORY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 04:53:01 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdi29q$suhm4$11@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69637

> >
> > True.... but as I predicted to myself, you have proven a point about
someone
> > not fully reading the text.... see where it said about speaking in
> > generalities, not specifics. They are both agitators.
>
> I read what you wrote and I disagreed. I don't think of Rush as an
> agitator and I don't think of Wayne Green as stable.

Rush has admitted himself that he is an agitator. That is the only
redeeming quality that he does have. Wayne is too... as far as his
non-amateur radio interests I could care less. I don't care about your
non-amateur radio interests, unless I ask either.

>
> > >
> > >
> > > > Whether or not you
> > > > agree with him or not, he gets you thinking.
> > >
> > > He certainly does. I subscribed to "73" back in 1975. In just a few
> > > months I began thinking that I'd wasted my money. At renewal time, I
> > > thought that I'd save my money and skip "73".
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Well.... I don't agree with his editorials, but from the issues I have
read
> > from somewhere in the 70's till the late 90's there were alot of
articles,
> > project and construction plans etc. that was not written by him, that
were
> > actually good. To discount a whole mag due to who writes the editorial
is
> > kinda foolish, but is a persons option. I hate the editor of a local
> > newspaper, and cannot stand their editorials, but I still read the
paper.
>
> Actually, 73's construction articles were better in the early 1960's.
> Much of the later stuff is quite basic. There was also a tendency to
> swerve toward computers rather than amateur radio in the mid-1970's and
> beyond. I recall telling Wayne at Dayton that I would have subscribed
> to a computer magazine if I'd wanted a computer magazine.

True, but that is also when computers started to become part of ham radio so I would expect some incorporation there. If it dominated the whole magazine on a regular basis, I would have issue there.

As far as the basic construction articles, I actually think that is a good thing. I would like to see more of that for the newer hams, as they can start small and work up. (in learning and project size)

>
> > > > As lethargic as ham radio has
> > > > gotten, we need more people like him, just to wake some of the old farts
> > up.
> > > > (speaking in generalities here, not specifics.)
> > >
> > > Well, look at the specifics. Wayne Green is one of the oldest farts
> > > around.
> > >
> >
> > So you are saying Wayne is responsible for the lethargy?
>
> First we'd have to establish that there is lethargy. To quote you, "but
> as I predicted to myself, you have proven a point about someone
> not fully reading the text....". I wrote that Wayne is one of the
> oldest farts around.

Around here there is at least a lethargy. Come to one of the three local club meetings and you would think it is a scene from the movie "Coma." Half these people seem to just sit there like a deer caught in the headlights. It is almost like I want to bring in some firecrackers or a starter pistol just to wake people up. There just is not any energy or enthusiasm anymore. I am active in a couple clubs and visit some of the others on a regular basis and try to help out where I can, so yes, I do get involved.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3465. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 05:10:30 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdi29r$suhm4$12@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69638

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EF9AD82.2C24EBEC@earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > Here are a few of the things that would be of interest:
> >
> > *Full motion video (i.e. ATV) that could be remote-control deployed in
the
> > field by some form of a device that can also be remote controlled to the
> > scene. This would help keep people safer if it is a haz-mat related
> > situation.
>
> ATV is available now. I prefer to leave hazardous material situations
> to trained professionals.

What they are looking (current project) is a device that is self-propellable to the site using ATV to monitor the scene, from a safe distance. One prime example is a few years ago they had a haz-mat incident involving a Dow railroad tanker and they wished they had something that could watch the gauge on the side. A self-propelled device, with a video device would have served well. One thing that is being looked at is the larger versions of the remote-controlled model cars as the "propelling" device.

>
> > *File sharing capabilities-not just talking about little files here.
> > Possibly sending scans of important documentation or digital camera
pictures
> > or a couple of other things as well.
>
> Such things are available now, though they use COTS units over pretty
> short distances.

>
> > *Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until
it
> > is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to
HIPAA
> > regulations now, patient information is a concern.
>
> What you're proposing is illegal in amateur radio.

No... it can be sent over packet. Any information regarding patient information WHATSOEVER has to be dealt with carefully though, and I would not send it over voice. I should have also included ANY OTHER sensitive communications in that as well. If you are working a disaster, and are the

primary communications unit, assuming that public services freqs. are unusable, you very well may have to pass on patient information, albeit statistical information at times, for the emergency services groups to a ham at the recieving hospital. It is very concievable.

As far as the protecting the communications, packet is also a good start. It helps because not everyone out there with a scanner can easily pick up that information. My intent of the original post is that we are getting further and further behind in our digital communications part of the hobby. Aren't we supposed to be the innovators??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3466. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 05:31:34 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdi29t$suhm4$13@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69639

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EF9F77D.5010608@psu.edu...
>
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Here are a few of the things that would be of interest:
> >
> > *Full motion video (i.e. ATV) that could be remote-control deployed in
the
> > field by some form of a device that can also be remote controlled to the
> > scene. This would help keep people safer if it is a haz-mat related
> > situation.
>
> That would be cool!

Definitely, as stated in another response, we are possibly looking some type
of a remote-control car to do this. The robot type things used by
bomb-squads are cost-prohibitive. Nice thing about this is that it can
monitor the scene without putting a person in danger to monitor the scene,
or for that matter setting up a tripod with the corresponding equipment
close to the scene. Just drive (via remote control) the damned thing up
there.

>
> > *File sharing capabilities-not just talking about little files here.
> > Possibly sending scans of important documentation or digital camera
pictures
> > or a couple of other things as well.
>
> Perhaps in a few years.

Yeah, that would be nice. The speeds allowed in ham radio seem to equate to
modems used for computers 20 years ago.....

>
> > *Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until
it
> > is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to
HIPAA
> > regulations now, patient information is a concern.
>
> hmmmmmm, now you're getting into a really gray area. The amateur bands
> are by definition open to whoever has a radio. Anyone can listen.

That is why they should be sent over something digital like packet or
whatever the improvement over packet might be. After all, even sending a

"fatality" list which is something that should not be done over voice, and
in the technical sense is patient related information of which you do not
want people like the media getting ahold of prematurely.

>
>
> > *Speed of getting message information from point A to point B etc., in a
> > faster, timely means, as well as tracking of that information as to who
and
> > where that information went and also, the follow up on that information
as
> > to "did that really get done?"
>
> Sounds like they need full time, professional communicators.

No... just improvement to our own skills and abilities. This talking point
was not necessarily directed as a problem with hams, just an important
point.

>
>
> How much faster doya need? I'm not sure how to speed up RF! (cheap one,
> I know 8^))
>
> Tracking of messages seems like something that is their responsibility.
> I mean the Hams can send what they are told to. Just set up a protocol.
>

Speed can definitely be improved upon. Christ, the average person can send
data over the air now legally a hell of alot faster than any ham radio
digital mode, without a license. So why the hell are we so limited?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3467. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 05:38:12 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bdi29v$suhm4$14@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69640

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0306251345.3820970@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bdc55b$qci45$15@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> > Here are a few of the things that would be of interest:
> >
> > *Full motion video (i.e. ATV) that could be remote-control deployed in
the
> > field by some form of a device that can also be remote controlled to the
> > scene. This would help keep people safer if it is a haz-mat related
> > situation.
>
> The ATV is no particular problem but a reliable self-propelled
> all-terrain RC robot is another whole story. They already exist (bomb
> squads) and I've been involved in the mechanical design of such
> widgets at the professional level for decades and I can tell you
> somebody better have very deep pockets and a bunch of expertise well
> beyond just the electronics a la AMSAT. The electronics would be the
> easy part.

Understood as the bombsquad robot thing is definitely gonna be out of the
price range but a remote control car (the larger scale ones) may suit the
needs possibly.

>
> > *File sharing capabilities-not just talking about little files here.
> > Possibly sending scans of important documentation or digital camera
pictures
> > or a couple of other things as well.
>
> Hellschreiber for document & photo scans.

What type of files can be sent, and what size? What types of speeds with
Hellschrieber??

>
> > *Protection of communications from the general public (and media) until
it
> > is determined that information is okay to release. Also, thanks to
HIPAA
> > regulations now, patient information is a concern.
>
> That's not a ham function and I wouldn't touch it with a ten foot pole
> even if it was.

Show me a ham group working a large-scale disaster that has not?? Injuries, triage info, fatalities are information that *may* have to be passed as traffic and need to stay in a mode that is not generally accessable to every nut (or media person) with a scanner. Packet, albeit slow is okay for this, as it is a legal means of encrypting the data.

>
> > *Speed of getting message information from point A to point B etc., in a
> > faster, timely means, as well as tracking of that information as to who
and
> > where that information went and also, the follow up on that information
as
> > to "did that really get done?"
>
> That's mostly an organization design problem, I pass.

These points that were listed were talking points of things they felt were important. Not necessarily stating a fault in the hams.....

>
> > These were some of the points referred to as being important.
>
> Interesting shopping list, tnx Ryan.
> \

No problem, and possibly might come across some solutions eh?? :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3468. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 11:58:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306270358.4448717e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69613

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<8665msgmoi.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Jim" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.com> writes:
>
> [...]
>
> Jack> I was trying to call attention to 0 recalls for 75 years, then 3
> Jack> recalls in 15 years.
>
> Jim> Do we really know that there were 0 recalls in 75 years?
>
> The first sentence of the article:
>
> "For the third time in League history, an ARRL Section Manager has
> been removed from office through a recall election."

Well, that sure looks like proof to me!
>
> Now, it's possible that recall elections haven't been part of the
> bylaws for 75 years. I haven't done that research. However, I would
> be surprised if recall elections were a recent innovention in the bylaws.
>
I agree. Standard boilerplate bylaws.

> [...]
>
> Jack> It might also be a cultural thing -- that recalls weren't
> Jack> socially acceptable methods of resolution until recently.
>
> Jim> Perhaps. I know that in the past there have been midterm
> Jim> step-downs. Perhaps some of them were the result of a "word to
> Jim> the wise".
>
> This wouldn't surprise me in the least. That seems to be more like
> the method a group of 'old school' hams might use to resolve that kind
> of situation.

Yep - but it's sad to think of that sort of thing as 'old school'.

After all, ARRL field appointments are all unpaid, volunteer jobs,
right up to Director. One wonders why an unpopular appointee, faced
with a recall vote, would not know he/she would be better off stepping

down.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3469. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:14:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0306270414.7148802f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69614

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93A676D50D55Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030626064642.09955.00000420@mb-m21.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> >>news:c2356669.0306251227.7d9a448c@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:<Xns93A2E23C78588elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >>>> <SNIP>

> > The trouble is that unless other privs are given to Novices and Tech
> > Pluses, it sets a bad precedent.
>
> True

All of which can be fixed, of course. There was a "refarming" proposal
some time back, but FCC hasn't ruled on it yet.

> > 2007 is only three years, tho.
>
> Four, but who's counting?

I'm figuring that it may be 2004 before the treaty is ratified by The
Congress.

> >>> 2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
>
> >>I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
> >>quicker.
>
> >>There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
> >>bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the
> >>FCC will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.
> >
> > IIRC, historically the FCC can't/won't do anything until The Congress
> > ratifies the revised treaty. That will take some time, and petitioning
> > before that time may just works against the petitioners' goal because
> > it shows they don't understand the process.
>
> I hadn't thought about that. Clearly you are right.

Usually, but not always, such ratifications sail right through.
However, sometimes they get stalled by higher-priority items, or the
ratification gets tacked onto something controversial and there's a
delay. See K2ASP's story of Senator John Glenn....
>
> >>Quite a few other countries already have provisional dates next month
> >>or the month after for abolishing code testing.
> >
> > Sure, but other countries' ratification methods are different.
>
> I know. Ironically, the relatively open nature of FCC rule-making also
> slows things down.

Which can be a good thing. It's not the ideal system but it's better
than having them make changes without any citizen input.

It's important to remember that none of this is front-burner stuff to
the FCC. To FCC, amateur radio is a small-potatoes legacy service that
generates a small amount of revenue. They're not anti-ham, they just
have a lot of other things going on.

> >>> 3) What other changes should be made in the US license structure and
> >>> regs?
> >>>
> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>
> >>If I were writing a petition, I would put in automatic upgrades for
> >>Novice and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There
> >>is also the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting
> >>rid of the Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the
> >>latter, and keeping track of their code credit indefinitely after
> >>getting rid of element 1 seems illogical. One way out may be to make
> >>the Tech licence simply 28 MHz and above. Any thoughts on that?
> >
> > Several:
> >
> > 1) As part of its 1998 restructuring petition (has it really been 5
> > years!?), ARRL proposed auto upgrading of existing Novices and Tech
> > Pluses to General. FCC said no. I also recall a QCWA petition to
> > effectively upgrade pre-1968 Generals and Advanceds to Extra, which
> > also went nowhere with FCC. Even Tech Pluses who were licensed before
> > March 21 1987 have to show up at a VE session to get a General, even
> > though they don't need any more test credits. Seems FCC just doesn't
> > want to do auto upgrades and doesn't care about the closed-off license
> > classes.
> >
> > 2) Without Element 1, there's no reason to differentiate between Techs
> > and Tech Pluses, so the two license classes should be made equivalent
> > in the rules.
>
> That's probably the thorniest issue arising from this.

How is it thorny? The only difference in testing between a Tech, Tech
Plus and Tech-with-HF is that the latter two have passed Element 1. If
Element 1 goes away as a license qualification, why not just give them
all the same privileges?

> Maybe the fairest
> and simplest thing to do is to give all the Techs the privileges of a
> Tech+?

'zactly.

> > 3) I'd propose that Technicians get about half of General bandspace on
> > all HF/MF bands, at the current Novice/Tech Plus power level, plus an
> > assortment of modes on HF/MF. Maybe even give them all of 160 and the
> > WARC bands. And since Novices currently have the same HF/MF privs as
> > Tech Pluses, Novices should get the same additional privs.
> >
> > This solves the "refarming" question and makes the privileges more
> > balanced. It also substitutes one set of subbands for another, so
> > overall rules complexity is about the same.
> >
> > Some might say "Why the giveaway?", but note how many Novices and Techs
> > with Code 1 credit haven't upgraded in over 3 years.
> >
> > Historical note: I recall that one of the main reasons Tech Pluses and
> > Novices got 10 meter SSB was an attempt to populate the band and impede
> > its use by freeband/cb folks. The freeband/cb folks' argument was
> > "nobody's using those frequencies"
> >
> > Thoughts?

> I think that for the latter reason any solution should give all the Techs
> at least the part of 10m that the Novice and Tech+ already have.

At the very least.
>
> I'm surprised how much we agree on most of this.
>
Not at all. The thing we need to be doing now, IMO, is developing a
coherent proposal that goes beyond just "dump Element 1" and that can
gather wide support in the amateur community. We know FCC isn't going
to do it.

Of course if by some miracle Element 1 survives, there will be strong
opposition to any change so soon after the last restructure. But
without Element 1, it makes little sense to have the Tech so VHF-UHF
heavy and HF/MF light.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3470. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:15:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <izWKa.2550$Vx2.1387066@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69615

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EFB8423.6040109@ix.netcom.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy". While
the
> >very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes not only
training
> >but talent, normal levels of usage only require training. The biggest
> >problem most people face in learning code is unrealistic expectations.
They
> >try for a week and think they are a failure when they simply haven't
given
> >it the proper amount and type of study. It takes the normal person 30
hours
> >of study and practice (see the book "Morse Code, The Essential
Language"),
> >if done correctly, to achieve a reliable 5wpm.
> >
>
> >Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with for
> >written material (which of course they forget immediately following the
test
> >as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to 5wpm, a
> >person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day (or
> >nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.
> >
> Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
> average person to
> learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should that
> time be devoted
> to something else?"
>

Well each individual has to decide if the investment is worth the return. However that is true in any activity in life. Is the time I spend practicing my clarinet worth it? Is the time I spend reading worth it? And so on. If one is looking at just passing the code to get to the General license class, 30 hours is not an unreasonable investment in time. So I tend to share the opinion that most of those who are "waiting for the code to be dropped" just don't care to put a priority on getting the upgrade (or in more basic terms, don't "want it enough"). Of course some will learn it faster and some will take longer. I would be more than happy to elmer anyone who is having a tough time of the code.

You asked the question about how long it takes the average person to get do a decent code ability. Well here's the info from "Morse Code, The Essential Language"

WPM Average hours to learn
5 30
10 60
15 95
20 150

A lot of casual conversations are conducted around 13 wpm to 15 wpm. So that is a reasonable level to achieve if one has the interest. And it tends to come naturally once one gets on the air and starts using the code if they stick with it.

Also referring back to "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," the author has found through his research that once the 13wpm level is reached, the person has learned it well enough that even if they don't use it, they are not apt to forget it. They may get rusty but they retain it.

If the morse requirement gets dropped, it looks like it's going to be as we slide into the bottom of the sunspot cycle. I think a lot of people will upgrade and then be disappointed at how "dead" so many of the bands are since they will have little experience with the vagaries of HF propagation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3471. Re: Where the heck are all the News Article postings coming from and WHY..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:20:31 UTC
From: AtPay ArterCay <P_Carter@nc-nospam-village.net>
Message-ID: <09812561.16359671@ncvillage.net>
Source record: 69616
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 09:51:42 GMT, the fake Agent Smith <th@t.other.george.sucks.com> wrote:
>
> You are full of shit. If a person just blocks the sender they will no longer see
> posts by that person.

The sociopath wrote this because he FEARS being filtered by free
newsreaders such as Xnews or slrn. He knows that site blocking will
silence him forever, AND HE CAN'T STAND THE THOUGHT. Site blocking
also allows the real nym owner's posts to come through unimpeded.

Recommendation: Go to Google and search for the Xnews news reader;
you won't be sorry.

====
"Ignorance is correctable, but stupidity is forever." -- John
Simmons

3472. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:22:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JFWKa.2551$Vx2.1387958@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69617

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bdg1l7$3i0$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> [snip] Now here is the kicker. All the licenses above would grant only
SSB/AM/FM
> privlidges.
>
> ALL OTHER MODES would require a applicant to demonstrate profeciency in
the
> mode he wants to be endorsed for. Test, written or other (such as CW).
>
> So no one needs do what he don't want to.
>
> Just some thoughts.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

That would be the fastest way possible to kill off CW. I'd do it the other way around. Let them do all the CW they want but no SSB/AM/FM until they've actually passed the code.

Besides even just going to written tests only, people will still have to do things they don't want to. People will complain why do they have to study on packet or other digital or satellite. They'll complain about having to study basic electronics. They'll complain about studying propagation. They will even complain about studying rules, regulations, and standard operating practices.

In any field of endeavor, the material to be studied needs to be determined by the experienced members of the group not the beginners. In school, we require students to study a basic core of subjects. The students do NOT get to determine what the core studies are.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3473. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:27:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EFC381D.30400@psu.edu>
Source record: 69618

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3EFB9D7A.7030906@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>>Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
>>>regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?
>>
>>
>> Heh, heh. And how do we gruntle a disgruntled person? 8^)
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Actually, a "disgruntled" person would have to be "regruntled," since
> he must have been "gruntled" at one time in order to become "disgruntled."
>
> Same thing applies to "discombobulated" people.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Disaffected former HF phone operator

I think I'm going to have to do some research here. I wonder how close gruntleing and combobulating are to each other?

Full report to follow! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA

3474. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:29:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EFC38A2.9090301@psu.edu>
Source record: 69619

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
>>>regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?
>>
>> Heh, heh. And how do we gruntle a disgruntled person? 8^)
>
>
> Whern you figure it out, apply your technique on Lennie and B. Burke, please.
> They're about as disgruntled as it gets.
>

I'll have to see just what gruntleing means first, before I commit!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3475. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:35:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdhdsc$nt7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69630

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
> >
> >I think it could take about a year, but some people think it may happen
> >quicker.
> >
> >There will be a bunch of petitions filed on July 5th. Some of them are
> >bound to be over-complicated reforms filed by total crackpots, but the
FCC
> >will (theoretically) have to consider all of them.
> >
> Whatever the crackpots suggest in reguards to dropping the code test,
> the FCC could just
> say "element 1 is no longer required after Oct 31, 2003" or such date
> that adds up to the
> usual comment period and publish it in the federal register process.

True. After all, the only reason the FCC kept 5wpm was because of the
treaty.
The call for rational reasons to retain morse testing was done in
NPRM-98-143.
Does anyone think there are any new reasons to retain code testing that
haven't
already been run through the FCC comment process?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3476. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 12:40:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdhe6s$40a$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69631

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030626222527.12501.00000475@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <Xns93A674231DEAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
> >news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com:
>
> (N2EY wrote:)
>
> >>>>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?

(SNIP)

> First, the revised treaty has to be ratified by The Congress.

Probably an assumed or expected noncontroversial action.
FCC could begin the process in anticipation of congressional
approval.

> Second, FCC has to decide whether dropping Element 1 requires the NPRM
process.

As you note below. I think that decision has already been
made in 98/99.

> If FCC decides to do an NPRM, somebody has to write it up, then there are
> comment and reply comment periods of length decided by FCC. Probably on
the
> order of a few months. Then FCC processes all the comments (couple more
months)
> and issues an R&O that changes the rules.
> >
> But FCC could decide that they don;t need the NPRM process. For example,
> changes like new VE fees and QPC pool changes don't get NPRMs, FCC just
does
> it.
>
> Seems to me that FCC could just say, in effect, 'we considered all the
codetest
> arguments, pro and con, back in 98 and 99. We said back then that the
treaty
> was the only reason for a code test, and we reduced code testing to 5 wpm
> because that's the minimum we think meets the treaty. Without the treaty,
> there's no reason, so the code test is history." Element 1 gets dumped by
> executive order and that's that.

Agree completely..

> But first the revised treaty has to be ratified.

Anyone know the time interval it took after the last WRC?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3477. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 13:15:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EFC435B.1050509@psu.edu>
Source record: 69620

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
>>>regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?
>>
>> Heh, heh. And how do we gruntle a disgruntled person? 8^)
>
>
> Whern you figure it out, apply your technique on Lennie and B. Burke, please.
> They're about as disgruntled as it gets.
>

My research has indicated that "gruntle" does indeed exist! According
to Merriam-Webster Online:

grunï¿½tle
Pronunciation: 'gr&n-t&l
Function: transitive verb
Inflected Form(s): grunï¿½tled; grunï¿½tling /'gr&nt-li[ng], 'gr&n-t&l-i[ng]/
Etymology: back-formation from disgruntle
Date: 1926
: to put in a good humor <were gruntled with a good meal and good
conversation -- W. P. Webb

It would appear that despite its somewhat salacious sound, that
gruntling is not a specific action. So that much is good.

Let us apply this to the task at hand.

Can Len or Brian B be gruntled?

Brian:

Always at the ready to engage in combative behavior here, and in some
of my own discourses with the man, ending in re-iteration of the same
points to the point of thread exhaustion, I believe that under some
circumstances it would be possible to gruntle this individual. most of
the controversy seems to be of a "have you now, or have you ever
operated from......." sort of nature.

Len:

Here is a person who thrives on his disgruntlement, a veritable master of discontent with the Amateur Radio world. Having perfected his trolling art here, (although I fear at great personal self-damage) he waves his banner of disgruntlement with great pride.

Chance of Gruntlement? 0

3478. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 13:32:00 UTC
From: Rich Cacace <"richcacace-REMOVE TO REPLY-"@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <kHXKa.13008$2D1.3311517@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 69621
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Do they perform as well as the FRS only radio's? They do look small enough.

"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:3fbnfv4hd800j8383vilmguloshlt7bukb@4ax.com...
> On 25 Jun 2003 18:16:28 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >Look - the GMRS feature on these radios is a USELESS GIMMICK. Forget
> >about using those frequencies or getting a license for them.
>
> I just renewed my GMRS license (for the second time) so I could use my
> new T4500.
>
> With all that power super-gain antenna I don't want to take any
> chances. :)
>
> Mike
>

3479. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 14:16:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB21C9E1.1D8B5%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69622

"Jim Hampton" wrote:

> (snip) You are correct in that the only thing
> we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see
> how long this thread gets :)

Amazing. Twenty-six messages posted to the thread in the first day alone.
They're even arguing over the word "disgruntled." Absolute madness. :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3480. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 14:30:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB21CD36.1D8B7%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69623

"Mike Coslo" wrote:

> (snip) When it is dropped, we will probably have
> a quick influx of new hams, who will probably drop
> out almost as quickly.
>
> The overall effect is likely to be underwhelming.

Increasing ham numbers is only one goal of the change, and even that is mainly limited to some arguments here in the United States. World-wide, the change is more a recognition of the lesser role of Morse Code in radio as a whole - the decreasing need for a pool of radio operators with that skill.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3481. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 14:55:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB21D330.1D8B9%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69624

"Mike Coslo" wrote:

> For better or worse, the code test ensured that
> those who became Hams, *wanted* to be Hams.

Not always true. Years ago, military radio operators, for example, learned code as part of their military training. To become a ham, the only additional thing they needed to learn was the material on the written exam. As such, it was no more extra effort for them to become a ham than it would be for those if code is dropped as a testing requirement. In other words, since they did not learn code to become a ham, their knowledge of code did not prove their desire or lack of desire to be hams (the testing requirement only affected their ability to do so). The same could be said for those who initially learned code to work for government or industry and later became hams.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3482. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 14:56:13 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A76F690AB1CAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@65.100.3.61>
Source record: 69625

Alun wrote

> Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a
> knack, something that some people get easily and that
> others find to be extraordinarily hard. The first group
> often don't understand the second (not only with this
> skill, but also with others). None of this should be very
> surprising to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.

Agreed. I almost walked out of the testing center
when I was told that 5 WPM could be memorized. No
skill was really necessary at all. I am having a
hard time at it. This comment was from a General,
who has not passed his Extra. Surely, it could
be memorized. :)

Teaching by phonetics did not work for many students.
Now, Massachusetts has devised newer methods to encompass
students that are tactile or visual learners.

Bill

3483. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 15:00:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EFC5C04.5020408@psu.edu>
Source record: 69626

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
>
>> (snip) You are correct in that the only thing
>>we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see
>>how long this thread gets :)
>
>
>
> Amazing. Twenty-six messages posted to the thread in the first day alone.
> They're even arguing over the word "disgruntled." Absolute madness. :)

Are you one of the disgruntled, or gruntled ones, Dwight?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3484. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 15:04:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EFC5D09.5050207@psu.edu>
Source record: 69627

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
>
>> (snip) You are correct in that the only thing
>>we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see
>>how long this thread gets :)
>
>
>
> Amazing. Twenty-six messages posted to the thread in the first day alone.
> They're even arguing over the word "disgruntled." Absolute madness. :)

I just thought we were having a little fun with that part!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3485. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 15:11:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EFC5E89.2080903@psu.edu>
Source record: 69628

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>
>>For better or worse, the code test ensured that
>>those who became Hams, *wanted* to be Hams.
>
>
>
> Not always true. Years ago, military radio operators, for example, learned
> code as part of their military training. To become a ham, the only
> additional thing they needed to learn was the material on the written exam.
> As such, it was no more extra effort for them to become a ham than it would
> be for those if code is dropped as a testing requirement. In other words,
> since they did not learn code to become a ham, their knowledge of code did
> not prove their desire or lack of desire to be hams (the testing requirement
> only affected their ability to do so). The same could be said for those who
> initially learned code to work for government or industry and later became
> hams.

Yes, of course if a person already knew Morse from a diffferent area,
it would not be any particular feat to take the code test.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3486. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 15:28:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EFC6289.4070803@psu.edu>
Source record: 69629

William H. O'Hara, III wrote:
> Alun wrote
>
>
>>Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a
>>knack, something that some people get easily and that
>>others find to be extraordinarily hard. The first group
>>often don't understand the second (not only with this
>>skill, but also with others). None of this should be very
>>surprising to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.
>
>
> Agreed. I almost walked out of the testing center
> when I was told that 5 WPM could be memorized. No
> skill was really necessary at all. I am having a
> hard time at it. This comment was from a General,
> who has not passed his Extra. Surely, it could
> be memorized. :)

Some people will indeed have a hard time with Morse. We do not all process sound in the same way.

I am a visual artist, highly vision oriented, and I have been hearing impaired since early childhood, and after getting tinnitus at a bit older age, I can attest that my brain does not process sound as does those who pick up Morse code easily.

After my initial frustrations with Morse, I came up with a theory of why this was a problem, at least in my case. I believe my brain does not pay as much attention to sound as it does my other senses. I think a very rough analog is a reciever de-sensing. This is due to two separate tones, one in each ear, and peoples voices sounding kind of muzzy, some worse than others. So after 40 some years of this, when I was tring to process Morse, with it's three different states, (short, long, and wait) my brain had to be retrained. My proficiency goes waaay down as I fatigue, and I cannot have any noise distractions

As an experiment, I may try a visual Morse display. Was it Dan who mentioned a device to pick up the sound, then flash a light? That may really increase my enjoyment of Morse. I doubt that the speeds can get very hig, and I don't know what blinking will do, but it sounds like a fun experiment.

But Keep at it, William. If you work at it, it will happen eventually.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3487. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 17:41:01 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86llvnfmfm.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 69632

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Jim" == N2EY <N2EY@aol.com> writes:

[...]

Jack> It might also be a cultural thing -- that recalls weren't
Jack> socially acceptable methods of resolution until recently.

Jim> Perhaps. I know that in the past there have been midterm
Jim> step-downs. Perhaps some of them were the result of a "word to
Jim> the wise".

Jack> This wouldn't surprise me in the least. That seems to be more
Jack> like the method a group of 'old school' hams might use to
Jack> resolve that kind of situation.

Jim> Yep - but it's sad to think of that sort of thing as 'old
Jim> school'.

It is, and it isn't. It's sad to think that it's necessary at all,
but the entire 'elmer model' of amateur radio operators relies upon
having elder members passing on their experience, and the "word to the
wise" approach would work for everything from "use a dummy load
instead of tuning up on top of someone's conversation" to "you are
losing the confidence of the members due to your style of leadership".

Jim> After all, ARRL field appointments are all unpaid, volunteer
Jim> jobs, right up to Director. One wonders why an unpopular
Jim> appointee, faced with a recall vote, would not know he/she would
Jim> be better off stepping down.

Ah, that's easy to solve. Sometimes people are so convinced that they
are Right and that the people will handily defeat a recall election
that they won't bother standing down. Besides, even if he won the
election, it'd make for some serious friction when working with his
peers, and he'd have to have a lot of charisma to overcome the damage
to his reputation.

On an unrelated note, I'm not very excited about the prospects for a
recall election here in California. It'll cost a great deal of money,
and whoever wins really loses. If Davis wins, see above as for what
happens to him. If the other guy wins, then he's got a whole lot to
learn in a short time, and any quick measures he takes to fix things
are more likely (in my opinion) to break other things worse.

ObOnTopic: At least the antenna bill (AB 1228) currently before the
California Assembly has no fiscal component, making it less
likely to get defeated as a cost-cutting measure.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+/IGyGPFSfAB/ezgRAuGeAKDpzx0UDrv1Cn03pevqC088GZVbJgCfRkh0
fnHH69PhVzBCYiY1RdUkIxU=
=m1zl
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3488. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 17:51:13 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A78CE6B46DBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69633

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:3EFB7711.2010203@adelphia.net:

>
>
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>> news:3EFB3128.9060402@adelphia.net:
>>
>>
>>>Jim Hampton wrote:
>>>
>>>>Dwight,
>>>>
>>>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when
>>>>the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a
>>>>few years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice.
>>>>You are correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't*
>>>>know. Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>>>
>>>
>>> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested
>>> in the ARS.
>>
>>
>> Simply not a true statement, and backed up by nothing.
>
> Perhaps I should have added IMO. That's what it is, an opinion.
> But
> it's backed up by life experiences.
>
> I've heard many excuses for why people don't quit smoking, lose
> weight,
> get in shape, the list goes on and on. It becomes pretty clear that in
> reality, they don't really want to do these things, or else they would.
> And as a former 3 pack a day smoker (now 26 years without a ciggy) I
> know I did not quit until I wanted to.
>
> And this is a FACT. Anyone who does *not* get their General or
> Extra
> ticket until the code requirement is dropped does NOT want to get it
> badly enough that they will take a Morse code test. In other words,
> they are not interested if it is there, and interested if it is not,

>
>
>>
>>
>>>This is separate to any argument of whether or not there
>>>should be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.
>>>
>>> When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new
>>> hams,
>>
>>
>> Possibly
>>
>>
>>>who will probably drop out almost as quickly.
>>>
>>
>>
>> I doubt that, although I do think it may be a one-time event
>
>
> Look at the Japanese situation.
>
>
>>
>>
>>> The overall effect is likely to be underwhelming.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Largely because it comes too late. If this had happened in 1992, as it
>> might well have if it had made the agenda and that particular
>> conference had not been postponed by three years, then I think the
>> effect would have been much bigger. Something else happened in the
>> interim, an explosion in Internet use, which has changed the
>> landscape.
>
> Comparison of Ham radio to the internet is something that I have
> always
> found amusing and a little suspect. You don't need any special training
> or talent to surf the internet. I know, I get a lot of people out of
> jams on their 'pooters. They don't know how to set up an email account,
> but they can click that mouse button as good as I can.
>
> Despite a lot of people's thoughts to the contrary, the Internet
> is not
> terribly hi-tech. Probably 80-90 percent of Internet users would never

> consider being a ham.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

But what about the other 10-20%? That's a lot of people.

3489. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 17:54:05 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A78D62F2809elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69634

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:90LKa.2442$Vx2.1286360@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns93A6A0A619705elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a knack,
>> something that some people get easily and that others find to be
>> extraordinarily hard. The first group often don't understand the
>> second (not only with this skill, but also with others). None of this
>> should be very surprising to anyone who takes a minute to think about
>> it.
>
> Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy". While
> the very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes not only
> training but talent, normal levels of usage only require training. The
> biggest problem most people face in learning code is unrealistic
> expectations. They try for a week and think they are a failure when
> they simply haven't given it the proper amount and type of study. It
> takes the normal person 30 hours of study and practice (see the book
> "Morse Code, The Essential Language"), if done correctly, to achieve a
> reliable 5wpm. No talent or knack is required. The first book that I
> mention indicates that a very ordinary untalented person can achieve a
> reliable 20wpm to 25wpm if they go about it the right way.
>
> Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with
> for written material (which of course they forget immediately following
> the test as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get
> to 5wpm, a person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day,
> every day (or nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60
> days.
>
> No magic or talent is required to master the basics. Only if you want
> to be a superstar does talent come into play.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

In my case it required a lot of outside help to pass code. It simply
wasn't something I could do on my own, whereas I never needed any help
from anyone to pass theory. Your mileage may differ!

3490. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 17:57:31 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A78DF8042F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69635

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:izWKa.2550$Vx2.1387066@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3EFB8423.6040109@ix.netcom.com...
>> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>> >Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy".
>> >While the very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes
>> >not only training but talent, normal levels of usage only require
>> >training. The biggest problem most people face in learning code is
>> >unrealistic expectations. They try for a week and think they are a
>> >failure when they simply haven't given it the proper amount and type
>> >of study. It takes the normal person 30 hours of study and practice
>> >(see the book "Morse Code, The Essential Language"), if done
>> >correctly, to achieve a reliable 5wpm.
>> >
>>
>> >Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with
>> >for written material (which of course they forget immediately
>> >following the test as it is only in short term memory when they
>> >"cram"). To get to 5wpm, a person should put in about two 15 minute
>> >sessions per day, every day (or nearly so otherwise you start to
>> >forget) for about 60 days.
>> >
>> Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
>> average person to
>> learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should
>> that time be devoted
>> to something else?"
>>
>
> Well each individual has to decide if the investment is worth the
> return. However that is true in any activity in life. Is the time I
> spend practicing my clarinet worth it? Is the time I spend reading
> worth it? And so on. If one is looking at just passing the code to get
> to the General license class, 30 hours is not an unreasonable
> investment in time. So I tend to share the opinion that most of those
> who are "waiting for the code to be dropped" just don't care to put a
> priority on getting the upgrade (or in more basic terms, don't "want it
> enough"). Of course some will learn it faster and some will take
> longer. I would be more than happy to elmer anyone who is having a
> tough time of the code.

>
> You asked the question about how long it takes the average person to
> get do a decent code ability. Well here's the info from "Morse Code,
> The Essential Language"
>
> WPM Average hours to learn
> 5 30
> 10 60
> 15 95
> 20 150
>
> A lot of casual conversations are conducted around 13 wpm to 15 wpm.
> So that is a reasonable level to achieve if one has the interest. And
> it tends to come naturally once one gets on the air and starts using
> the code if they stick with it.
>
> Also referring back to "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," the
> author has found through his research that once the 13wpm level is
> reached, the person has learned it well enough that even if they don't
> use it, they are not apt to forget it. They may get rusty but they
> retain it.
>
> If the morse requirement gets dropped, it looks like it's going to be
> as we slide into the bottom of the sunspot cycle. I think a lot of
> people will upgrade and then be disappointed at how "dead" so many of
> the bands are since they will have little experience with the vagaries
> of HF propagation.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

That last part is certainly very true. It may definitely lead to a higher
attrition rate amongst all the new HF ops.

3491. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 18:55:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdi3t8$5if$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69641

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bdgdbnhqo0@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > Just because you don't hear any transmitting does not mean it is not in
use.
>
> I guess everyone is standing by waiting for someone to talk?
>
>

No, but it is assigned to that agency. And it will be used when/if
required.

> >
> > There are a large number of guburment users in the 5 Mhz range. FEMA,
> > SHARES, Homeland Security, US Military. MARS. Just as an example.
>
> Yaas, none of which uses HF to any serious extent these days. It's
virtually
> unused. Relegated to a 'secondary' or backup status. About the same as
military
> HF usage..

Completely and totally wrong. Military still uses HF, overseas aircraft
flights use HF. etc.

So what is wrong with being a backup status? Your point is?
Oh I get it. You don't think there needs to be a backup in case the bird
falls from the sky, eh?

Dan/W4NTI

3492. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:10:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdi4nobrd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69642

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030626224933.23745.00000748@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <Xns93A6A0A619705elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a knack, something
> >that some people get easily and that others find to be extraordinarily
> >hard. The first group often don't understand the second (not only with
> >this skill, but also with others). None of this should be very surprising
> >to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.
>
> Alun:
>
> In that case, I guess you could say that I am one person who represents
> both groups. I spent fourteen of what could have been the best years of
> my ham radio career being a person who completely hated the notion of
> having to learn the Morse code in order to get an amateur radio license.
> I tried to learn it several times, to the point of having built homebrew
> code practice oscillators on two separate occasions, years apart. You
> see, I always enjoyed the technical and project construction aspect of
> the electronics hobby, but I wanted to get involved in ham radio without
> having to learn how to make and copy those ancient, useless beeping
> noises. After all, we had just put men on the Moon and brought them
> back, and we had computers that could fit into a small house! What the
> heck did we need to know Morse code for, anyway? Then, one fine day,
> I "found" a ham radio operator in my dormitory day room at Andrews AFB,
> MD, where I was stationed in the Air Force at the time as a Sergeant.
> This guy walks in and is carrying a new Tempo 2-meter HT, and we start
> discussing ham radio. He takes me to his room and shows me his very
> neat station setup, with 6- and 10-meter capability and an HF longwire
> in the works. I told him I've wanted to get into ham radio for a long
time,
> but I didn't want to be bothered with the "beeping." I could never learn
it,
> I had a mental block or some physical problem that prevented me from
> copying it, or whatever other excuse I could think of -- but I was sure I
> would have no problem talking into a microphone! He said, and these
> words ring in my ears to this day, "Well, Larry, a lot of people are like
> that, but none of them are hams!" I kept thinking about that, and about
> a year later, I decided that I'd made excuses long enough. I talked
another
> friend of mine into joining me in a Novice class at the local radio club,
and

> within a month, we both had our Novice tickets. The same day we got
> our tickets on the air, I made my first CW QSO on the club station. I was
> a Tech in a couple of months, General in a few more, Advanced and Extra
> came very quickly due to an upgrading "race" I was in with another new
> ham in our club at the time. Throughout it all, I made approximately 500
> HF/CW QSO's at our club station and on my own mobile HF station I had
> built out of my 1978 Plymouth Horizon.
>
> The funny thing is, it never occurred to me until years later that I had
> somehow made a miraculous recovery from all of the physical and
> mental "problems" I had been having with learning the Morse code! In
> fact, I went from zero to 20 WPM in four months. What got me "hooked"
> was that first nervous, sweaty-palmed CW QSO, which happened to be
> with LU2DSL in Argentina! What kept me going was the requirement
> to pass the 13- and 20-WPM code tests for my General and Extra tickets.
> What surprised me was I passed the 20 WPM the day I went to the FCC
> office in Baltimore for the General, but I missed the Advanced theory
> test by two questions, since I had only been studying for my General up
> to that point. It was just over a year before I finally went for the
Extra,
> so I had to re-take the 20-WPM test, but that was no problem by that
> time!
>
> Now that it seems that the ITU will eliminate code testing soon, all I
> can say is that I really feel sympathy for future new hams who will never
> have to go through the same great process I experienced on my way to
> full amateur privileges. They may think that this is some kind of
> victory for them, but in reality, all they are is a sorry bunch of losers!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Ex: KA3HXE, N3CRA, DA1RZ, DA1ZW, WR2F, AFA7LR, G0LYW
>
>
Best I've read in a long while. Hit that nail right square on the head
Larry.

See we may have crossed paths a bit.

Dan/W4NTI
Ex; KN8BHH, K8BHH, HS1BH, DL4PK, DA2LJ,KX6AA(now V73).

3493. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:14:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KI0La.2796$Vx2.1441910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69643

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EFC6289.4070803@psu.edu...
>
>
>
> As an experiment, I may try a visual Morse display. Was it Dan who
> mentioned a device to pick up the sound, then flash a light? That may
> really increase my enjoyment of Morse. I doubt that the speeds can get
> very hig, and I don't know what blinking will do, but it sounds like a
> fun experiment.

Morse sent visually must be sent at a slow speed or the eye runs it all together as one light. Remember that is how "motion" pictures work, a series of still frames sent at a speed that causes them to blend.

Anyway, Morse at 5wpm is definitely possible with lights. At 18wpm, it is not possible. I don't know whether 13wpm is possible or not. I read about it years ago but can't remember where the break point was for the visual blending.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3494. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:19:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdi59g$b83$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69644

Thanks Phil.

Dan/W4NTI

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hh407fo.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Thu, 26 Jun 2003 19:05:19 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >Prior to my arrival there was other arrangements, such as no Novice, No
> >Tech. etc. Someone from pre 1961 please chime in here.
>
> Pre 1951, you mean.
>
> Class A - all amateur privileges
> Class B - all except no phone below 10 meters
> Class C - Class B exam taken before a volunteer examiner if the
> applicant was more than 75 miles from the nearest FCC
> quaretrly testing point. (Later changed to 175 miles)
>
> Note that there was no 15 meter band (let alone 13 and 17 meters),
> and no phone segment on 40 meters.
>
> If we want to keep the VE program, going back to the pre-1951
> scheme would result in 2 classes, A and B. B would be the beginners
> license with limited privileges (maybe nothing below 28 MHz) and A
> would be the full-privilege license.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3495. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:24:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627152422.18497.00000963@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69645

In article <BB21C9E1.1D8B5%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
>> (snip) You are correct in that the only thing
>> we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see
>> how long this thread gets :)
>
> Amazing. Twenty-six messages posted to the thread in the first day alone.
>They're even arguing over the word "disgruntled." Absolute madness. :)

Morse code ability does that to a person? :-)

3496. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:24:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627152422.18497.00000962@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69646

In article <BB21D330.1D8B9%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>> For better or worse, the code test ensured that
>> those who became Hams, *wanted* to be Hams.
>
> Not always true. Years ago, military radio operators, for example, learned
>code as part of their military training.

MANY years ago, Dwight. :-)

I had 5 different MOSs in radio before 1956 and NONE of them involved
any sort of morse code use or training.

>To become a ham, the only
>additional thing they needed to learn was the material on the written exam.
>As such, it was no more extra effort for them to become a ham than it would
>be for those if code is dropped as a testing requirement. In other words,
>since they did not learn code to become a ham, their knowledge of code did
>not prove their desire or lack of desire to be hams (the testing requirement
>only affected their ability to do so). The same could be said for those who
>initially learned code to work for government or industry and later became
>hams.

Well, you and I both know that one MUST subscribe to what the
self-styled Rules of US hamdom decree...morse code ability is at
the very heart of being a "real" radio amateur. That is a prime
requirement.

Morse code ability assures the ham of being primo, grade A, the
"superiority" measured by his morse skill.

It's all about working DX on HF with CW.

Anything else is for snit. :-)

3497. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:24:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627152424.18497.00000964@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69649

In article <3EFC435B.1050509@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <hockeypuck@psu.edu> writes:

>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>>
>>>>Ever notice that things are often refurbished but seldom furbished?
>>>>regurgitated but not gurgitated? unexpurgated but not expurgated?
>>>
>>> Heh, heh. And how do we gruntle a disgruntled person? 8^)
>>
>> Whern you figure it out, apply your technique on Lennie and B. Burke,
>> please. They're about as disgruntled as it gets.
>
> My research has indicated that "gruntle" does indeed exist! According
>to Merriam-Webster Online:
>
>grunï¿½tle
>Pronunciation: 'gr&n-t&l
>Function: transitive verb
>Inflected Form(s): grunï¿½tled; grunï¿½tling /'gr&nt-li[ng], 'gr&n-t&l-i[ng]/
>Etymology: back-formation from disgruntle
>Date: 1926
>: to put in a good humor <were gruntled with a good meal and good
>conversation -- W. P. Webb
>
> It would appear that despite its somewhat salacious sound, that
>gruntling is not a specific action. So that much is good.
>
> Let us apply this to the task at hand.
>
> Can Len or Brian B be gruntled?

No, the question is not of "gruntling," hockeypuck, it is a question
of how salacious you can become in being nasty to an NCTA.

> Brian:
>
> Always at the ready to engage in combative behavior here, and in some
>of my own discourses with the man, ending in re-iteration of the same
>points to the point of thread exhaustion, I believe that under some
>circumstances it would be possible to gruntle this individual. most of
>the controversy seems to be of a "have you now, or have you ever

>operated from....." sort of nature.

Poor baby Mike...can't stand an opposing opinion so he throws more
snit on the person of his opposition. <SOP>

> Len:
>
> Here is a person who thrives on his disgruntlement, a veritable master
>of discontent with the Amateur Radio world.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Mike is striking to become the fifth wheel in the Gang
of Four who wish to take over this newsgroup (by any means possible).

My only discontent is of two things: Morse code testing for a license;
the self-righteous, self-important "superiors" who think they Must
rule on ethics, mores, the "ham community" group think.

> Having perfected his
>trolling art here, (although I fear at great personal self-damage) he
>waves his banner of disgruntlement with great pride.

Not at all, hockeypucker.

This isn't "personal abuse," it is merely a newsgroup. Mostly it is
a waste of time considering the regulars and their insistence on
"regulating" all content not to their liking. Because of that terrible
need for others to Fight in here, I don't bother looking in daily.
If I had a need to fight, I'd go to the Golden Gloves or something
like that. :-)

Well, strange phenomena happen. I attended a hockey match
last month and a Game broke out during a fight! :-)

> Chance of Gruntlement? 0

Chance of Mike Coslo joining the Gang of Four: Very good.

Mike is getting down to the nitty-gritty of Personal Insult tactics
when he can't justify his morse code views or claims of amateur
radio "superiority." Any day now Mike will hop on Larrah's big
superior ham bus beeping its way through ancientville. :-)

3498. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:24:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627152425.18497.00000965@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69647

In article <20030626224933.23745.00000748@mb-m22.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <Xns93A6A0A619705elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>Morse is not like learning theory. It is a skill, or a knack, something
>>that some people get easily and that others find to be extraordinarily
>>hard. The first group often don't understand the second (not only with
>>this skill, but also with others). None of this should be very surprising
>>to anyone who takes a minute to think about it.
>
>Alun:
>
>In that case, I guess you could say that I am one person who represents
>both groups. I spent fourteen of what could have been the best years of
>my ham radio career being a person who completely hated the notion of
>having to learn the Morse code in order to get an amateur radio license.
>I tried to learn it several times, to the point of having built homebrew
>code practice oscillators on two separate occasions, years apart. You
>see, I always enjoyed the technical and project construction aspect of
>the electronics hobby, but I wanted to get involved in ham radio without
>having to learn how to make and copy those ancient, useless beeping
>noises. After all, we had just put men on the Moon and brought them
>back, and we had computers that could fit into a small house! What the
>heck did we need to know Morse code for, anyway? Then, one fine day,
>I "found" a ham radio operator in my dormitory day room at Andrews AFB,
>MD, where I was stationed in the Air Force at the time as a Sergeant.
>This guy walks in and is carrying a new Tempo 2-meter HT, and we start
>discussing ham radio. He takes me to his room and shows me his very
>neat station setup, with 6- and 10-meter capability and an HF longwire
>in the works. I told him I've wanted to get into ham radio for a long time,
>but I didn't want to be bothered with the "beeping." I could never learn it,
>I had a mental block or some physical problem that prevented me from
>copying it, or whatever other excuse I could think of -- but I was sure I
>would have no problem talking into a microphone! He said, and these
>words ring in my ears to this day, "Well, Larry, a lot of people are like
>that, but none of them are hams!" I kept thinking about that, and about
>a year later, I decided that I'd made excuses long enough. I talked another
>friend of mine into joining me in a Novice class at the local radio club, and
>within a month, we both had our Novice tickets. The same day we got
>our tickets on the air, I made my first CW QSO on the club station. I was
>a Tech in a couple of months, General in a few more, Advanced and Extra
>came very quickly due to an upgrading "race" I was in with another new

>ham in our club at the time. Throughout it all, I made approximately 500
>HF/CW QSO's at our club station and on my own mobile HF station I had
>built out of my 1978 Plymouth Horizon.

...it was all due to making a radio station out of an old Plymouth?!?!?

>The funny thing is, it never occurred to me until years later that I had
>somehow made a miraculous recovery from all of the physical and
>mental "problems" I had been having with learning the Morse code! In
>fact, I went from zero to 20 WPM in four months. What got me "hooked"
>was that first nervous, sweaty-palmed CW QSO, which happened to be
>with LU2DSL in Argentina! What kept me going was the requirement
>to pass the 13- and 20-WPM code tests for my General and Extra tickets.
>What surprised me was I passed the 20 WPM the day I went to the FCC
>office in Baltimore for the General, but I missed the Advanced theory
>test by two questions, since I had only been studying for my General up
>to that point. It was just over a year before I finally went for the Extra,
>so I had to re-take the 20-WPM test, but that was no problem by that
>time!

Bless you, Larrah...you got the energy rays from the Wayback
Machine and set your mental state back to 1850 when Morse
Code began to show who was the superiorust of all!

>Now that it seems that the ITU will eliminate code testing soon, all I
>can say is that I really feel sympathy for future new hams who will never
>have to go through the same great process I experienced on my way to
>full amateur privileges. They may think that this is some kind of
>victory for them, but in reality, all they are is a sorry bunch of losers!

All Hail the Victor, Larrah, most superior of all!

:-)

3499. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:24:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627152429.18497.00000966@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 69648

In article <3EFB7711.2010203@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<hockeypuck@adelphia.net> writes:

>Alun Palmer wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>> news:3EFB3128.9060402@adelphia.net:
>>
>>>Jim Hampton wrote:
>>>
>>>>Dwight,
>>>>
>>>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when
>>>>the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a few
>>>>years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice. You are
>>>>correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't* know.
>>>>Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>>>
>>> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested
>>> in the ARS.
>>
>> Simply not a true statement, and backed up by nothing.
>
> Perhaps I should have added IMO. That's what it is, an opinion. But
>it's backed up by life experiences.
>
> I've heard many excuses for why people don't quit smoking, lose weight,

>get in shape, the list goes on and on. It becomes pretty clear that in
>reality, they don't really want to do these things, or else they would.
>And as a former 3 pack a day smoker (now 26 years without a ciggy) I
>know I did not quit until I wanted to.

If you REALLY wanted to keep on smoking, you could have kept
at it, practicing day and night. Instead, you opted out, chickened
out, because you couldn't keep on. Read "The Art Of Keeping
On Smoking" by A. Coffing Hacker.

> And this is a FACT. Anyone who does *not* get their General or Extra
>ticket until the code requirement is dropped does NOT want to get it
>badly enough that they will take a Morse code test. In other words, they
>are not interested if it is there, and interested if it is not,

Yes, Mike, YOU and all the other morseaholics are the role models.
If YOU had to learn and pass morse code, then EVERYONE has to
learn and pass morse code!

>>>This is separate to any argument of whether or not there
>>>should be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.
>>>
>>> When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new
>>> hams,
>>
>> Possibly
>>
>>>who will probably drop out almost as quickly.
>>
>> I doubt that, although I do think it may be a one-time event
>
> Look at the Japanese situation.
>
>>> The overall effect is likely to be underwhelming.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>> Largely because it comes too late. If this had happened in 1992, as it
>> might well have if it had made the agenda and that particular conference
>> had not been postponed by three years, then I think the effect would have
>> been much bigger. Something else happened in the interim, an explosion in
>> Internet use, which has changed the landscape.
>
> Comparison of Ham radio to the internet is something that I have always

>found amusing and a little suspect. You don't need any special training
>or talent to surf the internet. I know, I get a lot of people out of
>jams on their 'pooters. They don't know how to set up an email account,
>but they can click that mouse button as good as I can.

Such a good "pooter" Elmer! We are all proud of you, Mike.

BTW, I made my own PC back in 1976, laying out and etching
the boards, soldering in the components, programming my own
monitor chip (what is now referred to as a "BIOS"). Motorola
6800 microprocessor, sort of a "QRP CW rig" equivalent. Do I
insist that all others emulate me? NO.

BTW2: Only girls use the term "pooter." Think about it. :-)

> Despite a lot of people's thoughts to the contrary, the Internet is not

>terribly hi-tech. Probably 80-90 percent of Internet users would never
>consider being a ham.

...more like 99+ percent. :-)

3500. Re: Oregon ARRL Section Manager Booted From Office.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:28:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh5ebdu.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69650

On 27 Jun 2003 04:58:29 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>After all, ARRL field appointments are all unpaid, volunteer jobs,
>right up to Director. One wonders why an unpopular appointee, faced
>with a recall vote, would not know he/she would be better off stepping
>down.

I know the individual both from ham radio and professionally. He
did not think that he would be "unhorsed" but there were valid
reasons for that which are now electrons under the wire, so to say.

A lot of us had mixed feelings - but the electorate spoke.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3501. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:28:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh5epdw.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69701

On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 08:35:22 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>True. After all, the only reason the FCC kept 5wpm was because of
>the treaty. The call for rational reasons to retain morse testing was
>done in NPRM-98-143. Does anyone think there are any new reasons to
>retain code testing that haven't already been run through the FCC
>comment process?

Not here.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3502. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:28:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh5ewbx.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69702
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 01:16:02 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>> Although you "actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all". Why
>> not get the license and make full use of your radio ??? Comes the day you
>> may want or need it.
>
>....Maybe he doesn't want to pay $75 every 5 years....

The cost of a large soda at a fast-food place or a 2-liter bottle at
the supermarket once a month......

I was surprised how much spare change I had in my pocket when I
stopped buying my daily yoghurt or ice cream a while ago. And my
waistline appreciated it, too.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3503. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:28:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh5en0v.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69703

On 27 Jun 2003 05:14:09 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>It's important to remember that none of this is front-burner stuff to
>the FCC. To FCC, amateur radio is a small-potatoes legacy service that
>generates a small amount of revenue. They're not anti-ham, they just
>have a lot of other things going on.

And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
over the broadcast ownership rule change.

Code tests, indeed..... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3504. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:40:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627154056.00871.00000390@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 69704

In article <KI0La.2796$Vx2.1441910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3EFC6289.4070803@psu.edu...
>>
>> As an experiment, I may try a visual Morse display. Was it Dan who
>> mentioned a device to pick up the sound, then flash a light? That may
>> really increase my enjoyment of Morse. I doubt that the speeds can get
>> very hig, and I don't know what blinking will do, but it sounds like a
>> fun experiment.
>
>Morse sent visually must be sent at a slow speed or the eye runs it all
>together as one light. Remember that is how "motion" pictures work, a
>series of still frames sent at a speed that causes them to blend.
>
>Anyway, Morse at 5wpm is definitely possible with lights. At 18wpm, it is
>not possible. I don't know whether 13wpm is possible or not. I read about
>it years ago but can't remember where the break point was for the visual
>blending.

Motion picture frame rate is 24 frames per second.

The "visual blending" (actually 'persistence of vision') threshold
is roughly 15 to 20 images per second, depending on the
individual.

Ten "dits" per second should be at a fairly fast WPM equivalent
rate in morse.

But *WHY* is that morse code necessary for effective radio
communication?

3505. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 19:51:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFCA055.9030905@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69705

>
>
>
>
>
>>To become a ham, the only
>>additional thing they needed to learn was the material on the written exam.
>>As such, it was no more extra effort for them to become a ham than it would
>>be for those if code is dropped as a testing requirement. In other words,
>>since they did not learn code to become a ham, their knowledge of code did
>>not prove their desire or lack of desire to be hams (the testing requirement
>>only affected their ability to do so). The same could be said for those who
>>initially learned code to work for government or industry and later became
>>hams.
>>
>>
I know someone who learned code in the military back in the Korean war.
He and some of the
guys from his unit got passes to go take FCC ham tests. An excuse to
get off the base for
a day. Everyone passed the code, but only my friend passed the writtens
to get his general or advanced.
The FCC examiner was pissed with all these clowns wasting his time....

3506. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 20:22:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627162237.17796.00001108@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 69706

In article <BB21C9E1.1D8B5%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
>> (snip) You are correct in that the only thing
>> we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see
>> how long this thread gets :)
>
>
> Amazing. Twenty-six messages posted to the thread in the first day alone.
>They're even arguing over the word "disgruntled." Absolute madness. :)
>
Dwight,

Don't you remember the line from the film "Gladiator" in which the victorious
Maximus shouts to the crowd "ARE YOU ENTERTAINED?!" or something like that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3507. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 22:22:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627182214.14837.00001021@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 69707

In article <bdhe6s$40a$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030626222527.12501.00000475@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> In article <Xns93A674231DEAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
>> >news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com:
>>
>> (N2EY wrote:)
>>
>> >>>>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
>
>(SNIP)
>
>> First, the revised treaty has to be ratified by The Congress.
>
>Probably an assumed or expected noncontroversial action.
>FCC could begin the process in anticipation of congressional
>approval.

True, but can anyone recall an example of when FCC started a rules change
process in anticipation of a treaty change or some other legislative change?
Particularly when they did not have to?
>
>> Second, FCC has to decide whether dropping Element 1 requires the NPRM
>> process.
>
>As you note below. I think that decision has already been
>made in 98/99.
>
>> If FCC decides to do an NPRM, somebody has to write it up, then there are
>> comment and reply comment periods of length decided by FCC. Probably on
>> the
>> order of a few months. Then FCC processes all the comments (couple more
>> months)
>> and issues an R&O that changes the rules.
>> >
>> But FCC could decide that they don;t need the NPRM process. For example,
>> changes like new VE fees and QPC pool changes don't get NPRMs, FCC just
>> does
>> it.
>>

>> Seems to me that FCC could just say, in effect, 'we considered all the
>> codetest
>> arguments, pro and con, back in 98 and 99. We said back then that the
>> treaty
>> was the only reason for a code test, and we reduced code testing to 5 wpm
>> because that's the minimum we think meets the treaty. Without the treaty,
>> there's no reason, so the code test is history." Element 1 gets dumped by
>> executive order and that's that.
>
>Agree completely..

Note also that there was at least one Petition for Reconsideration wrt the loss of the 13 and 20 wpm code tests. Despite lots of support, FCC simply said no, it was gonna stay 5 wpm only.

>
>> But first the revised treaty has to be ratified.
>
>Anyone know the time interval it took after the last WRC?
>
I recall that ratification of WRC-79 was delayed because of some action by Sen. John Glenn (help us out here, Phil/K2ASP). And it took some time for us to actually get the WRC bands after that.

But that was a different time and different changes. If the decision is to drop code testing completely, FCC doesn't have to write any new rules, they just have to eliminate Element 1. I recall that some time back we did a quick flip through Part 97 and noted the sections that would have to change or be deleted. There weren't very many.

And I'm quite confident that you, Bill, will see to it that a suitably written proposal is in FCC's hands on the first day it is advisable to submit one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3508. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 22:49:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdihmk$8oj$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 69708

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3EFB8423.6040109@ix.netcom.com...
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >
> > >Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy". While
> the
> > >very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes not only
> training
> > >but talent, normal levels of usage only require training. The biggest
> > >problem most people face in learning code is unrealistic expectations.
> They
> > >try for a week and think they are a failure when they simply haven't
> given
> > >it the proper amount and type of study. It takes the normal person 30
> hours
> > >of study and practice (see the book "Morse Code, The Essential
> Language"),
> > >if done correctly, to achieve a reliable 5wpm.
> > >
> >
> > >Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with for
> > >written material (which of course they forget immediately following the
> test
> > >as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to 5wpm, a
> > >person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day (or
> > >nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.
> > >
> > Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
> > average person to
> > learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should that
> > time be devoted
> > to something else?"
> >
>
> Well each individual has to decide if the investment is worth the return.
> However that is true in any activity in life. Is the time I spend
> practicing my clarinet worth it? Is the time I spend reading worth it? And
> so on. If one is looking at just passing the code to get to the General
> license class, 30 hours is not an unreasonable investment in time. So I
> tend to share the opinion that most of those who are "waiting for the code
> to be dropped" just don't care to put a priority on getting the upgrade (or
> in more basic terms, don't "want it enough"). Of course some will learn it

> faster and some will take longer. I would be more than happy to elmer
> anyone who is having a tough time of the code.
>
> You asked the question about how long it takes the average person to get do
> a decent code ability. Well here's the info from "Morse Code, The Essential
> Language"
>
> WPM Average hours to learn
> 5 30
> 10 60
> 15 95
> 20 150
>
> A lot of casual conversations are conducted around 13 wpm to 15 wpm. So
> that is a reasonable level to achieve if one has the interest. And it tends
> to come naturally once one gets on the air and starts using the code if they
> stick with it.
>
> Also referring back to "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," the author
> has found through his research that once the 13wpm level is reached, the
> person has learned it well enough that even if they don't use it, they are
> not apt to forget it. They may get rusty but they retain it.
>
> If the morse requirement gets dropped, it looks like it's going to be as we
> slide into the bottom of the sunspot cycle. I think a lot of people will
> upgrade and then be disappointed at how "dead" so many of the bands are
> since they will have little experience with the vagaries of HF propagation.

And those who peruse the CW portions of the bands will find signals present, if
weak, where there are none to be found on the SSB portions.
Those who learned the code and are adventurous enough to want to try to use it
will find plenty of contacts while the SSB-only operators will sometimes
have a much more difficult time of it.

3509. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 23:03:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdiifh$b3t$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 69709

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "Jim Hampton" wrote:
> >
> >
> >> (snip) You are correct in that the only thing
> >>we *know* is that we *don't* know. Let's see
> >>how long this thread gets :)
> >
> >
> >
> > Amazing. Twenty-six messages posted to the thread in the first day alone.
> > They're even arguing over the word "disgruntled." Absolute madness. :)
>
> I just thought we were having a little fun with that part!

Yup. It's Dwight that's "mad".

3510. Re: What a childish loser.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 23:38:12 UTC
From: Patrick C <Carter_P@ncvillage.net>
Message-ID: <981071068.36511586@ncvillage.net>
Source record: 69710
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 14:43:48 -0700, Agent Smith <biteme@here.com> wrote:
> ......this nym stealing anonymous prick is.
>

His childishness was obvious from the beginning. The only question is: Is he really worth all of the trouble? You could complain to abuse@altopia.com (Chris Caputo), and if you include enough of his posts which originate at Altopia, you can probably have his crossposting ability turned off. The trouble is, he is also using whatever remailers are available to him, and Caputo has no control over them. You would then have to persue him one remailer at a time.

Instead, may I suggest that you go to http://cws.internet.com/news-xnews.html and download the free newsreader called "Xnews?" It can filter out entire sites, rather than ever-changing nicks, and filtering on the basis of the originating site will also allow the real nym owner's posts to come through unimpeded, while the child's posts are blocked.

You would set up Xnews to filter on the basis of the Path header and kill any posts which contain any of the strings

sewer-output
gilgamesh-frog
uncensored-news
nym.alias.net
alt.net

in that header. That will kill all posts from all of the various servers that the child has been using, NO MATTER WHAT HIS NYM, and will allow everyone else through. I'm filtering that way now, and that's how your posts get through while his posts get killed.

In the meantime, be aware that the child *is* being persued, but that it will take time before any results are evident.

===
"Ignorance can be cured, but stupidity is forever." -- John Simmons

3511. Re: What a childish loser.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-27 23:56:31 UTC
From: The REAL Agent Smith <biteme@here.com>
Message-ID: <PQ4La.172306$eJ2.162161@fed1read07>
Source record: 69711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Patrick C" <Carter_P@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
news:981071068.36511586@ncvillage.net...

> Instead, may I suggest that you go to
> http://cws.internet.com/news-xnews.html and download the free
> newsreader called "Xnews?" It can filter out entire sites, rather
> than ever-changing nicks, and filtering on the basis of the
> originating site will also allow the real nym owner's posts to come
> through unimpeded, while the child's posts are blocked.

Sounds great. Can't do it on this PC, but I have another that I can... will give it a try.

> In the meantime, be aware that the child *is* being persued, but that
> it will take time before any results are evident.

Good. Glad to hear that as well. Thanks!

-Smith. Agent Smith.

3512. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 00:46:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdioh5$r2e$0@208.206.142.102>
Source record: 69712

Robert Casey wrote:

>

>
> I know someone who learned code in the military back in the Korean war.
> He and some of the
> guys from his unit got passes to go take FCC ham tests. An excuse to
> get off the base for
> a day. Everyone passed the code, but only my friend passed the writtens
> to get his general or advanced.
> The FCC examiner was pissed with all these clowns wasting his time....

Ahhh. More "professional" clowns!

3513. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 01:39:32 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <turpfv42hi9nqf9rgb34eh7m1pc0moq01k@4ax.com>
Source record: 69713
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 13:32:00 GMT, "Rich Cacace" <richcacace-REMOVE TO REPLY-@optonline.net> wrote:

>Do they perform as well as the FRS only radio's? They do look small enough.

The receiver/antenna is not quite as sensitive as some of the larger older radios like the Kenwood UBZ-LF14 but it is fairly close. It takes a bit of moving around the room on different signals to tell any difference.

I have not yet tried a side by side ERP comparison. Oddly enough the T4500 puts out more power on FRS frequencies than on GMRS frequencies but not enough difference that I expect to see. FRS = 190 mWERP and GMRS = 180 mWERP.

Audio is a lot better than some of the less expensive FRS radios I've had a chance to hear.

The best thing is that they don't use Motorola's compander. That makes a lot of difference when scanning, listening to other brands of radios.

Mike

3514. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 01:44:09 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <6mspfv0sul8v1gae8drfionor9mii6scmg@4ax.com>
Source record: 69714
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I meant the Kenwood UBZ-LH14.

Mike

3515. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 02:18:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFCFB28.6040409@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69715

Alun Palmer wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:3EFB7711.2010203@adelphia.net:
>
>
>>
>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>>>news:3EFB3128.9060402@adelphia.net:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Jim Hampton wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dwight,
>>>>>
>>>>>My reply to a few codeless techs that had started studying Morse and
>>>>>questioned if they should continue has been that we don't know when
>>>>>the code will be eliminated and they still might wait around for a
>>>>>few years rather than enjoying HF. I think it reasonable advice.
>>>>>You are correct in that the only thing we *know* is that we *don't*
>>>>>know. Let's see how long this thread gets :)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Anyone who isn't willing to learn Morse isn't all that interested
>>>> in the ARS.
>>>
>>>
>>>Simply not a true statement, and backed up by nothing.
>>
>> Perhaps I should have added IMO. That's what it is, an opinion.
>> But
>>it's backed up by life experiences.
>>
>> I've heard many excuses for why people don't quit smoking, lose
>> weight,
>>get in shape, the list goes on and on. It becomes pretty clear that in
>>reality, they don't really want to do these things, or else they would.
>>And as a former 3 pack a day smoker (now 26 years without a ciggy) I
>>know I did not quit until I wanted to.
>>
>> And this is a FACT. Anyone who does *not* get their General or

>> Extra
>>ticket until the code requirement is dropped does NOT want to get it
>>badly enough that they will take a Morse code test. In other words,
>>they are not interested if it is there, and interested if it is not,
>>
>>
>>
>>>
>>>>This is separate to any argument of whether or not there
>>>>should be code testing, or whether it is outdated or not.
>>>>
>>>> When it is dropped, we will probably have a quick influx of new
>>>> hams,
>>>
>>>
>>>Possibly
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>who will probably drop out almost as quickly.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>I doubt that, although I do think it may be a one-time event
>>
>>
>> Look at the Japanese situation.
>>
>>
>>
>>>
>>>> The overall effect is likely to be underwhelming.
>>>>
>>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Largely because it comes too late. If this had happened in 1992, as it
>>>might well have if it had made the agenda and that particular
>>>conference had not been postponed by three years, then I think the
>>>effect would have been much bigger. Something else happened in the
>>>interim, an explosion in Internet use, which has changed the
>>>landscape.
>>
>> Comparison of Ham radio to the internet is something that I have
>> always
>>found amusing and a little suspect. You don't need any special training
>>or talent to surf the internet. I know, I get a lot of people out of
>>jams on their 'pooters. They don't know how to set up an email account,

>>but they can click that mouse button as good as I can.
>>
>> Despite a lot of people's thoughts to the contrary, the Internet
>> is not
>>terribly hi-tech. Probably 80-90 percent of Internet users would never
>>consider being a ham.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> But what about the other 10-20%? That's a lot of people.

They *might* choose to become hams.. I just don't think that a truly technically oriented person will find the Internet as such very satisfying, and will find other hobbies to satisfy their technical nature. They will probably continue to use the net, but yeah, they'll probably read books too.

- Mike KB3EIA -

- Mike KB3EIA -

3516. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 02:20:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EFCFBA4.8060104@adelphia.net>
Source record: 69716

Alun Palmer wrote:

> In my case it required a lot of outside help to pass code. It simply
> wasn't something I could do on my own, whereas I never needed any help
> from anyone to pass theory. Your mileage may differ!

Exact same situation here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3517. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 02:22:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627222247.25815.00000983@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 69717

In article <bdhdsc$nt7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>True. After all, the only reason the FCC kept 5wpm was because of the
>treaty.

They made that pretty clear in the R&O. Just FCC's opinion, of course, but
theirs is the one that makes the rules...

>The call for rational reasons to retain morse testing was done in
>NPRM-98-143.

Doesn't mean FCC has to be 100% rational, tho....;-)

There was also at least one Petition for Reconsideration, too. Denied.

>Does anyone think there are any new reasons to retain code testing that
>haven't already been run through the FCC comment process?

New or old, whether a reason is rational or not doesn't mean FCC must act on
it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3518. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 02:22:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030627222248.25815.00000984@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 69718

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hh5en0v.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 27 Jun 2003 05:14:09 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>>It's important to remember that none of this is front-burner stuff to
>>the FCC. To FCC, amateur radio is a small-potatoes legacy service that
>>generates a small amount of revenue. They're not anti-ham, they just
>>have a lot of other things going on.
>
> And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
> over the broadcast ownership rule change.

"Powell-burger"?
>
> Code tests, indeed..... <ggg>
>
Singular - there's only one left.

--

FD antenna is up at the site and the W1AW bulletin has been copied. 100 points
in the bag and FD won't start for another 17 hours...

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3519. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 03:19:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh60ury.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69719

On 28 Jun 2003 02:22:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>> And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
>> over the broadcast ownership rule change.
>
>"Powell-burger"?

Michael Powell is the Chairman of the FCC (and the son of Colin
Powell). He was the front-runner in pushing for the June 2 FCC
decision to allow all sorts of cross-iwnership of broadcast
stations - a controversial ruling that was pushed through with
very little opportunity to get public input, and it was railr....
err, voted in on strict party lines 3-2.

A number of powerful Senators of both parties were not pleased.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3520. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 05:29:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306272129.6d679218@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69720

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030627152429.18497.00000966@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <3EFB7711.2010203@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo

> BTW, I made my own PC back in 1976, laying out and etching
> the boards, soldering in the components, programming my own
> monitor chip (what is now referred to as a "BIOS"). Motorola
> 6800 microprocessor, sort of a "QRP CW rig" equivalent. Do I
> insist that all others emulate me? NO.

Thank God. There's already a putz surplus, and one more would
really put the EPA into a tizzy.

> BTW2: Only girls use the term "pooter." Think about it.

Oh? This is a law? A rule? A regulation?

> > Despite a lot of people's thoughts to the contrary, the Internet is not
> >terribly hi-tech. Probably 80-90 percent of Internet users would never
> >consider being a ham.
>
> ...more like 99+ percent.

And WE are darned proud Lennie is in THAT majority.

Steve, K4YZ

3521. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 05:30:24 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>
Source record: 69721
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

sir,
freebanding is NOT a hobby.

its a deliberate and amlicious violation of federal rules and regulations (those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the affact and power of law).

you want to attract attention, fine. just don't try to take others with you when you go down.

BTW, this applies to all those hams that choose to use gear on 11 meters. better make sure its type approved. If not, well, you get the picture.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

On Wed, 25 Jun 2003 14:33:28 +0200, twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:

> Like many Alpha Tango members I have DXed over 100 confirmed countries
> on 12 whiskey SSB, worldwide without the need for license or expense of
> ham radio.
>
> I have everything a man could ask for without the additional
> volunteer headache Uncle Charlie could induce by means of harassment.
> Besides,,I like the freeband way better than the HF hammie bands and
> repeaters.
>
> And I do it barefoot 99% of the time..only time I use power, is when
> it's something really rare and I have exhausted myself with my 3
> watts..then, and only then, I may elect to toss out a hundred
> watts,,,maximum. That "crime" is less than the fine and imprisonment
> that you can get for taping a movie from HBO.
>
> No cber has been prosecuted (during this or the last administration) for
> merely operating an amp or talking DX or freebanding without receiveing
> a warning. So, to set the record straight, a warning letter outlining
> the infractions is to be issued to the offending station as a warning.
> Fail to heed the warning and you may find yourself facing a fine.
> Underline the word "may". This reduces the relative risk and associated
> penalty to a petty infraction comparable to jaywalking.
>
> I have spoken to Mr. Hollingsworth personally, and I can assure you,
> even if he thinks that slightly exceeding power limits is ok, he can't
> verbalize it due his present position.
>

> There are many hammies on the freeband...and guess what? They are cool
> as all get out!!! Us cbersare a friendlier lot. We really don'tgive a
> rat's azz if a hammie talks on cb,,,we'lll talk to him
> anyways...probably why they come on down in the first place,,,so they
> can escape the frequency fuzz and just......enjoy radio.
>
> RS 1175, FL
>
> No flames answered.
> Emails only:
> twistedhed@hotmail.com

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

3522. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 05:42:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306272142.2d6feac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69722

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030627152424.18497.00000964@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <3EFC435B.1050509@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <hockeypuck@psu.edu> writes:

> Mike is getting down to the nitty-gritty of Personal Insult tactics
> when he can't justify his morse code views or claims of amateur
> radio "superiority." Any day now Mike will hop on Larrah's big
> superior ham bus beeping its way through ancientville.

Perhaps...But at least he bought a ticket and got on the
bus...Unlike poor Licenseless Lennie, standing at the bus stop,
drowning rain and without "correct change".

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3523. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 06:41:07 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <c0cqfv4h5ihmg3s7cfcq5dn78bf0u8gr13@4ax.com>
Source record: 69723
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
<n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:

>..... federal rules and regulations
>(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
>affact and power of law).

That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like- vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes, ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3524. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 08:53:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306280853000.99@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 69724
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 27 Jun 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 01:16:02 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> >> Although you "actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all". Why
> >> not get the license and make full use of your radio ??? Comes the day you
> >> may want or need it.
> >
> >....Maybe he doesn't want to pay $75 every 5 years....
>
> The cost of a large soda at a fast-food place or a 2-liter bottle at
> the supermarket once a month......
>
> I was surprised how much spare change I had in my pocket when I
> stopped buying my daily yoghurt or ice cream a while ago. And my
> waistline appreciated it, too.....

But the FCC wants it all at once, not amortized over time.

3525. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 10:23:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030628062304.14837.00001027@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 69725

In article <3EFCFBA4.8060104@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> In my case it required a lot of outside help to pass code. It simply
>> wasn't something I could do on my own, whereas I never needed any help
>> from anyone to pass theory. Your mileage may differ!
>
> Exact same situation here.
>
I didn't have much trouble with either. But I did spend far more time learning
the theory than I did learning the code. Part of the reason for that was I
didn't know much of either when I got started.

I have known individuals who had trouble learning theory as well as code. One
ham I helped took the old Advanced written no less than 9 times before passing
it. He was a successful professional who simply wasn't very good with math,
particularly algebraic formulas.

He's not a rare case.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3526. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 10:23:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030628062304.14837.00001026@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 69726

In article <KI0La.2796$Vx2.1441910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Morse sent visually must be sent at a slow speed or the eye runs it all
>together as one light. Remember that is how "motion" pictures work, a
>series of still frames sent at a speed that causes them to blend.
>
>Anyway, Morse at 5wpm is definitely possible with lights. At 18wpm, it is
>not possible. I don't know whether 13wpm is possible or not. I read about
>it years ago but can't remember where the break point was for the visual
>blending.
>
Let's take a look at dit times:

At 5 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 12/50 seconds, or 240 milliseconds. That's a little more than 2 dits per second.

At 13 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 4.615/50 seconds, or 92 milliseconds. That's a little more than 5 dits per second.

At 20 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 3/50 seconds, or 60 milliseconds. That's a little more than 8 dits per second.

Visual blending depends on the individual, but is around 20 flashes (dits) per second.

Motion picture speed is 24 frames per second, but to eliminate flicker ecah frame is flashed on the screen twice by means of a rotating shutter. So the effective flash rate is 48 per second. NTSC television refreshes the screen 30 times per second, but the refresh pattern is interlaced, (odd lines one time, even the next) so the effective flash rate is 60 per second.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3527. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 10:23:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030628062305.14837.00001028@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 69727

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hh60ury.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 28 Jun 2003 02:22:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>> And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
>>> over the broadcast ownership rule change.
>>
>>"Powell-burger"?
>
> Michael Powell is the Chairman of the FCC (and the son of Colin
> Powell). He was the front-runner in pushing for the June 2 FCC
> decision to allow all sorts of cross-iwnership of broadcast
> stations - a controversial ruling that was pushed through with
> very little opportunity to get public input, and it was railr....
> err, voted in on strict party lines 3-2.

That much I know - and this latest is an expansion of an earlier rules change that has homogenized broadcast radio in many markets.

> A number of powerful Senators of both parties were not pleased.
>
Ah - that's the part I missed.

I wonder if Mr. P even knows what the code test is?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3528. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 11:17:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030628071739.23307.00001044@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 69728

In article <YEKKa.2429$Vx2.1283062@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:Xns93A5F0569BC48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> I would put in automatic upgrades for Novice
>> and Advanced, and reallocate some of the novice subbands. There is also
>> the question of what to do with Techs and Tech plusses. Getting rid of the
>> Novice subbands would be a loss of privileges for the latter, and keeping
>> track of their code credit indefinitely after getting rid of element 1
>> seems illogical. One way out may be to make the Tech licence simply 28 MHz
>> and above. Any thoughts on that?
>
>Automatic upgrades would be inappropriate.

We know from experience that FCC won;t go for it, either. Back in 98, ARRL proposed giving existing Novices and Tech Pluses Generals. FCC said no.

>There is material on the Tech
>written that was NOT included in the Novice written.

Heck, there is a lot of current ham dtuff that wasn't on my 1970 Extra written or any of the preceding writtens I took in 1967 and 1968. Nothing on those old tests about VECs,RF exposure, repeaters, satellites, frequency counters or WARC bands, as I recall. Lots of stuff on keeping a log, IDing properly, and technologies that are considered "vintage" today. FCC is perfectly happy to keep renewing my license without any more tests, because I have a clean record. FCC is willing to assume that I and hundreds of thousands of other hams have kept current with the requirements, and that's a valid assumption.

>They can take the
>test. Any Novice that wants to upgrade to Tech (with HF) should already
>have done so. They've had the opportunity to upgrade to Tech with a single
>written test for over a decade.

A lot more than a decade. Since 1987 it's been just the 35 question Tech written.

>They didn't do it so they didn't want it.

Not that simple. If a Novice is primarily interested in HF, upgrading to Tech Plus doesn't get them a thing except more vanity call options.

The big unknown today is how many of those in the database are completely inactive, and only show up because the license terms are so long.

We're down to about 33,000 Novices now.

>There is NO need for automatic upgrades. As far as Advanced goes, again,
>they haven't been tested on material that was specific to the Extra class.
>Since the reduction of the code to 5wpm in 2000, they've had 3 years to
>upgrade with a single written test if they wanted to. They didn't do it so
>they didn't want it. Again NO need for an automatic upgrade.

Since restructuring, the percentage of Advanceds has decreased far less than
the percentage of Novices, which is a puzzle.
>
>Should the Element 1 requirement be dropped, the simplest thing is to simply
>keep the bands and privileges of Novices, Generals, Advanced and Extras
>exactly as they are now. Change the Tech to get the privileges that the old
>Tech Plus license used to have. So they would have the 10m voice and code
>privileges plus 15m, 40m, and 80m code privileges.
>
>This would keep the rule changes simple and accommodate all current
>licensees.
>
Simple, yes, but is that what's best for the ARS? What such a structure creates
is an amateur radio license structure that makes VHF/UHF easy to attain and
HF/MF much harder. Is that a good thing?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3529. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 13:58:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdk6ut$72k$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 69729

N2EY wrote:

> In article <KI0La.2796$Vx2.1441910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Morse sent visually must be sent at a slow speed or the eye runs it all
> >together as one light. Remember that is how "motion" pictures work, a
> >series of still frames sent at a speed that causes them to blend.
> >
> >Anyway, Morse at 5wpm is definitely possible with lights. At 18wpm, it is
> >not possible. I don't know whether 13wpm is possible or not. I read about
> >it years ago but can't remember where the break point was for the visual
> >blending.
> >
> Let's take a look at dit times:
>
> At 5 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 12/50 seconds, or 240 milliseconds.
> That's a little more than 2 dits per second.
>
> At 13 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 4.615/50 seconds, or 92 milliseconds.
> That's a little more than 5 dits per second.
>
> At 20 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 3/50 seconds, or 60 milliseconds.
> That's a little more than 8 dits per second.
>
> Visual blending depends on the individual, but is around 20 flashes (dits) per
> second.
>
> Motion picture speed is 24 frames per second, but to eliminate flicker ecah
> frame is flashed on the screen twice by means of a rotating shutter. So the
> effective flash rate is 48 per second. NTSC television refreshes the screen 30
> times per second, but the refresh pattern is interlaced, (odd lines one time,
> even the next) so the effective flash rate is 60 per second.

And of course the persistance of the light source used for a CW reader would need
to be considered. I'd use an LED rather than a lamp

Dick

3530. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 14:00:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdk71v$72k$1@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 69730

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 28 Jun 2003 02:22:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >> And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
> >> over the broadcast ownership rule change.
> > >
> > >"Powell-burger"?
> >
> > Michael Powell is the Chairman of the FCC (and the son of Colin
> > Powell). He was the front-runner in pushing for the June 2 FCC
> > decision to allow all sorts of cross-iwnership of broadcast
> > stations - a controversial ruling that was pushed through with
> > very little opportunity to get public input, and it was railr....
> > err, voted in on strict party lines 3-2.
> >
> > A number of powerful Senators of both parties were not pleased.
> >

Dittto plenty of the public.

3531. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 14:04:17 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdk791$72k$2@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 69731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
> <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >..... federal rules and regulations
> >(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
> >affact and power of law).
>
> That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because
> the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a
> vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about
> you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like-
> vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
> ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.

No, Eric has it rght. Rules and regulations carry the force of law. None has been considered and passed into public law, rather a single law confering onto those rules and regulations the force of law.

3532. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 14:23:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdk8dp$a4k$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 69732
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Stripling wrote:

>
>
> I hesitate to post this

After reading it I can see why. Date it April 1.

3533. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 14:43:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bdk9ie$dvm@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 69733

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030626224931.23745.00000746@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <3EFB8423.6040109@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >>Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with
for
> >>written material (which of course they forget immediately following the
test
> >>as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to 5wpm, a
> >>person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day (or
> >>nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.
> >>
> >Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
> >average person to
> >learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should that
> >time be devoted
> >to something else?"
>
> Bob:
>
> The time I spent learning the Morse code and increasing my skill in
> order to upgrade to 20-WPM Extra-class status was in investment that
> paid off in what has become, so far, over 20 years of enjoyable HF CW
> operation. I'm certainly glad I didn't decide to devote that time to
> "something else" -- especially if that may have been hours of yakking
> into a microphone!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

So. You're thinking that people would have actually made a conscious
decision to stay "verbally engaged" with you for hours, huh?

Kim W5TIT

3534. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 18:59:22 UTC
From: Phil Stripling <phil_stripling@cieux.zzn.com>
Message-ID: <3qel1exc39.fsf@shell4.tdl.com>
Source record: 69734
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:

> Phil Stripling wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > I hesitate to post this
>
> After reading it I can see why. Date it April 1.

Oh, sorry -- I didn't realize I had to say it was a hilarious joke. :->
Forgot what groups it's posted to.

--
Philip Stripling | email to the replyto address is presumed
Legal Assistance on the Web | spam and read later. email to philip@
http://www.PhilipStripling.com/ | civex.com is read daily.

3535. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 20:06:50 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vfs83ir1mfnm28@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69738

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030627222248.25815.00000984@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hh5en0v.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On 27 Jun 2003 05:14:09 -0700, N2EY wrote:
> > Code tests, indeed..... <ggg>
> >
> Singular - there's only one left.

Then there was none, but we will suvive.

QRN?

Larry

3536. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 21:17:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030628171748.04554.00000754@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 69735

In article <bdk71v$72k$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 28 Jun 2003 02:22:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >> And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
>> >> over the broadcast ownership rule change.
>> >
>> >"Powell-burger"?
>>
>> Michael Powell is the Chairman of the FCC (and the son of Colin
>> Powell). He was the front-runner in pushing for the June 2 FCC
>> decision to allow all sorts of cross-iwnership of broadcast
>> stations - a controversial ruling that was pushed through with
>> very little opportunity to get public input, and it was railr....
>> err, voted in on strict party lines 3-2.
>>
>> A number of powerful Senators of both parties were not pleased.
>
>Dittto plenty of the public.

Why are you so concerned about COMMERCIAL radio broadcasting
practices? Such practices don't involve any amateur radio activity
anywhere. By definition, US amateur radio is prohibited from any
pecuniary compensation (that's why the word "amateur" is there).

If you have investments in radio broadcasting, try a different
newsgroup for your bitching and whining about COMMERCIAL
radio.

3537. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 21:17:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030628171750.04554.00000755@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 69736

In article <20030628062304.14837.00001026@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <KI0La.2796$Vx2.1441910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>Morse sent visually must be sent at a slow speed or the eye runs it all
>>together as one light. Remember that is how "motion" pictures work, a
>>series of still frames sent at a speed that causes them to blend.
>>
>>Anyway, Morse at 5wpm is definitely possible with lights. At 18wpm, it is
>>not possible. I don't know whether 13wpm is possible or not. I read about
>>it years ago but can't remember where the break point was for the visual
>>blending.
>>
>Let's take a look at dit times:
>
>At 5 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 12/50 seconds, or 240 milliseconds.
>That's a little more than 2 dits per second.
>
>At 13 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 4.615/50 seconds, or 92 milliseconds.
>That's a little more than 5 dits per second.
>
>At 20 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 3/50 seconds, or 60 milliseconds.
>That's a little more than 8 dits per second.
>
>Visual blending depends on the individual, but is around 20 flashes (dits)
>per second.

The correct term is "persistence of vision." :-)

The actual persistence threshold varies with individuals and can
go down to 15 "flashes" per second. That seems to be a combined
function of the retinal cells and cerebral visual cortex.

>Motion picture speed is 24 frames per second, but to eliminate flicker ecah
>frame is flashed on the screen twice by means of a rotating shutter.

Not quite. The shutter is there to blank the "pull-down" time when
the geneva mechanism and pawl yank down the next frame. The
intermittent movement requires a free loop of film before and after
the shutter mechanism so that the supply and take-up reels can
move at an approximate constant rate. Note: A geneva wheel may
not be used in cheaper projectors but was standard in cinema
projectors for decades; there are other, simpler pull-downs.

Motion picture frame rate standards are still 24 per second and that
is what nearly everyone sees. That's a comporomise between the
maintenance of persistence of vision and length of film needed for a
given time.

>So the effective flash rate is 48 per second.

For nearly all film projectors and editors, it is still 24 per second.

>NTSC television refreshes the screen 30
>times per second, but the refresh pattern is interlaced, (odd lines one time,
>even the next) so the effective flash rate is 60 per second.

Not in the human perception. The effective IMAGE "flash rate" is still
30 per second for the US NTSC system and the rest-of-the-world's
PAL system at 25 per second. Human persistence of vision will
blend the interlaced display lines (if a fast phosphor is on the CRT)
to yield a better vertical definition of the image.

For a TFT or LCD display, the materials used in the display screen
may cause a longer persistence than the average CRT phosphor.
The internal TFT or LCD display temporary visual memory RAM is
considerably faster and could easily update an entire image in less
than the time of vertical blanking even using an 8 Megapixel image
standard.

In the old Dumont TV "Film Chain" (combined film and slide pickup
unit, two of each), there was no film shutter at all and the film looped
through the projection-equivalent portion at a constant rate. To do the
conversion from 24 to 30 frames per second, Dumont used a rather
expensive cylindrical lens which had precision wedge lenses around
the cylinder. The action was to overlay one film image over the next
one, always two image frames overlayed at the pickup point. The
spacing of the wedge sections caused the image conversion rate of
24 per second to 30 per second...and could also convert 24/sec to
25/sec for a PAL system. The cylinder of lenses was driven by a
synchronous motor. The light source was a "flying spot" CRT (fast
phosphor) and the pickup a photomultiplier tube.

Now, none of what you wrote involved "Morse Code Test May Not
'Die' at ITU Conference" but you did state a number of innaccuracies
and those were simply corrected.

An LED is considerably faster in on-off rate than an incandescent
lamp (can do 100 to 20 microseconds). A neon lamp (such as the
NE-2 indicator) is nearly as fast as an LED. Neon bulbs driven from
an amplified microphone were the light source for the Conn
"Stroboconn" musical pitch indicator. A patterned wheel driven by
a synchronous motor operating off the primary power AC allowed a
comparison of amplified musical tones to the correct pitch by viewing
the rotation of the particular note's pattern. An early, special-purpose
frequency meter. :-)

Some LEDs can be used as variable-capacitance diodes if reverse-biased. Several radio amateurs, notably those in the UK and Europe have used those, but those must be selected; larger LED structures seem to work out better in this regard.

GOTA GODI ... keep the US ARS a living museum of radiotelegraphy!

3538. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 22:54:55 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306281454.78d145b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69737
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

k4cap@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<a08ca5a.0306260714.d42ceaf@posting.google.com>...
> Only a radio specifically designed for FRS applications may be
> used license free. Any other radio is GMRS and must be licensed.

Bullshit.

There are MANY FRS/GMRS hybrids on sale at Wal-Mart, K-Mart, etc. You
CAN use them on the FRS freqs without a license.

You could use them on the GMRS repeater output freqs (and a very few
of the hybrids are even repeater-capable), but they are not very
useful on those frequencies in most environments... so don't bother
using them on those freqs, and don't bother licensing them.

The GMRS capability on the integral-antenna GMRS-FRS hybrids is
bascially a marketing gimmick, created so that the radio manufacturers
can claim "5 MILE RANGE!", and claim "22 FREQUENCIES"!

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

3539. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 23:17:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh7jmy0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69739
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 28 Jun 2003 08:53:57 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>> The cost of a large soda at a fast-food place or a 2-liter bottle at
>> the supermarket once a month......
>>
>> I was surprised how much spare change I had in my pocket when I
>> stopped buying my daily yoghurt or ice cream a while ago. And my
>> waistline appreciated it, too.....
>
>But the FCC wants it all at once, not amortized over time.

As my dentist once said - take up the question of time payments with
your bank.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3540. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 23:17:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh7jwu1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69740

On 28 Jun 2003 10:23:05 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>I wonder if Mr. P even knows what the code test is?
>
He's no dummy - he was a pretty sharp Assistant Attorney General for
quite a while. He is, however, smart enough to know what the
string-pullers want and how to deliver it.

I suspect that the issue of keeping or dropping the code test is not
on his agenda. That's what the staff recommendations are for.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3541. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 23:53:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EFE2A8D.3070705@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69741

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030627152424.18497.00000964@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
>
>>In article <3EFC435B.1050509@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <hockeypuck@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>
>
>
>> Mike is getting down to the nitty-gritty of Personal Insult tactics
>> when he can't justify his morse code views or claims of amateur
>> radio "superiority." Any day now Mike will hop on Larrah's big
>> superior ham bus beeping its way through ancientville.
>>
>>
>
> Perhaps...But at least he bought a ticket and got on the
>bus...Unlike poor Licenseless Lennie, standing at the bus stop,
>drowning rain and without "correct change".
>
>
>
Larry's the busdriver of the ham bus......
:-)

3542. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-28 23:59:54 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <gu7sfv84quhhjgg74ugsbfm1traigt88s6@4ax.com>
Source record: 69742
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <bdk791$72k$2@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
>> <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>> >..... federal rules and regulations
>> >(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
>> >affact and power of law).
>>
>> That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because
>> the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a
>> vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about
>> you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like-
>> vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
>> ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.
>
> No, Eric has it rght. Rules and regulations carry the force of law.

Then they are laws. If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, quacks like a
duck....

> None has been
>considered and passed into public law, rather a single law confering onto those
>rules and regulations the force of law.

Well, I checked with Webster:

law -- 1. all the rules of conduct established by the authority or custom of a
nation, etc. 2. any one of such rules. 3. obedience to such rules. 4. the study
of such rules..... ---"lay down the law" 1. to give orders authoritatively....

I also looked through a few online law dictionaries:

http://www.duhaime.org/dictionary/dict-l.htm#L
http://dictionary.law.com/definition2.asp?selected=1111&bold=||||
http://dictionary.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/results.pl?co=dictionary.lp.findlaw.com&topic=7e/
7e837b5d2a954e82f31227c53fd80b3b
http://august1.com/pubs/dict/l.htm

So they all say pretty much the same thing -- if it's enforcable, it's a law.
Maybe you can find something that says something different?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3543. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 00:31:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306290031000.284@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 69743
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 28 Jun 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Sat, 28 Jun 2003 08:53:57 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> >> The cost of a large soda at a fast-food place or a 2-liter bottle at
> >> the supermarket once a month......
> >>
> >> I was surprised how much spare change I had in my pocket when I
> >> stopped buying my daily yoghurt or ice cream a while ago. And my
> >> waistline appreciated it, too.....
> > >
> > >But the FCC wants it all at once, not amortized over time.
> >
> > As my dentist once said - take up the question of time payments with
> > your bank.

Did he also confirm the existence of The Tooth Fairy? :-)

3544. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 00:38:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69744
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 28 Jun 2003 15:54:55 -0700, stewart wrote:

>k4cap@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<a08ca5a.0306260714.d42ceaf@posting.google.com>...
>> Only a radio specifically designed for FRS applications may be
>> used license free. Any other radio is GMRS and must be licensed.
>
>Bullshit.

Yes,. "stewart", the rest of your diatribe sure is.

>There are MANY FRS/GMRS hybrids on sale at Wal-Mart, K-Mart, etc.

That is true,

>You CAN use them on the FRS freqs without a license.

That is not true.

Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
understand the law.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
A real communications lawyer who deals
in these interpretations for a living

3545. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 00:51:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh7om28.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69745
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 29 Jun 2003 00:31:47 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>> >But the FCC wants it all at once, not amortized over time.
>>
>> As my dentist once said - take up the question of time payments with
>> your bank.
>
>Did he also confirm the existence of The Tooth Fairy? :-)

He was the opposite = you left money under the pillow and he put an
extracted tooth in its place.... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3546. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 01:08:12 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <0_qLa.1016$jC.583@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 69746

> Hey Steve, Thanks for the respectful reply.

My pleasure.

> 1. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *before* the Morse test is
> dropped?

No

>
> 2. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *after* the Morse
> Requirement is dropped?
>

Yes

Why ?

Because I have better things to do in life than study for a mode of
operation (CW) that I will rarely if at all use.

This does not mean that I do not respect anyone who has mastered CW and uses
it on a regular basis.

Steve
N2UBP

3547. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 01:16:23 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <H5rLa.1071$PF.803@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 69747

> The time I spent learning the Morse code and increasing my skill in
> order to upgrade to 20-WPM Extra-class status was in investment that
> paid off in what has become, so far, over 20 years of enjoyable HF CW
> operation. I'm certainly glad I didn't decide to devote that time to
> "something else" -- especially if that may have been hours of yakking
> into a microphone!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I glad to hear you are enjoying one aspect of our hobby.

My "something else" has been family, long work days, and the constant challenge of proving that amateur radio is part of the emergency communications solution to Nextel and Blackberry laden county officials.

3548. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 01:27:08 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MfrLa.1149$YI.73@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 69748

> Does that 'average person' want a ham radio license or does he want to
sit on
> his duff complaining about the requriements for a couple decades or more
until a
> weary FCC finally capitulates?
>

The average person couldn't care less about amateur radio. The guy next door is busy screaming at his ex wife on the phone, downing Prozac with beer chasers while watching the baseball game.

For those of us interested in communications, well I'm sitting here in front of a recently overhauled TS-430S with the mike disconnected and placed in a desk drawer until the time I qualify for HF transmissions, listening to amateurs with HF privileges talk about their latest operations or hemorrhoid attacks, belching and farting, discussing their sex life, preaching hell and damnation, refusing to give up a frequency for local emergencies.

Why in &pandas name would I want to get HF privileges for this cesspool ?

Steve
N2UBP

3549. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 01:30:24 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <dhfsfvkudu7n6q9pt5ps2hpqalsdsoi1gm@4ax.com>
Source record: 69749
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 29 Jun 2003 00:38:00 GMT, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:

>On 28 Jun 2003 15:54:55 -0700, stewart wrote:
>
>>k4cap@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<a08ca5a.0306260714.d42ceaf@posting.google.com>...
>>> Only a radio specifically designed for FRS applications may be
>>> used license free. Any other radio is GMRS and must be licensed.
>>
>>Bullshit.
>
> Yes,. "stewart", the rest of your diatribe sure is.
>
>>There are MANY FRS/GMRS hybrids on sale at Wal-Mart, K-Mart, etc.
>
> That is true,
>
>>You CAN use them on the FRS freqs without a license.
>
> That is not true.
>
> Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
> certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
> understand the law.

Here is text from the Motorola Users Manual for the T4500:

"The FCC requires that all operators using General Mobile Radio
Service (GMRS) frequencies obtain a radio license before operating
their equipment."

I have two questions about this:

(1) FRS channels 8 - 14 are not GMRS frequencies. Would not the above
strongly infer that use of those channels do not require a license?

95.194 (FRS Rule 4) FRS units.
(a) You may only use an FCC certified FRS unit. (You can identify an
FCC certified FRS unit by the label placed on it by the manufacturer.)

The above rule does not say that a GMRS radio may be used on FRS
frequencies. Only FRS radios are allowed.

(2) Does this not infer that a hybrid radio can only be an FRS radio
on FRS channels 8 - 14?

Mike

3550. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 01:37:09 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <9prLa.1216$TF.366@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 69750

> The only "total and complete horse manure" here is the notion that
> a so-called amateur radio operator who hasn't mastered the basic
> communications skill of Morse/CW operation is qualified to be a
> county Skywarn Coordinator.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Total garbage

3551. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 01:57:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdlh88$1te$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69651

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030627182214.14837.00001021@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <bdhe6s$40a$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030626222527.12501.00000475@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> In article <Xns93A674231DEAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
> >> >news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com:
> >>
> >> (N2EY wrote:)
> >>
> >> >>>>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
> >
> >(SNIP)
> >
> >> First, the revised treaty has to be ratified by The Congress.
> >
> >Probably an assumed or expected noncontroversial action.
> >FCC could begin the process in anticipation of congressional
> >approval.
>
> True, but can anyone recall an example of when FCC started a rules change
> process in anticipation of a treaty change or some other legislative
change?
> Particularly when they did not have to?
> >
> >> Second, FCC has to decide whether dropping Element 1 requires the NPRM
> >> process.
> >
> >As you note below. I think that decision has already been
> >made in 98/99.
> >
> >> If FCC decides to do an NPRM, somebody has to write it up, then there
are
> >> comment and reply comment periods of length decided by FCC. Probably on
> >> the
> >> order of a few months. Then FCC processes all the comments (couple more
> >> months)
> >> and issues an R&O that changes the rules.
> >> >

> >> But FCC could decide that they don;t need the NPRM process. For
example,
> >> changes like new VE fees and QPC pool changes don't get NPRMs, FCC just
> >> does
> >> it.
> >>
> >> Seems to me that FCC could just say, in effect, 'we considered all the
> >> codetest
> >> arguments, pro and con, back in 98 and 99. We said back then that the
> >> treaty
> >> was the only reason for a code test, and we reduced code testing to 5
wpm
> >> because that's the minimum we think meets the treaty. Without the
treaty,
> >> there's no reason, so the code test is history." Element 1 gets dumped
by
> >> executive order and that's that.
> >
> >Agree completely..
>
> Note also that there was at least one Petition for Reconsideration wrt the
loss
> of the 13 and 20 wpm code tests. Despite lots of support, FCC simply said
no,
> it was gonna stay 5 wpm only.
> >
> >> But first the revised treaty has to be ratified.
> >
> >Anyone know the time interval it took after the last WRC?
> >
> I recall that ratification of WRC-79 was delayed because of some action by
Sen.
> John Glenn (help us out here, Phil/K2ASP). And it took some time for us to
> actually get the WRC bands after that.
>
> But that was a different time and different changes. If the decision is to
drop
> code testing completely, FCC doesn't have to write any new rules, they
just
> have to eliminate Element 1.

Much as it may seem strange for me to admit, but in
reality, even if S25.5 is dropped completely, that does NOT
require any rule change since the FCC "could" still keep code testing
without violating the treaty.

> I recall that some time back we did a quick flip
> through Part 97 and noted the sections that would have to change or be
deleted.
> There weren't very many.

Agreed.

> And I'm quite confident that you, Bill, will see to it that a suitably
written
> proposal is in FCC's hands on the first day it is advisable to submit one.

Well I'll be part of a team that does anyway :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3552. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 01:59:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdlhcrpjf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69652

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030627222247.25815.00000983@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bdhdsc$nt7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >True. After all, the only reason the FCC kept 5wpm was because of the
> >treaty.
>
> They made that pretty clear in the R&O. Just FCC's opinion, of course, but
> theirs is the one that makes the rules...
>
> >The call for rational reasons to retain morse testing was done in
> >NPRM-98-143.
>
> Doesn't mean FCC has to be 100% rational, tho....;-)
>
> There was also at least one Petition for Reconsideration, too. Denied.

Translation - There was nothing new in that petition for
reconsideration either.

> >Does anyone think there are any new reasons to retain code testing that
> >haven't already been run through the FCC comment process?
>
> New or old, whether a reason is rational or not doesn't mean FCC must act
on
> it.

Generally true.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3553. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 02:05:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdlhnq$jj4$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69653

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bdihmk$8oj$0@208.206.142.92...
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3EFB8423.6040109@ix.netcom.com...
> > > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > >
> > > >Please consider reading "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy".
While
> > the
> > > > >very highest levels (such as world record setting) takes not only
> > training
> > > > >but talent, normal levels of usage only require training. The
biggest
> > > > >problem most people face in learning code is unrealistic
expectations.
> > They
> > > > >try for a week and think they are a failure when they simply haven't
> > given
> > > > >it the proper amount and type of study. It takes the normal person
30
> > hours
> > > > >of study and practice (see the book "Morse Code, The Essential
> > Language"),
> > > > >if done correctly, to achieve a reliable 5wpm.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > >Cramming doesn't work for Morse code as some people can get away with
for
> > > > >written material (which of course they forget immediately following
the
> > test
> > > > >as it is only in short term memory when they "cram"). To get to
5wpm, a
> > > > >person should put in about two 15 minute sessions per day, every day
(or
> > > > >nearly so otherwise you start to forget) for about 60 days.
> > > > >
> > > > Of course there is the question "Is the amount of time required by the
> > > > average person to
> > > > learn decent code ability really worth the investment? Or should

that
> > > time be devoted
> > > to something else?"
> > >
> >
> > Well each individual has to decide if the investment is worth the
return.
> > However that is true in any activity in life. Is the time I spend
> > practicing my clarinet worth it? Is the time I spend reading worth it?
And
> > so on. If one is looking at just passing the code to get to the General
> > license class, 30 hours is not an unreasonable investment in time. So I
> > tend to share the opinion that most of those who are "waiting for the
code
> > to be dropped" just don't care to put a priority on getting the upgrade
(or
> > in more basic terms, don't "want it enough"). Of course some will
learn it
> > faster and some will take longer. I would be more than happy to elmer
> > anyone who is having a tough time of the code.
> >
> > You asked the question about how long it takes the average person to get
do
> > a decent code ability. Well here's the info from "Morse Code, The
Essential
> > Language"
> >
> > WPM Average hours to learn
> > 5 30
> > 10 60
> > 15 95
> > 20 150
> >
> > A lot of casual conversations are conducted around 13 wpm to 15 wpm. So
> > that is a reasonable level to achieve if one has the interest. And it
tends
> > to come naturally once one gets on the air and starts using the code if
they
> > stick with it.
> >
> > Also referring back to "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," the
author
> > has found through his research that once the 13wpm level is reached, the
> > person has learned it well enough that even if they don't use it, they
are
> > not apt to forget it. They may get rusty but they retain it.
> >
> > If the morse requirement gets dropped, it looks like it's going to be as
we
> > slide into the bottom of the sunspot cycle. I think a lot of people

will
> > upgrade and then be disappointed at how "dead" so many of the bands are
> > since they will have little experience with the vagaries of HF
propagation.
>
> And those who peruse the CW portions of the bands will find signals
present, if
> weak, where there are none to be found on the SSB portions.
> Those who learned the code and are adventurous enough to want to try to
use it
> will find plenty of contacts while the SSB-only operators will sometimes
> have a much more difficult time of it.

Which, if true, should prove to be a good incentive for
some hams to learn CW even though there isn't a mandatory
test.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3554. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 02:24:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB23C625.1DA20%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69654

"Mike Coslo" wrote:

> Are you one of the disgruntled, or gruntled ones, Dwight?

I disavow any involvement in that discombobulated disagreement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3555. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 02:36:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB23C8DD.1DA22%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69655

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> MANY years ago, Dwight. :-)
>
> I had 5 different MOSs in radio before 1956 and
> NONE of them involved any sort of morse code use
> or training.

My MOS (31M) didn't have it either. However, there were still classes in the early 1970's at Fort Gordon. I have no idea what MOS is was for. But, you are right - that was many years ago.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3556. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 02:47:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB23CB8D.1DA24%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69656

"Robert Casey" wrote:
>
> I know someone who learned code in the military
> back in the Korean war. He and some of the guys
> from his unit got passes to go take FCC ham tests.
> An excuse to get off the base for a day.
> Everyone passed the code, but only my friend
> passed the writtens to get his general or advanced.
> The FCC examiner was pissed with all these clowns
> wasting his time....

That sounds like some of the nonsense we used to pull to get out of work. For example, we volunteered to go pick up a guy transferring in from another unit 40 miles away. It took us more than two days, with an overnight visit to a nearby large city, to make the trip. However, it didn't help that we were using the jeep assigned to the orderly room for all this and arrived back to the unit without the person we were supposed to pick up. Needless to say, they didn't send us back to go get him. :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3557. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 02:49:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB23CC07.1DA25%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69657

"N2EY" wrote:

> Don't you remember the line from the film "Gladiator"
> in which the victorious Maximus shouts to the crowd
> "ARE YOU ENTERTAINED?!" or something like that?

Well, I suppose it could get worse - someone could start shouting about releasing the lions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3558. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 02:50:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306281850.54f4ca80@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69658

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030628171750.04554.00000755@mb-m20.aol.com>...

> GOTA GODI ... keep the US ARS a living museum of radiotelegraphy!

Damn, Len! Not only do you know a lot about radio, but you've
mastered motion picture and human sensory input as well.

didit

3559. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 02:53:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB23CCE0.1DA27%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69659

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Yup. It's Dwight that's "mad".

Nope, my mind is just a little disgruntled. Or is that disarray?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3560. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 03:00:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306281900.19a2a83b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in message news:<44176N919@web2news.com>...
> Like many Alpha Tango members I have DXed over 100 confirmed countries
> on 12 whiskey SSB, worldwide without the need for license or expense of
> ham radio.

What is "12 whiskey?"

> I have everything a man could ask for without the additional
> volunteer headache Uncle Charlie could induce by means of harassment.
> Besides,,I like the freeband way better than the HF hammie bands and
> repeaters.

Some people like breaking and entering, others prefer purse snatching.

> And I do it barefoot 99% of the time..only time I use power, is when
> it's something really rare and I have exhausted myself with my 3
> watts..then, and only then, I may elect to toss out a hundred
> watts,,,maximum. That "crime" is less than the fine and imprisonment
> that you can get for taping a movie from HBO.

Now if you take control of the 700 Club and run dirty pictures, you might get noticed.

> No cber has been prosecuted (during this or the last administration) for
> merely operating an amp or talking DX or freebanding without receiveing
> a warning. So, to set the record straight, a warning letter outlining
> the infractions is to be issued to the offending station as a warning.
> Fail to heed the warning and you may find yourself facing a fine.
> Underline the word "may". This reduces the relative risk and associated
> penalty to a petty infraction comparable to jaywalking.

You must not have visited the FCC website during this or the last administration.

> I have spoken to Mr. Hollingsworth personally, and I can assure you,
> even if he thinks that slightly exceeding power limits is ok, he can't
> verbalize it due his present position.

Freeband is not CB. You have no legal power limit.

> There are many hammies on the freeband...and guess what? They are cool
> as all get out!!! Us cbersare a friendlier lot. We really don'tgive a
> rat's azz if a hammie talks on cb,,,we'lll talk to him
> anyways...probably why they come on down in the first place,,,so they
> can escape the frequency fuzz and just......enjoy radio.

>
> RS 1175, FL
>
> No flames answered.
> Emails only:
> twistedhed@hotmail.com

Cool. Be sure not to answer.

3561. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 03:03:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306281903.74859efa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69661

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bdi3t8$5if$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bdgdbnhqo0@208.206.142.79...
> >
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > Just because you don't hear any transmitting does not mean it is not in
> use.
> >
> > I guess everyone is standing by waiting for someone to talk?
> >
> >
>
> No, but it is assigned to that agency. And it will be used when/if
> required.
>
> > >
> > > There are a large number of guburment users in the 5 Mhz range. FEMA,
> > > SHARES, Homeland Security, US Military. MARS. Just as an example.
> >
> > Yaas, none of which uses HF to any serious extent these days. It's
> virtually
> > unused. Relegated to a 'secondary' or backup status. About the same as
> military
> > HF usage..
>
> Completely and totally wrong. Military still uses HF, overseas aircraft
> flights use HF. etc.
>
> So what is wrong with being a backup status? Your point is?
> Oh I get it. You don't think there needs to be a backup in case the bird
> falls from the sky, eh?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Backups to backups. Redundancy = Survivability

3562. Re: Morse Code Banned by FCC on 5 MHz (if you thought THAT was curious.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 03:07:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0306281907.af8c9fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69662

k4cap@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<a08ca5a.0306261552.22b9ed12@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030626144851.09580.00001037@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0306260445.23d8b7d4@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030623145911.23406.00000439@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>
> > "CW gets through when everything else will."
>
> Except for you, of course, Lennie. No tickee, no transmitee
>
> > I like that phrase! Well done. US hamdom in 2003.
>
> One more self-inflicted wound on the face of the Licenseless One.
>
> So foolish. So sad. So Putzy.

So CW doesn't get through when everything else will?

Now I've heard it all.

Where's Aaron Jones and his Morse Myths List when you need him?

3563. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 03:07:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh7uth9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69663
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 29 Jun 2003 01:30:24 GMT, G. M. Alf wrote:

>Here is text from the Motorola Users Manual for the T4500:
>
>"The FCC requires that all operators using General Mobile Radio
>Service (GMRS) frequencies obtain a radio license before operating
>their equipment."
>
>I have two questions about this:
>
>(1) FRS channels 8 - 14 are not GMRS frequencies. Would not the above
>strongly infer that use of those channels do not require a license?
>
>95.194 (FRS Rule 4) FRS units.
>(a) You may only use an FCC certified FRS unit. (You can identify an
>FCC certified FRS unit by the label placed on it by the manufacturer.)
>
>The above rule does not say that a GMRS radio may be used on FRS
>frequencies. Only FRS radios are allowed.

That is true on FRS Channels 8-14.
>
>(2) Does this not infer that a hybrid radio can only be an FRS radio
>on FRS channels 8 - 14?

If the "hybrid" radio is type certified as a FRS radio AND a GMRS
radio (FCC type certification, not the manufacturer's advertising
claim) then it can be used on FRS channels 1-14 without a GMRS
license or on any GMRS channel in the radio with a GMRS license.

Again the Commission screwed up by interleaving a licensed service
with a non-licensed service.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3564. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 03:50:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh7wxrc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69664

On Sat, 28 Jun 2003 22:36:14 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>>> I had 5 different MOSs in radio before 1956 and NONE of them
>>> involved any sort of morse code use or training.
>>
>>
>> My MOS (31M) didn't have it either. However, there were still
>> classes in the early 1970's at Fort Gordon. I have no idea what MOS is
>> was for. But, you are right - that was many years ago.

The dead horse is being kicked once more, and it is stirring.

Apologies to whomever needs one if I posted this earlier.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

==========

COAST STATIONS NMC, KPH AND KFS WILL RETURN TO
THE AIR USING MORSE CODE

For the first time since 12 July 1999 listeners around the world will
have the opportunity to hear three historic US coast stations on the
air using Morse code.

On July 1st, Coast Guard Communications Area Master Station Pacific
(CAMSPAC), Pt Reyes will retire the historic "Sparks" from the
Telecommunications Specialist Enlisted Rating Badge, as the Coast
Guard restructures its work force replacing that specialty with two
others, the Operations Specialist and the Information Technology
Specialist.

As a special part of the ceremony surrounding this change NMC will
return to the air using Morse code (CW) and possibly radioteletype
(RTTY). These services, once the mainstays of Coast Guard
communications, have been retired for several years but will be
reinstated for this ceremony.

At present the frequencies known to be authorized for NMC are 8574kc
and 500kc with the possible addition of 488kc. Additional HF
frequencies may be authorized by the time of the event. Those
wishing the latest information about NMC frequencies and times of
operation should write directly to TCCM Loren R. O'Banion at
LObanion@d11.uscg.mil .

The public is invited to visit NMC to participate in this event. The
unit's Receiver Site, located at 17000 Sir Francis Drake Blvd on the

Pt Reyes National Seashore will be open to the public between the hours of 9am and 3pm. Persons wishing to attend must RSVP to (415) 669-2004.

KPH will activate its HF and MF transmitters to participate in this historic event and to give listeners the opportunity to hear three US coast stations on the air - possibly for the last time. KFS will also return to the air on a single frequency.

KPH will transmit on 6477.5, 8642.0, 12808.5 and17016.5 on HF and on 500 and 426kc on MF. KFS will transmit on 17026.0kc. These frequencies have been made available through the generous cooperation of Globe Wireless, the current owner of the KPH and KFS licenses.

KPH and KFS operators will listen for calls from ships on 6276.0, 8368.0, 12552.0 and 16736.0 on HF and 500kc on MF.

Reception reports for NMC may be sent to:

USCG CAMSPAC Pt. Reyes
ATTN: LCCT O'Banian
1700 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. , POB 560
Point Reyes Station, CA 94956-0560
USA

Reception reports for KPH and KFS may be sent to:

Ms. DA Stoops
P.O. Box 381
Bolinas CA 94924-0381
USA

3565. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 04:16:14 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdlp6evhc0@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 69665

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <bdk71v$72k$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> >> On 28 Jun 2003 02:22:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> >> And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
> >> >> over the broadcast ownership rule change.
> >> >
> >> >"Powell-burger"?
> >>
> >> Michael Powell is the Chairman of the FCC (and the son of Colin
> >> Powell). He was the front-runner in pushing for the June 2 FCC
> >> decision to allow all sorts of cross-iwnership of broadcast
> >> stations - a controversial ruling that was pushed through with
> >> very little opportunity to get public input, and it was railr....
> >> err, voted in on strict party lines 3-2.
> >>
> >> A number of powerful Senators of both parties were not pleased.
> >
> >Dittto plenty of the public.
>
> Why are you so concerned about COMMERCIAL radio broadcasting
> practices?

DUUUh, could it be because I'm not 'just' a radio amateur but also a member of he
comsuming public?

> Such practices don't involve any amateur radio activity
> anywhere.

Do tell! One could easily wonder how it is that you know that.

> By definition, US amateur radio is prohibited from any
> pecuniary compensation (that's why the word "amateur" is there).
>
> If you have investments in radio broadcasting, try a different
> newsgroup for your bitching and whining about COMMERCIAL
> radio.

Yes indeed, the owners are the very folks who have promoted all this. And before
long the owners will number a very few, with such changes in regulations. The
COMSUMING PUBLIC might just be a bit concerned with that.

BTW, betecha I've spent more time in keeping more COMMERCIAL radio stations on the air than you have, Putzy Poo!

It really wasn't necessary for you to, once again, put forth so much effort to show, yet one more time, that you're a trolling, dorky dumbass, most of us reading here already knew that.

3566. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 04:19:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdlpcdvhc1@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 69666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <bdk791$72k$2@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >Frank Gilliland wrote:
> >
> >> In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
> >> <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >..... federal rules and regulations
> >> >(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
> >> >affact and power of law).
> >>
> >> That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because
> >> the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a
> >> vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about
> >> you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like-
> >> vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
> >> ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.
> >
> > No, Eric has it rght. Rules and regulations carry the force of law.
>
> Then they are laws. If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, quacks like a
> duck....
>
> > None has been
> >considered and passed into public law, rather a single law confering onto those
> >rules and regulations the force of law.
>
> Well, I checked with Webster:
>
> law -- 1. all the rules of conduct established by the authority or custom of a
> nation, etc. 2. any one of such rules. 3. obedience to such rules. 4. the study
> of such rules..... ---"lay down the law" 1. to give orders authoritatively....
>
> I also looked through a few online law dictionaries:
>
> http://www.duhaime.org/dictionary/dict-l.htm#L
> http://dictionary.law.com/definition2.asp?selected=1111&bold=||||
> http://dictionary.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/results.pl?co=dictionary.lp.findlaw.com&topic=7
e/7e837b5d2a954e82f31227c53fd80b3b

> http://august1.com/pubs/dict/l.htm
>
> So they all say pretty much the same thing -- if it's enforcable, it's a law.
> Maybe you can find something that says something different?

Yep- You forgot to ask the one source that really matters- the people who actually make the laws.

3567. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 04:23:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdlpjtvhc2@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 69667

Steve Fleckenstein wrote:

> > Does that 'average person' want a ham radio license or does he want to
> sit on
> > his duff complaining about the requriements for a couple decades or more
> until a
> > weary FCC finally capitulates?
> >
>
> The average person couldn't care less about amateur radio. The guy next door
> is busy screaming at his ex wife on the phone, downing Prozac with beer
> chasers while watching the baseball game.
>
> For those of us interested in communications, well I'm sitting here in front
> of a recently overhauled TS-430S with the mike disconnected and placed in a
> desk drawer until the time I qualify for HF transmissions, listening to
> amateurs with HF privileges talk about their latest operations or hemorrhoid
> attacks, belching and farting, discussing their sex life, preaching hell and
> damnation, refusing to give up a frequency for local emergencies.
>
> Why in &pandas name would I want to get HF privileges for this cesspool ?

You just *might* dilute the crud a bit, you know. Every proper ham who gets on the air helps to do that. First thing you know, we may actually have normalcy again.

3568. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 04:26:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdlpp8vhc3@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 69668

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> Much as it may seem strange for me to admit, but in
> reality, even if S25.5 is dropped completely, that does NOT
> require any rule change since the FCC "could" still keep code testing
> without violating the treaty.

Youi know what it would take for just exactly that to occur? ONE WORD from the right place. Just as happened when we got the medical waivers. The source of that work is the key. Will it happen? I doubt it.

3569. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 04:31:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdlq31vhc4@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 69669

Brian wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bdi3t8$5if$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bdgdbnhqo0@208.206.142.79...
> > >
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > Just because you don't hear any transmitting does not mean it is not in
> > use.
> > >
> > > I guess everyone is standing by waiting for someone to talk?
> > >
> > >
> >
> > No, but it is assigned to that agency. And it will be used when/if
> > required.
> >
> > > > There are a large number of guburment users in the 5 Mhz range. FEMA,
> > > > SHARES, Homeland Security, US Military. MARS. Just as an example.
> > >
> > > Yaas, none of which uses HF to any serious extent these days. It's
> > virtually
> > > unused. Relegated to a 'secondary' or backup status. About the same as
> > military
> > > HF usage..
> >
> > Completely and totally wrong. Military still uses HF, overseas aircraft
> > flights use HF. etc.
> >
> > So what is wrong with being a backup status? Your point is?
> > Oh I get it. You don't think there needs to be a backup in case the bird
> > falls from the sky, eh?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Backups to backups. Redundancy = Survivability

So your lies finally surface and are admitted by you. If you really believed that you'd be a CW supporter.

3570. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 05:38:16 UTC
From: "Phil D. Bucket" <thgiwd.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <45645N696@web2news.com>
Source record: 69670
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> <snip>
> Hey Brian, you just bit some troll bait.
>
> news.invalid@web2news.net>
> Organization: Web2news.com
>
> See the header.

Moped which words in that post do you think twistedhed did not write?

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3571. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 06:02:38 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306282202.41d4b392@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69671
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>
> Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
> certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
> understand the law.

Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.

3572. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 07:10:11 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <h64tfv8vk85nct8e4q4pd5cvv7829dirat@4ax.com>
Source record: 69672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <bdlpcdvhc1@208.207.71.178>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> In <bdk791$72k$2@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >
>> >Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> >
>> >> In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
>> >> <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >..... federal rules and regulations
>> >> >(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
>> >> >affact and power of law).
>> >>
>> >> That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because
>> >> the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a
>> >> vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about
>> >> you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like-
>> >> vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
>> >> ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.
>> >
>> > No, Eric has it rght. Rules and regulations carry the force of law.
>>
>> Then they are laws. If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, quacks like a
>> duck....
>>
>> > None has been
>> >considered and passed into public law, rather a single law confering onto those
>> >rules and regulations the force of law.
>>
>> Well, I checked with Webster:
>>
>> law -- 1. all the rules of conduct established by the authority or custom of a
>> nation, etc. 2. any one of such rules. 3. obedience to such rules. 4. the study
>> of such rules..... ---"lay down the law" 1. to give orders authoritatively....
>>
>> I also looked through a few online law dictionaries:
>>

>> http://www.duhaime.org/dictionary/dict-l.htm#L
>> http://dictionary.law.com/definition2.asp?selected=1111&bold=||||
>> http://dictionary.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/results.pl?co=dictionary.lp.findlaw.com&topic=
7e/7e837b5d2a954e82f31227c53fd80b3b
>> http://august1.com/pubs/dict/l.htm
>>
>> So they all say pretty much the same thing -- if it's enforcable, it's a law.
>> Maybe you can find something that says something different?
>
> Yep- You forgot to ask the one source that really matters- the people who actually make
the laws.

The idea that rules and regulations are not laws is a fallacy that is coddled by anti-government malcontents. Their battle-cry is that the Constitution doesn't provide for the making of 'rules' or 'regulations', only 'laws', a semanitic spin based on the definition of 'law'. I really don't think that the authors of the Constitution intended the document to be legally interpreted by dummies, which is why they created the Judicial branch of government. And that branch has NEVER -- not ONCE in over 200 YEARS -- excluded from the definition of 'law' any rule, regulation, code, ordinance, or any other binding authority simply because it didn't include the word 'law' in the title. So no matter how -you- choose to define the word, the meaning is very clear to the rest of us, as well as to the US Government. But if you have a different definition, please post it.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3573. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 10:39:00 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <DpadnQODD8RaXGOjRTvU2Q@crocker.com>
Source record: 69673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0306281900.19a2a83b@posting.google.com...
> "twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in
message news:<44176N919@web2news.com>...
> > Like many Alpha Tango members I have DXed over 100 confirmed countries
> > on 12 whiskey SSB, worldwide without the need for license or expense of
> > ham radio.
>
> What is "12 whiskey?"

that's what they drink to get up the nerve to break federal regulations.

3574. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 11:14:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629071423.14458.00000704@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69674

In article <MfrLa.1149$YI.73@news02.roc.ny>, "Steve Fleckenstein"
<spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:
>
>The average person couldn't care less about amateur radio. The guy next door
>is busy screaming at his ex wife on the phone, downing Prozac with beer
>chasers while watching the baseball game.

Interesting neighborhood! None of my neighbors do any of that. Nor do I.
>
>For those of us interested in communications, well I'm sitting here in front
>of a recently overhauled TS-430S with the mike disconnected and placed in a
>desk drawer until the time I qualify for HF transmissions, listening to
>amateurs with HF privileges talk about their latest operations or hemorrhoid
>attacks, belching and farting, discussing their sex life, preaching hell and
>damnation, refusing to give up a frequency for local emergencies.

What bands and modes are being used for all of that? Betcha CW/Morse isn't one
of them..
>
>Why in &pandas name would I want to get HF privileges for this cesspool ?
>
Depends what HF neighborhood you're in. I've spent many, many hours on the
CW/data parts of the HF ham bands and never heard anyhting such as you describe
going on.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3575. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 15:08:30 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <OhDLa.4469$DA2.70@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030629010049.712$Rp@newsreader.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >You forgot to ask the one source that really
> > matters- the people who actually make the laws.
> >
> I'd like to talk to the jackass who just implemented
> higher sales tax, and more service tax's in Ohio!!
>
> --
> GO# 40

Their trying to raise the sales tax here, also
just raised the vehicle registration fee 3X. It's
going to cost a couple of hundred dollars just
to reg. my bike, I'm going to hate to see what
it's going to cost for trucks.

Landshark

--
Try these to learn about newsgroup trolls.

http://www.io.com/~zikzak/troll_thesis.html
http://members.aol.com/intwg/trolls.htm

3576. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 15:29:25 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <g_OdnS02tc5HmGKjRTvU2Q@crocker.com>
Source record: 69676
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030629090024.990$zr@newsreader.com...
> "David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote:
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0306281900.19a2a83b@posting.google.com...
> > > "twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in
> > message news:<44176N919@web2news.com>...
> > > > Like many Alpha Tango members I have DXed over 100 confirmed
> > > > countries on 12 whiskey SSB, worldwide without the need for license
> > > > or expense of ham radio.
> > >
> > > What is "12 whiskey?"
> >
> > that's what they drink to get up the nerve to break federal regulations.
> >
> Do you really believe that takes nerve, little man?
>
either lots of nerve, or very small brains.

3577. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 16:19:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306290819.125c6ee4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69677
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0306282202.41d4b392@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> >
> > Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
> > certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
> > understand the law.
>
> Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.

This is precious!

What an IDIOT you are, Stewie! And this "MURS/FRS will Save The
Radio Hobby" crusade you're on his hillarious!

Absolutely assinine idiot...Unabashed...complete and without
reserve...

Go ahead...Let's see YOUR interpretation of the law, then let's
hear from the fella who helped to WRITE those laws! I wonder who has
the better understanding...?!?! Well, no, not really, but it will be
fun to watch you flail about trying!

Steve, K4YZ

3578. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 16:22:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629122250.17796.00001135@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 69678

In article <FLKKa.2433$Vx2.1284001@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030626064642.09955.00000420@mb-m21.aol.com...
>> Historical note: I recall that one of the main reasons Tech Pluses and
>>Novices
>> got 10 meter SSB was an attempt to populate the band and impede its use by
>> freeband/cb folks. The freeband/cb folks' argument was "nobody's using
>> those frequencies"

>The freeband/cb folks were probably listening at the nadir of the sunspot
>cycles. It gets real busy at the zenith of a cycle.
>
Nowadays it does, but I'm talking about back when the problem started - the 1970s. "Freebanding" or "HF-ing" is not a new thing at all.

Back then Techs had no HF at all, and Novices had no 'phone at all. 10 meters was not so heavily used as today because every US ham who had 10 meter access also had access to every other US ham band, all modes, full power.

So it was a natural for those "HF-ers" to gravitate to 10 meters. They could use the same antennas and amplifiers they'd used on ~11 meters.

It was thought that giving Techs and Novices 10 meters would promote use of the band and help keep the unlicensed out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3579. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 16:22:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629122250.17796.00001136@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 69679

In article <bdlhcrpjf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030627222247.25815.00000983@mb-m07.aol.com...
>> In article <bdhdsc$nt7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >True. After all, the only reason the FCC kept 5wpm was because of the
>> >treaty.
>>
>> They made that pretty clear in the R&O. Just FCC's opinion, of course, but
>> theirs is the one that makes the rules...
>>
>> >The call for rational reasons to retain morse testing was done in
>> >NPRM-98-143.
>>
>> Doesn't mean FCC has to be 100% rational, tho....;-)
>>
>> There was also at least one Petition for Reconsideration, too. Denied.
>
>Translation - There was nothing new in that petition for
>reconsideration either.

Not at all, Bill. It simply means that FCC did not accept the arguments as
being sufficient to keep any code test except 5 wpm.

I think FCC had its mind made up on that score back in 1998, if not before.
>
>> >Does anyone think there are any new reasons to retain code testing that
>> >haven't already been run through the FCC comment process?
>>
>> New or old, whether a reason is rational or not doesn't mean FCC must act
>> on it.
>
>Generally true.
>
HAW!

Hope everyone had a great Field Day. I did.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3580. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 17:05:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdn68msod1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69680

"Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:0_qLa.1016$jC.583@news02.roc.ny...
>
> > Hey Steve, Thanks for the respectful reply.
>
> My pleasure.
>
>
> > 1. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *before* the Morse test is
> > dropped?
>
> No
>
> >
> > 2. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *after* the Morse
> > Requirement is dropped?
> >
>
> Yes
>
> Why ?
>
> Because I have better things to do in life than study for a mode of
> operation (CW) that I will rarely if at all use.
>

>
> Steve
> N2UBP
>
>

I have NEVER understood how someone can make a statement like that. How do
you KNOW you won't like it if you do learn it?

Don't you see your cutting yourself off from a major part of ham radio based
on what?

Dan/W4NTI

3581. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 17:32:12 UTC
From: Jacques Strappe <dnalel@btw.com>
Message-ID: <X2-dnQg0ZOgCv2KjXTWJhg@comcast.com>
Source record: 69681
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

OFF Topic

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030629131035.323$Ld@newsreader.com...
> "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030629010049.712$Rp@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > >You forgot to ask the one source that really
> > > > matters- the people who actually make the laws.
> > > >
> > > I'd like to talk to the jackass who just implemented
> > > higher sales tax, and more service tax's in Ohio!!
> > >
> > > --
> > > GO# 40
> >
> > Their trying to raise the sales tax here, also
> > just raised the vehicle registration fee 3X. It's
> > going to cost a couple of hundred dollars just
> > to reg. my bike, I'm going to hate to see what
> > it's going to cost for trucks.
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> That's crazy, ours wasn't even on the ballot.
>
> --
> GO# 40
> --
> http://NewsReader.Com/
> 50 GB/Month

3582. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 17:32:22 UTC
From: Jacques Strappe <dnalel@btw.com>
Message-ID: <--WdnTqVfuc0v2KjXTWJgA@comcast.com>
Source record: 69682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Off Topic

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote in message
news:OhDLa.4469$DA2.70@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030629010049.712$Rp@newsreader.com...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > >You forgot to ask the one source that really
> > > matters- the people who actually make the laws.
> > >
> > I'd like to talk to the jackass who just implemented
> > higher sales tax, and more service tax's in Ohio!!
> >
> > --
> > GO# 40
>
> Their trying to raise the sales tax here, also
> just raised the vehicle registration fee 3X. It's
> going to cost a couple of hundred dollars just
> to reg. my bike, I'm going to hate to see what
> it's going to cost for trucks.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Try these to learn about newsgroup trolls.
>
> http://www.io.com/~zikzak/troll_thesis.html
> http://members.aol.com/intwg/trolls.htm
>
>

3583. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 17:32:33 UTC
From: Jacques Strappe <dnalel@btw.com>
Message-ID: <2P2cnb58Wp0pv2KjXTWJhA@comcast.com>
Source record: 69683
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Off Topic

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030629010049.712$Rp@newsreader.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >You forgot to ask the one source that really
> > matters- the people who actually make the laws.
> >
> I'd like to talk to the jackass who just implemented
> higher sales tax, and more service tax's in Ohio!!
>
> --
> GO# 40
> --
> http://NewsReader.Com/
> 50 GB/Month

3584. Re: Just Curious

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 17:45:59 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <axFLa.15$59.7@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 69684

Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:LfQJa.10506$SV2.7465@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> Jerry,
>
> I found 10 meters wide open earlier today. Big signals from the south,
but
> I didn't hear the signals you suggest. I'm not suggesting they don't
exist
> (I'm sure they do), but I only heard a couple of loud signals - both from
> licensed amateurs.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Jim,

It is rampant along I-85 in the Charlotte/Atlanta corridor, I-77 thru
Columbia, SC, and I-20 at least
to the Georgia line. Truckers regularly beep and squeak their way on 28.085
along with abandon.
I am of the belief that if WE, the licensed users, do not take an active
role in preventing such abuse
of our band assignments, this problem will continue to get worse. After 10
and 12 Meters, it will
spread to 17 meters, onto 20 Meters and so on. It is really up to us to take
an active part to protect what we worked hard to obtain; if we don't, who
will?

Jerry
K4KWH

>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.491 / Virus Database: 290 - Release Date: 6/18/03
>
>

3585. Re: 15 days left for a new era of SSB DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 17:52:08 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <JEFLa.4783$gu6.3354@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 69685

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:8r27fvgv9321pe6r73nvqf1r2lidj9mei0@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 21 Jun 2003 01:50:15 +0200, Fritz Wuehler
> <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:
>

>
> You seem to have a fetish about stations smashing each other. Perhaps
> you picked the wrong hobby. This is radio, not demolition derby.

Does it sound familiar? Kinda like the chicken band, eh.

Jerry
>
> >>
>

>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>

3586. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 18:32:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh91idk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69686
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 29 Jun 2003 09:19:27 -0700, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>> > Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
>> > certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
>> > understand the law.
>>
>> Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.
>
> Go ahead...Let's see YOUR interpretation of the law, then let's
>hear from the fella who helped to WRITE those laws! I wonder who has
>the better understanding...?!?! Well, no, not really, but it will be
>fun to watch you flail about trying!

It's always fun to see the uninformed flail about before those of us
who enforce or interpret radio regulations every day....

--
73 de K2ASP / KAE8605 - Phil Kane

3587. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 18:32:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh916qj.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69687

On Sun, 29 Jun 2003 03:50:02 GMT, Phil Kane wrote:

> The dead horse is being kicked once more, and it is stirring.
>
> Apologies to whomever needs one if I posted this earlier.
>
Later info, direct from the USCG NAVTEX bulletins:

==========
ZCZC WX02
NMC BNM 0001-03
1. ON JULY 1ST, COAST GUARD COMMUNICATIONS AREA MASTER STATION
PACIFIC (CAMSPAC), PT REYES WILL RETIRE THE HISTORIC SPARKS FROM
THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST RATING BADGE, AS THE COAST GUARD
RESTRUCTURES ITS WORK FORCE REPLACING THAT SPECIALTY WITH TWO OTHERS,
THE OPERATIONS SPECIALIST AND THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST.
THE CEREMONY WILL HONOR THE SPARKS AND THOSE THAT HAVE WORN THEM
WITH SPEECHES AND VIGNETTES OF SIGNIFICANT EVENTS IN THE COAST
GUARD'S RICH COMMUNICATIONS HISTORY.
2. TO COMMEMORATE THE DAY CAMSPAC WILL BE OPEN FOR PUBLIC TOURS
STARTING AT 9AM AND RUNNING THROUGHOUT THE DAY UNTIL 3PM.
3. A COMMEMORATIVE MESSAGE WILL BE SENT AT 12 NOON LASTING
APPROXIMATELY 20 MINUTES AND IS EXPECTED TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED BY RADIO
STATIONS KFS, KPH, WLO, AND WLB WHO WILL BE ON-AIR AS WELL.
4. CAMSPAC WILL SEND A PRELIMINARY CALL ON 500KHZ FOLLOWED BY THE
COMMEMORATIVE MESSAGE ON 448KHZ AND 8574KHZ.
5. SIMPLEX RADIOTELETYPE WILL BE AVAILABLE ON 9373 KHZ AND A VOICE
BROADCAST WILL BE MADE ON THE FOLLOWING NMC VOICE BROADCAST
FREQUENCIES: 4426, 8764, 13089, 17314KHZ (USB).
NNNN

3588. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 18:55:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdncmttvv0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 69688
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

stewart wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> >
> > Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
> > certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
> > understand the law.
>
> Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.

Yeah, Phil....don't try to throw reality or legality into The Stew. He's most unaccustomed to all that.

3589. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 18:58:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdncs4tvv1@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 69689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <bdlpcdvhc1@208.207.71.178>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >Frank Gilliland wrote:
> >
> >> In <bdk791$72k$2@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >Frank Gilliland wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
> >> >> <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> >..... federal rules and regulations
> >> >> >(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
> >> >> >affact and power of law).
> >> >>
> >> >> That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because
> >> >> the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a
> >> >> vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about
> >> >> you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like-
> >> >> vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
> >> >> ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.
> >> >
> >> > No, Eric has it rght. Rules and regulations carry the force of law.
> >>
> >> Then they are laws. If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, quacks like a
> >> duck....
> >>
> >> > None has been
> >> >considered and passed into public law, rather a single law confering onto those
> >> >rules and regulations the force of law.
> >>
> >> Well, I checked with Webster:
> >>
> >> law -- 1. all the rules of conduct established by the authority or custom of a
> >> nation, etc. 2. any one of such rules. 3. obedience to such rules. 4. the study
> >> of such rules..... ---"lay down the law" 1. to give orders authoritatively....
> >>

> >> I also looked through a few online law dictionaries:
> >>
> >> http://www.duhaime.org/dictionary/dict-l.htm#L
> >> http://dictionary.law.com/definition2.asp?selected=1111&bold=||||
> >> http://dictionary.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/results.pl?co=dictionary.lp.findlaw.com&topic=7e/7e837b5d2a954e82f31227c53fd80b3b
> >> http://august1.com/pubs/dict/l.htm
> >>
> >> So they all say pretty much the same thing -- if it's enforcable, it's a law.
> >> Maybe you can find something that says something different?
> >
> > Yep- You forgot to ask the one source that really matters- the people who actually make the laws.
>
> The idea that rules and regulations are not laws is a fallacy that is coddled by
> anti-government malcontents. Their battle-cry is that the Constitution doesn't
> provide for the making of 'rules' or 'regulations', only 'laws', a semanitic
> spin based on the definition of 'law'. I really don't think that the authors of
> the Constitution intended the document to be legally interpreted by dummies,
> which is why they created the Judicial branch of government. And that branch has
> NEVER -- not ONCE in over 200 YEARS -- excluded from the definition of 'law' any
> rule, regulation, code, ordinance, or any other binding authority simply because
> it didn't include the word 'law' in the title. So no matter how -you- choose to
> define the word, the meaning is very clear to the rest of us, as well as to the
> US Government. But if you have a different definition, please post it.
>

Semantics, Frankie, just semantics. Nothing is different. You say potato and I say pototo, to recall an old song.

3590. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:04:42 UTC
From: Phil Stripling <phil_stripling@cieux.zzn.com>
Message-ID: <3qel1cr9h1.fsf@shell4.tdl.com>
Source record: 69690
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

> Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.

Hi, Stew,

Drop by
http://shamash.org/listarchives/cq-chaverim/log9804
and take a look at an old newsletter for a San Francisco Amateur club.

Even DVORAK gets IT wrong someTIMES! :->

--
Philip Stripling | email to the replyto address is presumed
Legal Assistance on the Web | spam and read later. email to philip@
http://www.PhilipStripling.com/ | civex.com is read daily.

3591. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153742.14458.00000710@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69699

In article <20030629071423.14458.00000704@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <MfrLa.1149$YI.73@news02.roc.ny>, "Steve Fleckenstein"
><spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:
>>
>>The average person couldn't care less about amateur radio. The guy next door
>>is busy screaming at his ex wife on the phone, downing Prozac with beer
>>chasers while watching the baseball game.
>
>Interesting neighborhood! None of my neighbors do any of that. Nor do I.

Your neighborhood is zoned for amateur radio stations? :-)

>>For those of us interested in communications, well I'm sitting here in front
>>of a recently overhauled TS-430S with the mike disconnected and placed in a
>>desk drawer until the time I qualify for HF transmissions, listening to
>>amateurs with HF privileges talk about their latest operations or hemorrhoid
>>attacks, belching and farting, discussing their sex life, preaching hell and
>>damnation, refusing to give up a frequency for local emergencies.
>
>What bands and modes are being used for all of that? Betcha CW/Morse isn't
>one of them..

OOK CW is very gentlemanly, calm, everyone in fine health,
upstanding, righteous, and never ever rude to anyone while
maintaining the Living Museum of Radiotelegraphy arts, the
spirit of the last millennium's state of the art, and the American
Way! :-)

>>Why in &pandas name would I want to get HF privileges for this cesspool ?
>>
>Depends what HF neighborhood you're in. I've spent many, many hours on the
>CW/data parts of the HF ham bands and never heard anyhting such as you
>describe going on.

Superradioman, able to leap tall pileups in a single keystroke.

Up, up, and awayyyyy....

Beep, beep.

3592. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153743.14458.00000711@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69697

In article <bdlpjtvhc2@208.207.71.178>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Steve Fleckenstein wrote:
>
>> > Does that 'average person' want a ham radio license or does he want to
sit on
>> > his duff complaining about the requriements for a couple decades or more
until a
>> > weary FCC finally capitulates?
>>
>> The average person couldn't care less about amateur radio. The guy next door
>> is busy screaming at his ex wife on the phone, downing Prozac with beer
>> chasers while watching the baseball game.
>>
>> For those of us interested in communications, well I'm sitting here in front
>> of a recently overhauled TS-430S with the mike disconnected and placed in a
>> desk drawer until the time I qualify for HF transmissions, listening to
>> amateurs with HF privileges talk about their latest operations or hemorrhoid
>> attacks, belching and farting, discussing their sex life, preaching hell and
>> damnation, refusing to give up a frequency for local emergencies.
>>
>> Why in &pandas name would I want to get HF privileges for this cesspool ?
>
> You just *might* dilute the crud a bit, you know. Every proper ham who gets
on
>the air helps to do that. First thing you know, we may actually have normalcy
>again.

Oh, oh, Dickie's been to the seminary again...any time he's going to start
in with more Hell and Damnation to all not in league with amateur
radiotelegraphy!

Look out Reverend Jimmie! :-)

3593. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153744.14458.00000713@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69692

In article <f45722ac.0306281850.54f4ca80@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030628171750.04554.00000755@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>
>> GOTA GODI ... keep the US ARS a living museum of radiotelegraphy!
>
>Damn, Len! Not only do you know a lot about radio, but you've
>mastered motion picture and human sensory input as well.
>
>didit

Persistence of Message :-)

3594. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153744.14458.00000712@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69696

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hh7wxrc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sat, 28 Jun 2003 22:36:14 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>>>> I had 5 different MOSs in radio before 1956 and NONE of them
>>>> involved any sort of morse code use or training.
>>>
>>> My MOS (31M) didn't have it either. However, there were still
>>> classes in the early 1970's at Fort Gordon. I have no idea what MOS is
>>> was for. But, you are right - that was many years ago.
>
> The dead horse is being kicked once more, and it is stirring.

That's rigor mortis, Phil. :-)

> Apologies to whomever needs one if I posted this earlier.

Old radiotelegraphers never die, they just beep away...

>COAST STATIONS NMC, KPH AND KFS WILL RETURN TO
> THE AIR USING MORSE CODE
>
>For the first time since 12 July 1999 listeners around the world will
>have the opportunity to hear three historic US coast stations on the
>air using Morse code.

Oh, Frabjous Joy! Hosanahs in the Highest!

>On July 1st, Coast Guard Communications Area Master Station Pacific
>(CAMSPAC), Pt Reyes will retire the historic "Sparks" from the
>Telecommunications Specialist Enlisted Rating Badge, as the Coast
>Guard restructures its work force replacing that specialty with two
>others, the Operations Specialist and the Information Technology
>Specialist.

Sic transit, gloria mundi.

Bye bye beeping.

3595. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153745.14458.00000714@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69691

In article <BB23CC07.1DA25%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>
>> Don't you remember the line from the film "Gladiator"
>> in which the victorious Maximus shouts to the crowd
>> "ARE YOU ENTERTAINED?!" or something like that?
>
> Well, I suppose it could get worse - someone could start shouting about
>releasing the lions.

Here's the latest score from the Coliseum:

Lions: 8
Christians: 0
:-)

3596. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153746.14458.00000715@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69694

In article <BB23C8DD.1DA22%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> MANY years ago, Dwight. :-)
>>
>> I had 5 different MOSs in radio before 1956 and
>> NONE of them involved any sort of morse code use
>> or training.
>
> My MOS (31M) didn't have it either. However, there were still classes in
>the early 1970's at Fort Gordon. I have no idea what MOS is was for. But,
>you are right - that was many years ago.

The "31M" MOS is still used in the US Army.

Last time I was at a field signal communications in operation was
at Fort Irwin, CA, back in 1989 as a civilian. They weren't using
any CW keys back then or even coming close to OOK CW modes
for anything. Fort Irwin was then, and remains, the Desert Warfare
Training Center...graduates would, in two years, bust the armor
of the Iraqi invaders of Kuwait and much later, other graduates
would use lessons learned to out-panzerfaust them in the second
Gulf War, sweeping right to the capital of Iraq in less than 3 weeks.

There's still a bunch of anal retentive amateurs in here who, never
having done a single bit of military communications, profess to be
absolute, self-righteous "experts" on How Things Are Done. They
are unable emotionally to come to grips with change or any
challenge to their very important amateur titles, rank, status
obtained a rather long time ago...and they keep on demanding that
all others DO AS THEY DID by working hard, knuckling under to
demands of seniors of that time, and following some fairyland
concepts of "proper radio operation" in an advanced age well
beyond the standards and practices of the pre-WW2 times.

The Living Museum of Amateur RadioTelegraphy is still
around, still kicking but now twitching in the onset of rigor mortis
and refusing to give in. We will have to crowbar their keys from
their cold, dead fingers. There are lots and lots of crowbars out
there. Attrition is slowly reducing the beepers' numbers.

Bye bye morsie.

3597. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153747.14458.00000716@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69693

In article <20030629122250.17796.00001135@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <FLKKa.2433$Vx2.1284001@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030626064642.09955.00000420@mb-m21.aol.com...
>>> Historical note: I recall that one of the main reasons Tech Pluses and
>>>Novices
>>> got 10 meter SSB was an attempt to populate the band and impede its use by
>>> freeband/cb folks. The freeband/cb folks' argument was "nobody's using
>>> those frequencies"
>
>>The freeband/cb folks were probably listening at the nadir of the sunspot
>>cycles. It gets real busy at the zenith of a cycle.
>>
>Nowadays it does, but I'm talking about back when the problem started - the
>1970s. "Freebanding" or "HF-ing" is not a new thing at all.

FREEBANDING was all the rage in the 1920s.

Put the keys in the old Desoto and start up "200 Meters and Down."
:-)

>Back then Techs had no HF at all, and Novices had no 'phone at all. 10 meters
>was not so heavily used as today because every US ham who had 10 meter access
>also had access to every other US ham band, all modes, full power.

Darn Techs anyway...didn't learn enough morse to qualify as the Masters
of Radio working DX on (lower) HF with CW!

Novices had to work and slave in the small back rooms until they got to
be like the Masters of Radio. Apprentices...just not respecting the
mighty Masters. Tsk, tsk.

>So it was a natural for those "HF-ers" to gravitate to 10 meters. They could
>use the same antennas and amplifiers they'd used on ~11 meters.

Class D CB became a radio service back in 1958. Ever think that had
anything to do with it? :-)

>It was thought that giving Techs and Novices 10 meters would promote use of
the
>band and help keep the unlicensed out.

It should have...darn Techs and those apprentice Novices, not properly respecting the Masters of Radio! They should have Learned Their Place (way back in the bus)!

Morse code will never die...it just slowly beeps away...

3598. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153747.14458.00000717@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69695

In article <bdlpp8vhc3@208.207.71.178>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> Much as it may seem strange for me to admit, but in
>> reality, even if S25.5 is dropped completely, that does NOT
>> require any rule change since the FCC "could" still keep code testing
>> without violating the treaty.
>
> Youi know what it would take for just exactly that to occur? ONE WORD from
the
>right place. Just as happened when we got the medical waivers. The source of
>that work is the key. Will it happen? I doubt it.

Yes! "The source of that work is the key!"

Lissen up, Masters of Radio! The battle is joined...off your cots and
grab your KEYS! Show them who is BOSS in amateurism!

Morse! Morse! Morse! Man the barricades...KEEP that code test
alive! Don't let any smartash kids, lids, and space cadets into the
US Amateur Radiotelegraphy Service!

Keep those bands PURE with the sound of beeping! :-)

3599. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153749.14458.00000718@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69700

In article <bdlp6evhc0@208.207.71.178>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <bdk71v$72k$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;"
><dixie@townsqr.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Phil Kane wrote:
>> >
>> >> On 28 Jun 2003 02:22:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >> And right now the dish-de-jour is the Senate preparing Powell-burger
>> >> >> over the broadcast ownership rule change.
>> >> >
>> >> >"Powell-burger"?
>> >>
>> >> Michael Powell is the Chairman of the FCC (and the son of Colin
>> >> Powell). He was the front-runner in pushing for the June 2 FCC
>> >> decision to allow all sorts of cross-iwnership of broadcast
>> >> stations - a controversial ruling that was pushed through with
>> >> very little opportunity to get public input, and it was railr....
>> >> err, voted in on strict party lines 3-2.
>> >>
>> >> A number of powerful Senators of both parties were not pleased.
>> >
>> >Dittto plenty of the public.
>>
>> Why are you so concerned about COMMERCIAL radio broadcasting
>> practices?
>
> DUUUh, could it be because I'm not 'just' a radio amateur but also a member
>of he comsuming public?

Go thee and "comsume" little man of la mancha.

You have lots of imaginary windmills to destroy.

>> Such practices don't involve any amateur radio activity anywhere.
>
>Do tell! One could easily wonder how it is that you know that.

Easy. US civil radio information is freely accessible to all.

Your problem is, Dick Quixote, one of living in the past too
much, following standards and practices of the past, thinking
those will apply forever more. You've developed a fairyland of
myths about morse and think (wrongly) that amateur radio is
the center of the radio universe. It isn't.

>> By definition, US amateur radio is prohibited from any
>> pecuniary compensation (that's why the word "amateur" is there).
>>
>> If you have investments in radio broadcasting, try a different
>> newsgroup for your bitching and whining about COMMERCIAL
>> radio.
>
> Yes indeed, the owners are the very folks who have promoted all this. And
before
>long the owners will number a very few, with such changes in regulations. The
>COMSUMING PUBLIC might just be a bit concerned with that.

Tsk, tsk, there you go, "COMSUMER." :-)

By the same token, those "consumers" who MIGHT want to get into amateur
radio also...AND already have extensive experience in non-amateur radio.

As one of the anal-retentive Masters of (CW) Radio, you are reminded that
this whole newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO policy, not commercial.
The minute you go commercial on the ham bands is when the Posse
Commitatus of Hamdom is going to Get You! :-)

> BTW, betecha I've spent more time in keeping more COMMERCIAL radio stations
on
>the air than you have, Putzy Poo!

"Betecha?" My name is not "Betecha," DICK.

I can show no less than ELEVEN separate, distinct radio stations on the
back of my First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial) license certificates,
one of those being one I co-owned. That's just in US civilian radio. It
doesn't count the RF emitters involved in US government contracts.

> It really wasn't necessary for you to, once again, put forth so much effort
to
>show, yet one more time, that you're a trolling, dorky dumbass, most of us
reading
>here already knew that.

Poor baby. Resorting to puerile little epithets again? Tsk, tsk, tsk!

You MUST stop messaging with that mirror in front of you. You are
describing the image seen in that mirror, not the folks who are
writing messages in here.

3600. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:37:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629153750.14458.00000719@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 69698

In article <bdlq31vhc4@208.207.71.178>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<bdi3t8$5if$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
>> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> > news:bdgdbnhqo0@208.206.142.79...
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> > >
>> > > > Just because you don't hear any transmitting does not mean it is not
>in
>> > use.
>> > >
>> > > I guess everyone is standing by waiting for someone to talk?
>> > >
>> > >
>> >
>> > No, but it is assigned to that agency. And it will be used when/if
>> > required.
>> >
>> > > >
>> > > > There are a large number of guburment users in the 5 Mhz range.
>FEMA,
>> > > > SHARES, Homeland Security, US Military. MARS. Just as an example.
>> > >
>> > > Yaas, none of which uses HF to any serious extent these days. It's
>> > virtually
>> > > unused. Relegated to a 'secondary' or backup status. About the same as
>> > military
>> > > HF usage..
>> >
>> > Completely and totally wrong. Military still uses HF, overseas aircraft
>> > flights use HF. etc.
>> >
>> > So what is wrong with being a backup status? Your point is?
>> > Oh I get it. You don't think there needs to be a backup in case the bird
>> > falls from the sky, eh?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>>

>> Backups to backups. Redundancy = Survivability
>
> So your lies finally surface and are admitted by you. If you really believed
>that you'd be a CW supporter.

Please don't use locker room language in here, Master of (CW)
Radio.

If you must do so, PLEASE launder that supporter, okay?

...it has been rather "ripe" for several years. [phew!]

3601. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:46:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629154657.14837.00001059@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 69751

In article <20030628171750.04554.00000755@mb-m20.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030628062304.14837.00001026@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <KI0La.2796$Vx2.1441910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>>>Morse sent visually must be sent at a slow speed or the eye runs it all
>>>together as one light. Remember that is how "motion" pictures work, a
>>>series of still frames sent at a speed that causes them to blend.
>>>
>>>Anyway, Morse at 5wpm is definitely possible with lights. At 18wpm, it is
>>>not possible. I don't know whether 13wpm is possible or not. I read about
>>>it years ago but can't remember where the break point was for the visual
>>>blending.
>>>
>>Let's take a look at dit times:
>>
>>At 5 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 12/50 seconds, or 240 milliseconds.
>>That's a little more than 2 dits per second.
>>
>>At 13 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 4.615/50 seconds, or 92
>milliseconds.
>>That's a little more than 5 dits per second.
>>
>>At 20 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 3/50 seconds, or 60 milliseconds.
>>That's a little more than 8 dits per second.
>>
>>Visual blending depends on the individual, but is around 20 flashes (dits)
>>per second.
>
> The correct term is "persistence of vision." :-)

A term which is actually a misnomer:

http://www.grand-illusions.com/percept.htm

> The actual persistence threshold varies with individuals and can
> go down to 15 "flashes" per second. That seems to be a combined
> function of the retinal cells and cerebral visual cortex.
>

>>Motion picture speed is 24 frames per second, but to eliminate flicker ecah
>>frame is flashed on the screen twice by means of a rotating shutter.
>
> Not quite.

How "not quite"?

Modern standard sound motion pictures run at 24 frames per second. But each frame is flashed on the screen twice, so there are 48 images per second on the screen. A two-bladed rotary shutter is usually used in the projector.

In the early silent film era, a speed of 16 frames per second was common, and a three-bladed shutter was usually used in the projector. Again, 48 images per second.

> The shutter is there to blank the "pull-down" time when
> the geneva mechanism and pawl yank down the next frame.

That's not the only thing the shutter does. It also blanks the screen halfway between pulldown intervals so that each frame is flashed on the screen twice.

> The
> intermittent movement requires a free loop of film before and after
> the shutter mechanism so that the supply and take-up reels can
> move at an approximate constant rate. Note: A geneva wheel may
> not be used in cheaper projectors but was standard in cinema
> projectors for decades; there are other, simpler pull-downs.
>
Irrelevant to the discussion.

> Motion picture frame rate standards are still 24 per second and that
> is what nearly everyone sees. That's a comporomise between the
> maintenance of persistence of vision and length of film needed for a
> given time.

48 images per second. See:

http://www.bbctv-ap.freeserve.co.uk/supfr3.htm

or any reliable reference on motion picture projection.
>
>>So the effective flash rate is 48 per second.
>
> For nearly all film projectors and editors, it is still 24 per second.

Incorrect.

You're simply wrong on this, Len. 24 frames per second, 48 images per second.

Be a big boy and admit it.

3602. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 19:57:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3xHLa.3338$Vx2.1793955@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69752

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030628071739.23307.00001044@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <YEKKa.2429$Vx2.1283062@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Should the Element 1 requirement be dropped, the simplest thing is to
simply
> >keep the bands and privileges of Novices, Generals, Advanced and Extras
> >exactly as they are now. Change the Tech to get the privileges that the
old
> >Tech Plus license used to have. So they would have the 10m voice and
code
> >privileges plus 15m, 40m, and 80m code privileges.
> >
> >This would keep the rule changes simple and accommodate all current
> >licensees.
> >
> Simple, yes, but is that what's best for the ARS? What such a structure
creates
> is an amateur radio license structure that makes VHF/UHF easy to attain
and
> HF/MF much harder. Is that a good thing?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Yes. Activity on HF/MF can be heard around the world on a regular basis where with VHF/UHF that seldom happens (yes I know satellites change that but the passes are so short, exchanges must be short). Thus it should be more difficult to get on the HF/MF bands. In this area we are supposed to represent a good image of our and so we should make an effort to insure that people value their ticket enough not to jeopardize it by making it somewhat difficult. We won't succeed 100% but it will be better than if we don't try at all.

Besides that the General written test is only slightly harder than the Tech written so it wouldn't really be that much harder to get on HF voice bands. If one were to learn everything in the "Now You're Talking" book, it is possible to pass the General from that alone. For example, this book contains information on the band privileges of all license classes, etc. It also contains all the equations that are used on both the Tech and General exams.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3603. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 20:08:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <1HHLa.3340$Vx2.1795147@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69753

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bdn68msod1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
> news:0_qLa.1016$jC.583@news02.roc.ny...
> >
> > > Hey Steve, Thanks for the respectful reply.
> >
> > My pleasure.
> >
> >
> > > 1. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *before* the Morse test
is
> > > dropped?
> >
> > No
> >
> > >
> > > 2. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *after* the Morse
> > > Requirement is dropped?
> > >
> >
> > Yes
> >
> > Why ?
> >
> > Because I have better things to do in life than study for a mode of
> > operation (CW) that I will rarely if at all use.
> >
>
> >
> > Steve
> > N2UBP
> >
> >
>
> I have NEVER understood how someone can make a statement like that. How
do
> you KNOW you won't like it if you do learn it?
>
> Don't you see your cutting yourself off from a major part of ham radio
based
> on what?
>

> Dan/W4NTI

This weekend's Field Day was a prime example of the benefits of CW. Bands were very poor most of the weekend and the voice stations struggled to find contacts late in the event. Our CW stations far outstripped the voice stations in total number of contacts.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3604. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 21:23:30 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <mNILa.44116$2D1.12166604@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 69754
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:DpadnQODD8RaXGOjRTvU2Q@crocker.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0306281900.19a2a83b@posting.google.com...
> > "twistedhed@webtv.net" <hotmailcom.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in
> message news:<44176N919@web2news.com>...
> > > Like many Alpha Tango members I have DXed over 100 confirmed countries
> > > on 12 whiskey SSB, worldwide without the need for license or expense
of
> > > ham radio.
> >
> > What is "12 whiskey?"
>
> that's what they drink to get up the nerve to break federal regulations.

It's a slang for 12 Watts P.E.P., which is the max legal output on 11-meter
CB radio in SSB mode.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3605. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 22:22:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629182252.08200.00000530@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 69755

In article <Xns93A6A1A7FE2DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>Largely because it comes too late. If this had happened in 1992, as it
>might well have if it had made the agenda and that particular conference
>had not been postponed by three years, then I think the effect would have
>been much bigger.

Maybe.

Or maybe S25.5 would have not been revised in 1992 if it was on the agenda,
conference wasn't postponed, etc. Remember that back in '92 the maritime folks
still had CW/Morse capability required on all ships over a certain size.

I think the delay actually worked FOR the total elimination of code testing.

>Something else happened in the interim, an explosion in
>Internet use, which has changed the landscape.

Which would have happened regardless of S25.5.

To paraphrase and expand on a statement by W3RV, amateur radio will continue to
exist because of things it offers that cannot be done with the internet, email,
cell phones or inexpensive long distance telecommunications. Toss in GMRS/FRS,
too. Example: most of the folks who got ham licenses for honeydew purposes in
the '80s and '90s now have cellphones for that job. There's no point in running
routine phone patches when you can direct dial for a few pennies a minute.

Amateurs, by definition, have to build their facilities with discretionary
money, time and other resources. And no hope of any financial return. Which
means they have to really want to do it or it's just not gonna happen. Classic
"bell the cat" situation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3606. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 23:33:03 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A9C6DB234C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69756

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:bdlh88$1te$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net:

>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030627182214.14837.00001021@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> In article <bdhe6s$40a$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030626222527.12501.00000475@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> >> In article <Xns93A674231DEAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
>> >> >news:3EFA6E3A.9030909@ix.netcom.com:
>> >>
>> >> (N2EY wrote:)
>> >>
>> >> >>>>2) How quickly will FCC dump Element 1?
>> >>
>> >(SNIP)
>> >
>> >> First, the revised treaty has to be ratified by The Congress.
>> >
>> >Probably an assumed or expected noncontroversial action.
>> >FCC could begin the process in anticipation of congressional
>> >approval.
>>
>> True, but can anyone recall an example of when FCC started a rules
>> change process in anticipation of a treaty change or some other
>> legislative change? Particularly when they did not have to?
>> >
>> >> Second, FCC has to decide whether dropping Element 1 requires the
>> >> NPRM process.
>> >
>> >As you note below. I think that decision has already been
>> >made in 98/99.
>> >
>> >> If FCC decides to do an NPRM, somebody has to write it up, then
>> >> there are comment and reply comment periods of length decided by
>> >> FCC. Probably on the order of a few months. Then FCC processes all
>> >> the comments (couple more months) and issues an R&O that changes
>> >> the rules.

>> >> >
>> >> But FCC could decide that they don;t need the NPRM process. For
>> >> example, changes like new VE fees and QPC pool changes don't get
>> >> NPRMs, FCC just does it.
>> >>
>> >> Seems to me that FCC could just say, in effect, 'we considered all
>> >> the codetest arguments, pro and con, back in 98 and 99. We said
>> >> back then that the treaty was the only reason for a code test, and
>> >> we reduced code testing to 5 wpm because that's the minimum we
>> >> think meets the treaty. Without the treaty, there's no reason, so
>> >> the code test is history." Element 1 gets dumped by executive order
>> >> and that's that.
>> >
>> >Agree completely..
>>
>> Note also that there was at least one Petition for Reconsideration wrt
>> the loss of the 13 and 20 wpm code tests. Despite lots of support, FCC
>> simply said no, it was gonna stay 5 wpm only.
>> >
>> >> But first the revised treaty has to be ratified.
>> >
>> >Anyone know the time interval it took after the last WRC?
>> >
>> I recall that ratification of WRC-79 was delayed because of some
>> action by Sen. John Glenn (help us out here, Phil/K2ASP). And it took
>> some time for us to actually get the WRC bands after that.
>>
>> But that was a different time and different changes. If the decision
>> is to drop code testing completely, FCC doesn't have to write any new
>> rules, they just have to eliminate Element 1.
>
> Much as it may seem strange for me to admit, but in
> reality, even if S25.5 is dropped completely, that does NOT
> require any rule change since the FCC "could" still keep code testing
> without violating the treaty.
>

It appears that it will be modified to make code testing optional, which has pretty much the same effect as dropping it, but legitimises the decision of certain countries to keep it (principally Germany and certain parts of the old communist bloc).

We all know that the FCC will be deluged with petitions, ranging from the sublime to the ridiculous. In the face of actual ITU rule changes, it is unlikely that they will respond by changing nothing. When the dust settles they are likely to drop element 1. The question is - what else will they change (if anything)?

>> I recall that some time back we did a quick flip through Part 97 and
>> noted the sections that would have to change or be deleted. There
>> weren't very many.

>
> Agreed.
>
>> And I'm quite confident that you, Bill, will see to it that a suitably
>> written proposal is in FCC's hands on the first day it is advisable to
>> submit one.
>
> Well I'll be part of a team that does anyway :-) :-)
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

3607. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 23:41:59 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A9C85F5BBF8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69757

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030629122250.17796.00001136@mb-m15.aol.com:

> In article <bdlhcrpjf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030627222247.25815.00000983@mb-m07.aol.com...
>>> In article <bdhdsc$nt7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>
>>> >True. After all, the only reason the FCC kept 5wpm was because of
>>> >the treaty.
>>>
>>> They made that pretty clear in the R&O. Just FCC's opinion, of
>>> course, but theirs is the one that makes the rules...
>>>
>>> >The call for rational reasons to retain morse testing was done in
>>> >NPRM-98-143.
>>>
>>> Doesn't mean FCC has to be 100% rational, tho....;-)
>>>
>>> There was also at least one Petition for Reconsideration, too.
>>> Denied.
>>
>>Translation - There was nothing new in that petition for
>>reconsideration either.
>
> Not at all, Bill. It simply means that FCC did not accept the arguments
> as being sufficient to keep any code test except 5 wpm.
>
> I think FCC had its mind made up on that score back in 1998, if not
> before.
>>
>>> >Does anyone think there are any new reasons to retain code testing
>>> >that haven't already been run through the FCC comment process?
>>>
>>> New or old, whether a reason is rational or not doesn't mean FCC must
>>> act on it.
>>
>>Generally true.
>>
> HAW!
>

> Hope everyone had a great Field Day. I did.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Me too. Our club was a 3A with a satellite station and a QRP 'GOTA'
station. I was using the QRP rig on phone, supervising Techs and my son
(no licence yet). It was 3 hours after I got there that I realised it was
set to 2 1/2 watts instead of 5! That gave everyone a good laugh. We still
worked quite a few sections on a QRP rig set to half power, and without
having to use funny bleeping mode.

3608. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-29 23:54:04 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A9CA6B9CA49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69758

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030629182252.08200.00000530@mb-m25.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93A6A1A7FE2DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>Largely because it comes too late. If this had happened in 1992, as it
>>might well have if it had made the agenda and that particular
>>conference had not been postponed by three years, then I think the
>>effect would have been much bigger.
>
> Maybe.
>
> Or maybe S25.5 would have not been revised in 1992 if it was on the
> agenda, conference wasn't postponed, etc. Remember that back in '92 the
> maritime folks still had CW/Morse capability required on all ships over
> a certain size.
>
> I think the delay actually worked FOR the total elimination of code
> testing.
>

Absolutely. It changed it from an odds on probability to a near certainty.

Don't forget though that the maritime CW phasing out period began way back
in 1987, although it wasn't completed until 2000 (and some would say,
isn't complete now, despite no testing, distress watch, etc.).

>>Something else happened in the interim, an explosion in
>>Internet use, which has changed the landscape.
>
> Which would have happened regardless of S25.5.
>
> To paraphrase and expand on a statement by W3RV, amateur radio will
> continue to exist because of things it offers that cannot be done with
> the internet, email, cell phones or inexpensive long distance
> telecommunications. Toss in GMRS/FRS, too. Example: most of the folks
> who got ham licenses for honeydew purposes in the '80s and '90s now
> have cellphones for that job. There's no point in running routine phone
> patches when you can direct dial for a few pennies a minute.
>
> Amateurs, by definition, have to build their facilities with
> discretionary money, time and other resources. And no hope of any
> financial return. Which means they have to really want to do it or it's
> just not gonna happen. Classic "bell the cat" situation.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3609. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 00:22:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629202255.25815.00001038@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 69759

In article <BB23CC07.1DA25%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>
>> Don't you remember the line from the film "Gladiator"
>> in which the victorious Maximus shouts to the crowd
>> "ARE YOU ENTERTAINED?!" or something like that?

> Well, I suppose it could get worse - someone could start shouting about
>releasing the lions.
>
I thought they used tigers in that movie.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Wimoweh

3610. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 00:22:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629202256.25815.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 69760

In article <1HHLa.3340$Vx2.1795147@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>This weekend's Field Day was a prime example of the benefits of CW. Bands
>were very poor most of the weekend and the voice stations struggled to find
>contacts late in the event. Our CW stations far outstripped the voice
>stations in total number of contacts.

Worst conditions in a long time.
>
FD 2003 at N2EY (1B-1 Battery, EPA):

Setup:

K2 #2084 at 5 W outout with KAT2, KAF2, powered by external 7 AH gel cell.
Homebrew coax-fed inverted V with traps, apex at 47 feet, ends at 25 feet,
oriented north-south. About 14 hours on the air.

Results:

80 CW: 89 QSOs
40 CW: 115 QSOs
20 CW: 15 QSOs
Total QSOs: 219 QSOs (2190 QSO points)
Bonuses: Emergency power, W1AW bulletin, message to SM (300 bonus points)
Total raw score: 2490 points

How did others fare?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3611. Field Day war stories

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 00:24:35 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3EFF8343.73DC2502@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 69761

> Me too. Our club was a 3A with a satellite station and a QRP 'GOTA'
> station. I was using the QRP rig on phone, supervising Techs and my son
> (no licence yet). It was 3 hours after I got there that I realised it was
> set to 2 1/2 watts instead of 5! That gave everyone a good laugh. We still
> worked quite a few sections on a QRP rig set to half power, and without
> having to use funny bleeping mode.

The one I was at was 11A MDC, and the one up the road was 37A MDC!

Would have been nice if CT took more then 32 and accepted F.

160 was noisy last night. We had a storm south of us in Virginia.
How the hell did folks ever talk on 160 with AM back in those days?

3612. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 00:36:51 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3EFF8623.E4DA44FE@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 69762

> How did others fare?

I was sitting at 160 phone during the storm to the south. I saw about 85 contacts by 0500Z (0100 EDT). About 100 watts to a dipole. Half scale static. My ears were hurting!!! Between the two of us experienced sidebanders, it was rough.

Yeah, so what, my sideband ear comes from 11 meters. <G> Talk about pileups! Call CQ on 38 USB sometime. Try to run our SSB CB net when the skip is in. I can tell who it is by voice, even if I can't make out what they said, just by them calling CQ. I know who it is even if they're f-ing around, trying to change their voice. 26 years on a radio. They can't hide. I hear the old CBers on 2 meters all the time.

There are many dual operators in this area. When one part is dead, the other is alive. I only use sideband on part 95. AMers suck. <G>

3613. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 01:07:48 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0306291707.85a6894@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69763
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bdncmttvv0@208.207.71.141>...
> stewart wrote:
>
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > >
> > > Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
> > > certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
> > > understand the law.
> > >
> > Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.
>
> Yeah, Phil....don't try to throw reality or legality into The Stew. He's most
unaccustomed to all that.

Idiots.

Quit cross-posting about issues that you Morse throwbacks know NOTHING
about. It is bad enough that you morons argue ENDLESSLY trying to
salvage what's left of the archaic Morse regulations... but when your
BS starts to spill over into other groups, your confusing,
narrow-minded negativism is totally unhelpful.... but, I suppose
THAT'S what you folks are ALL ABOUT, right?

- Stewart

3614. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 01:25:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bdo3od$l0a$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 69764

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030629122250.17796.00001136@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <bdlhcrpjf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030627222247.25815.00000983@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >> In article <bdhdsc$nt7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >True. After all, the only reason the FCC kept 5wpm was because of the
> >> >treaty.
> >>
> >> They made that pretty clear in the R&O. Just FCC's opinion, of course,
but
> >> theirs is the one that makes the rules...
> >>
> >> >The call for rational reasons to retain morse testing was done in
> >> >NPRM-98-143.
> >>
> >> Doesn't mean FCC has to be 100% rational, tho....;-)
> >>
> >> There was also at least one Petition for Reconsideration, too. Denied.
> >
> >Translation - There was nothing new in that petition for
> >reconsideration either.
>
> Not at all, Bill. It simply means that FCC did not accept the arguments as
> being sufficient to keep any code test except 5 wpm.

I read the petition(s)...there was nothing new in them.

> I think FCC had its mind made up on that score back in 1998, if not
before.

Works for me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3615. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 01:38:27 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306300137280.438@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 69765
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 28 Jun 2003, stewart wrote:
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> >
> > Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
> > certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
> > understand the law.
>
> Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.

Like you do? Your history of posts (on RRAP) clearly shows that you do not.
Go play with your MURS radios and leave FRS alone.

3616. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 01:46:48 UTC
From: deckthehall@webtv.com
Message-ID: <dc1baa4a.0306291746.a1262c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69766
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Phil D. Bucket" <thgiwd.news.invalid@web2news.net> wrote in message
news:<45645N696@web2news.com>...
Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
><snip>
Moped which words in that post do you think twistedhed did not write?

>twitsy dont have aol like you and wa3moj

3617. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 01:49:55 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0306300140570.438@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 69767
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 29 Jun 2003, stewart wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bdncmttvv0@208.207.71.141>...
> > stewart wrote:
> >
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > >
> > > > Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
> > > > certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
> > > > understand the law.
> > > >
> > > Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.
> > >
> > Yeah, Phil....don't try to throw reality or legality into The Stew. He's most
unaccustomed to all that.
>
> Idiots.
>
> Quit cross-posting about issues that you Morse throwbacks know NOTHING
> about. It is bad enough that you morons argue ENDLESSLY trying to
> salvage what's left of the archaic Morse regulations... but when your
> BS starts to spill over into other groups, your confusing,
> narrow-minded negativism is totally unhelpful.... but, I suppose
> THAT'S what you folks are ALL ABOUT, right?

Stop obsessing on that which you know nothing of. Anyway, Stewart, you are the idiot that insisted on posting the FRS/GMRS crap here - even though it is "Class A CB" and therefore belongs on "rec.radio.cb", and your MURS crap which has NO appropriate place because we all know it is NOT a legitimate radio service, but a manufacturer's mistake that the FCC bought into.

Regardless, not everyone here remains in favor of Morse Code. If there were a "codeless extra" available, then I might have one! That's how little I use morse code. Unfortunately, my license history ruins that - it shows that I have at least 13WPM (having held an Advanced class from 1993 to 2000). :-(

Personally, I find it antiquated, but it may come in handy in a "survival situation" where a canibalized radio is no longer capable of voice comms.

--
Stewart: Your refrigerator is running; better go catch it. All the "cold" may escape!

3618. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 02:23:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030629222300.25815.00001043@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 69768

In article <Xns93A9C6DB234C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>It appears that it will be modified to make code testing optional, which
>has pretty much the same effect as dropping it, but legitimises the
>decision of certain countries to keep it (principally Germany and certain
>parts of the old communist bloc).

Odd, very odd. A requirement that is completely optional is the same as no
requirement at all.
>
>We all know that the FCC will be deluged with petitions, ranging from the
>sublime to the ridiculous.

Maybe. A bad petition works against its cause.

>In the face of actual ITU rule changes, it is
>unlikely that they will respond by changing nothing. When the dust settles
>they are likely to drop element 1.

AGreed.

> The question is - what else will they
>change (if anything)?

All depends on what is requested. If all that is requested is an end to code
testing, FCC can just drop Element 1 and make no other changes.

Is that what's best?

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>>> I recall that some time back we did a quick flip through Part 97 and
>>> noted the sections that would have to change or be deleted. There
>>> weren't very many.
>>
>> Agreed.
>>
>>> And I'm quite confident that you, Bill, will see to it that a suitably
>>> written proposal is in FCC's hands on the first day it is advisable to
>>> submit one.
>>
>> Well I'll be part of a team that does anyway :-) :-)
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK

>>

3619. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 02:26:02 UTC
From: Mike Rotch <llahevad.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <45836N562@web2news.com>
Source record: 69769
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

deck-the-hall wrote:
> "Phil D. Bucket" <thgiwd.news.invalid@web2news.net>
> wrote in message news:<45645N696@web2news.com>..
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>
>><snip>
> Moped which words in that post do you think twistedhed did not write?
>
>>twitsy dont have aol like you and wa3moj

Twisty doesnt know how to quote even when he uses an alias like
deck-the-hall, LOL.

!ytsiwtolleh

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3620. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 02:28:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VeNLa.3394$Vx2.1844600@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 69770

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030629202256.25815.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <1HHLa.3340$Vx2.1795147@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >This weekend's Field Day was a prime example of the benefits of CW.
Bands
> >were very poor most of the weekend and the voice stations struggled to
find
> >contacts late in the event. Our CW stations far outstripped the voice
> >stations in total number of contacts.
>
> Worst conditions in a long time.
> >
> FD 2003 at N2EY (1B-1 Battery, EPA):
>
> Setup:
>
> K2 #2084 at 5 W outout with KAT2, KAF2, powered by external 7 AH gel cell.
> Homebrew coax-fed inverted V with traps, apex at 47 feet, ends at 25 feet,
> oriented north-south. About 14 hours on the air.
>
> Results:
>
> 80 CW: 89 QSOs
> 40 CW: 115 QSOs
> 20 CW: 15 QSOs
> Total QSOs: 219 QSOs (2190 QSO points)
> Bonuses: Emergency power, W1AW bulletin, message to SM (300 bonus points)
> Total raw score: 2490 points
>
> How did others fare?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Well I don't have the club's totals (club call W8HP with our GOTA station on
W8JXU) but our CW guys did well and I took a turn at both of our CW
stations. We ran 5A at a nearby park that is used as a Scout camp at times
(bunk beds to sleep in and a place to cook, Yay!). For 20m CW and phone,
the count was near 300 each although the voice didn't really pick up until
late this morning. 80 and 40 CW were good but voice was very modest. My OM
picked up one CW contact on 15m this morning and one on 6m yesterday. There

wasn't more than a couple dozen voice contacts on 15m, 10m, and VHF combined.

However, there's always a silver lining. Most of us got a pretty good night's sleep since the bands were poor. Today, we knocked down most of the antennas and stations early and just kept our 20m ones running until time to quit. That left only a minimal teardown to do this afternoon.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3621. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:10:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hh9pt30.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 69771
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 30 Jun 2003 01:38:27 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>On Sun, 28 Jun 2003, stewart wrote:
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hh7nx46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> >
>> > Go and learn a little FCC law in the area of FRS and type
>> > certification and then come back and talk to the folks who do
>> > understand the law.
>>
>> Buzz off. You don't know what you are talking about.
>
>Like you do? Your history of posts (on RRAP) clearly shows that you do not.
>Go play with your MURS radios and leave FRS alone.

Dieter - don't waste your time talking to a jackass who knows
nothing about radio regulatory matters and refuses to learn from
those who do. We're getting nowhere with him - time to break the
link.

30.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3622. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:31:34 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93A9EF4A0D58Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69772

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030629202256.25815.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com:

> In article <1HHLa.3340$Vx2.1795147@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>This weekend's Field Day was a prime example of the benefits of CW.
>>Bands were very poor most of the weekend and the voice stations
>>struggled to find contacts late in the event. Our CW stations far
>>outstripped the voice stations in total number of contacts.
>
> Worst conditions in a long time.
>>
> FD 2003 at N2EY (1B-1 Battery, EPA):
>
> Setup:
>
> K2 #2084 at 5 W outout with KAT2, KAF2, powered by external 7 AH gel
> cell. Homebrew coax-fed inverted V with traps, apex at 47 feet, ends at
> 25 feet, oriented north-south. About 14 hours on the air.
>
> Results:
>
> 80 CW: 89 QSOs
> 40 CW: 115 QSOs
> 20 CW: 15 QSOs
> Total QSOs: 219 QSOs (2190 QSO points)
> Bonuses: Emergency power, W1AW bulletin, message to SM (300 bonus
> points) Total raw score: 2490 points
>
> How did others fare?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I don't know the details, but we made 200 phone QSOs, and over 100 CW, but
we were a 3A. We had a TS-2000, an FT-817 and whatever the CW guys were
using! Antennas were an R7 and various dipoles.

3623. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:34:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EFFAFD9.F2D55EE7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69773

lk wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030627222248.25815.00000984@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hh5en0v.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> > <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
> >
> > >On 27 Jun 2003 05:14:09 -0700, N2EY wrote:
> > > Code tests, indeed..... <ggg>
> > >
> > Singular - there's only one left.
>
> Then there was none, but we will suvive.
>
> QRN?

Must be. Your stuff is garbled.

Dave K8MN

3624. Re: Why digital modes are few used

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:48:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030629234805.27503.00000783@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 69777

In article <bdi29v$suhm4$14@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Show me a ham group working a large-scale disaster that has not?? Injuries,
>triage info, fatalities are information that *may* have to be passed as
>traffic and need to stay in a mode that is not generally accessable to every
>nut (or media person) with a scanner. Packet, albeit slow is okay for this,
>as it is a legal means of encrypting the data.

Ryan:

Data transmitted over Amateur Packet Radio is not permitted to be
encrypted. Equipment to receive and decode AX.25 packet radio is
widely available, even to the news media, so that is not what I would
consider to be a legitimate concern. Any mode used by hams to
transmit data over the air must be considered to be wide open to
monitoring by anyone capable of acquiring the off-the-shelf technology
necessary to receive it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3625. Re: Field Day war stories

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:48:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030629234806.27503.00000784@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 69774

In article <3EFF8343.73DC2502@yahoo.moc>, Scott Unit 69
<scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> writes:

>160 was noisy last night. We had a storm south of us in Virginia.
>How the hell did folks ever talk on 160 with AM back in those days?
>

Scott:

Actually, they most likely didn't -- and used the funny beeping noises
instead!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3626. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:48:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030629234806.27503.00000785@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 69776

In article <bdgg09qek0@208.207.71.160>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>No question about the license beng required, but it's curious that FCC would
>authorize a radio that could be so easily misused by so many
>ordinary people who have no knowledge of the difference between FRS and GMRS.
>I've
>heard some buyers say it's OK to use the dual radios on FRS with no license,
>and
>one even said the radio was designed to reduce power to make it legal on FRS.
>
>Begins to look like maybe FCC is ambivilent on the matter.

Dick:

Hmmm -- I didn't consider the fact that the FCC must have approved the
FRS/GMRS combo rigs for manufacture and sale. Howver, I would
ass-u-&-me that they intended the purchasers to get the GMRS ticket
before utilizing that capability. If they approved them knowing full well
that they would be "inadvertently" creating thousands of potential GMRS
bootleggers, perhaps they figure that it would a good excuse to get themselves
out of the business of regulation and enforcement of GMRS operation,
thus saving themselves one more administrative burden linked to a
radio service with little or no economic significance.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3627. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:48:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030629234807.27503.00000786@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 69779

In article <bdk9ie$dvm@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> The time I spent learning the Morse code and increasing my skill in
>> order to upgrade to 20-WPM Extra-class status was in investment that
>> paid off in what has become, so far, over 20 years of enjoyable HF CW
>> operation. I'm certainly glad I didn't decide to devote that time to
>> "something else" -- especially if that may have been hours of yakking
>> into a microphone!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>So. You're thinking that people would have actually made a conscious
>decision to stay "verbally engaged" with you for hours, huh?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I'm not so sure about that. In any case, I never allowed it to happen!
Back in the days when I did regularly use HF phone, about 10 minutes
of listening to the same boring old bowel and bladder reports was all
I could stand!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3628. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:48:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030629234808.27503.00000788@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 69775

In article <9prLa.1216$TF.366@news02.roc.ny>, "Steve Fleckenstein"
<spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>> The only "total and complete horse manure" here is the notion that
>> a so-called amateur radio operator who hasn't mastered the basic
>> communications skill of Morse/CW operation is qualified to be a
>> county Skywarn Coordinator.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>Total garbage

Steve:

OK, if you want to put it that way, so be it. It's total garbage to have a
Skywarn Coordinator who hasn't mastered the basic communications
skill of Morse/CW!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3629. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:48:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030629234808.27503.00000787@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 69778

In article <H5rLa.1071$PF.803@news02.roc.ny>, "Steve Fleckenstein"
<spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>> The time I spent learning the Morse code and increasing my skill in
>> order to upgrade to 20-WPM Extra-class status was in investment that
>> paid off in what has become, so far, over 20 years of enjoyable HF CW
>> operation. I'm certainly glad I didn't decide to devote that time to
>> "something else" -- especially if that may have been hours of yakking
>> into a microphone!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I glad to hear you are enjoying one aspect of our hobby.
>
>My "something else" has been family, long work days, and the constant
>challenge of proving that amateur radio is part of the emergency
>communications solution to Nextel and Blackberry laden county officials.

Steve:

I enjoy all aspects of our hobby -- with the possible exception of endless
yakking on HF phone! Each year, I am my radio club's Field Day Digital
Mode Captain. I am also involved in Skywarn (ID # PLH010) and I am a
control operator for our repeaters. I have all the other "something elses"
in my life and always had, however, this didn't stop me from acquiring and
practicing the essential skill of Morse/CW operation! I just find it amusing
how often the "no-coders" pull out this tired old EXCUSE! I have no doubt
that if you somehow found the time to learn the code and use CW on the
air, that you would also learn how valuable a communications tool it can
be -- especially in emergency communications! The best part is, with
the International Treaty code proficiency requirement soon to be cancelled
by the ITU, and the FCC requirement soon to follow, you will no longer
be able to complain about it being "shoved down your throat" -- another
traditional "no-coder" complaint!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3630. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 03:57:58 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.06.30.03.57.54.98315@hotmail.com>
Source record: 69780
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 23:41:07 +0000, Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
> <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>>..... federal rules and regulations
>>(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
>>affact and power of law).
>
> That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because
> the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a
> vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about
> you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like-
> vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
> ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.
why are you comparing apples and tomatoes then?

the rules are clear, unless you have a license to operate in the section
from 27.405 - 28.000 (which I KNOW for a fact no one here does), you open
yourself up to litigation from the FCC, any commercial concern that may
have operating privileges there or even the military (which does have some
allocated spectrum there) this applies also for any frequency below 26.965
clear down to 12 meters (mostly commercial and marine band HF stuff).

you don't have the letter from the FCC saying you can operate there, its
the same as not having a license to drive a car on any street in america
(radio operations are a privilege, not a right and onyone spouting
otherwise really doesn't know what they are talking about).

if you want to show me where in the fcc rules it states that you can
operate there, be my guest. otherwise, stick to 11 meters (the class D
channels if you please) or get your ticket (amateur radio) and rgchew with
a bunch of us on bands you only dreamed of operating.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

p. field day was a blast. I made several contacts on 6 meters from here to
south texas and even florida (on 25 watts and a homebuilt 2 element beam!)

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

3631. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 04:15:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EFFB95D.D694549@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69781

N2EY wrote:

> How did others fare?

N8NN (+K8MN) 1-B WV

FT-1000MP "Field", 200 foot flattop fed with open wire line through
Johnson Matchbox.

1119 QSOs of which a little more than 800 were CW.

Early conditions were pretty poor.

Dave K8MN

3632. Technicians on 5Mhz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 04:43:16 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0306292043.3ad83295@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69782

Since Morse code is not an authorized mode on the 5MHz ham channels which open this week in the US, could a petition to allow non-morse-tested amateur radio licensees (Technicians) on these channels during FCC declared emergency communications be adopted by FCC? (Emergency comms being a prime reason advanced for the need for this allocation.) Since consideration of the removal of the ITU Morse test requirement may be delayed until a future WARC, this may issue may boil to the surface in coming months.

This would certainly open up a wider pool of available licensees during communications emergencies which might require HF operations (tropical storms, widespread floods, and similar "non-localized" emergency comm incidents).

Stow the flame-throwers for the moment, and comment dispassionately.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3633. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 05:36:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdoi9hnqf0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 69783

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <bdgg09qek0@208.207.71.160>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >No question about the license beng required, but it's curious that FCC would
> >authorize a radio that could be so easily misused by so many
> >ordinary people who have no knowledge of the difference between FRS and GMRS.
> >I've
> >heard some buyers say it's OK to use the dual radios on FRS with no license,
> >and
> >one even said the radio was designed to reduce power to make it legal on FRS.
> >
> >Begins to look like maybe FCC is ambivilent on the matter.
>
> Dick:
>
> Hmmm -- I didn't consider the fact that the FCC must have approved the
> FRS/GMRS combo rigs for manufacture and sale. Howver, I would
> ass-u-&-me that they intended the purchasers to get the GMRS ticket
> before utilizing that capability. If they approved them knowing full well
> that they would be "inadvertently" creating thousands of potential GMRS
> bootleggers, perhaps they figure that it would a good excuse to get themselves
> out of the business of regulation and enforcement of GMRS operation,
> thus saving themselves one more administrative burden linked to a
> radio service with little or no economic significance.

That thought crossed my mind. If some time in the future FCC
decides to merge GMRS and FRS we'll know. Since FCC gets none of the
income the GMRS licenses generates, they prolly couldn't care less about it,
comparative pittance that it amounts to in total anyway.

3634. Re: Technicians on 5Mhz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 05:54:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bdoja8phc0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 69784

K0HB wrote:

> Since Morse code is not an authorized mode on the 5MHz ham channels
> which open this week in the US, could a petition to allow
> non-morse-tested amateur radio licensees (Technicians) on these
> channels during FCC declared emergency communications be adopted by
> FCC? (Emergency comms being a prime reason advanced for the need for
> this allocation.) Since consideration of the removal of the ITU Morse
> test requirement may be delayed until a future WARC, this may issue
> may boil to the surface in coming months.
>

Frankly I wouldn't expect it for the singular reason that S25 still
exists and
FCC has shown itself loath to violate the letter of the treaty so far. I
doubt that'll change, probably S25 will first.

And, in a real emergency the rules allow use of whatever communications
are available.

Besides, dammit, five discrete HF channels will likely be overloaded with
all those who "didn't get the word". I know, emergencies are routinely
handled on a single HF channel, but they also routinely have difficulty
keeping the duffers off the emergency frequency, even with all that wide
open real estate out there to QSY to.
It'll be real interesting to watch the first 5 mhz disaster net unfold.

>
> This would certainly open up a wider pool of available licensees
> during communications emergencies which might require HF operations
> (tropical storms, widespread floods, and similar "non-localized"
> emergency comm incidents).
>
> Stow the flame-throwers for the moment, and comment dispassionately.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

3635. Re: 5MHz, Morse Code IS legal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 06:38:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306292238.2a80e8dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69785

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030629153750.14458.00000719@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> If you must do so, PLEASE launder that supporter, okay?
>
> ...it has been rather "ripe" for several years. [phew!]

What are you doing sniffing other men's supporters, Lennie? (As
if I had to ask...yet another revelation of just HOW putzy you can
be!)

Creep.

Steve, K4YZ

3636. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 06:44:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306292244.c67142d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69786

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030629153747.14458.00000717@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> Yes! "The source of that work is the key!"
>
> Lissen up, Masters of Radio! The battle is joined...off your cots and
> grab your KEYS! Show them who is BOSS in amateurism!
>
> Morse! Morse! Morse! Man the barricades...KEEP that code test
> alive! Don't let any smartash kids, lids, and space cadets into the
> US Amateur Radiotelegraphy Service!
>
> Keep those bands PURE with the sound of beeping! :-)

You've finally gone over the edge, Your Putziness.

Better tell Mrs. Correspondence School Shrink to get the plastic
off the couch...She's got a lot of work to do....

Steve, K4YZ

3637. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 06:48:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306292248.5b115c39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69787

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030628171748.04554.00000754@mb-m20.aol.com>...

> Why are you so concerned about COMMERCIAL radio broadcasting
> practices? Such practices don't involve any amateur radio activity
> anywhere. By definition, US amateur radio is prohibited from any
> pecuniary compensation (that's why the word "amateur" is there).
>
> If you have investments in radio broadcasting, try a different
> newsgroup for your bitching and whining about COMMERCIAL
> radio.

This from the same blitehring idiot (Yes, Lennie that WOULD be
YOU) who claims that Amateurs know nothing of the "radio world" beyond
PArt 97.

Once again skewered by his own foolishness.

Steve, K4YZ

3638. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 06:50:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306292250.583c80f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69788

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030629153747.14458.00000716@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> Morse code will never die...it just slowly beeps away...

Falling, ever falling.....

Steve, K4YZ

3639. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 07:37:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB2560F3.1DB95%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69789

"Phil Kane" wrote:

> On July 1st, Coast Guard Communications Area Master
> Station Pacific (CAMSPAC), Pt Reyes will retire the
> historic "Sparks" from the Telecommunications
> Specialist Enlisted Rating Badge, as the Coast Guard
> restructures its work force replacing that specialty
> with two others, the Operations Specialist and the
> Information Technology Specialist.
>
> As a special part of the ceremony surrounding this
> change NMC will return to the air using Morse code
> (CW) and possibly radioteletype (RTTY). These
> services, once the mainstays of Coast Guard
> communications, have been retired for several years
> but will be reinstated for this ceremony.

A radio station on the East Coast is supposed to involved also. There is also supposed to be at least one, perhaps more, simulated messages sent based on some actual messages sent many years ago. Each of the stations involved will respond to those messages. I have no details, but listen for all this just in case.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3640. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 07:53:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB2564B8.1DB97%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69790

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> The "31M" MOS is still used in the US Army.

I believe MOS 31M (Radio Relay Operator) has been replaced by another MOS.
Off the top of my head, I don't remember what the number of that new MOS is.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3641. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 07:58:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB2565FE.1DB99%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69791

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I thought they used tigers in that movie.

They had to use lions somewhere in the movie - lions seem to be a
Hollywood staple. After all, they had plenty left over after the old Tarzan
movies. Perhaps they just cut their hair, applied a little makeup, and
called them tigers. :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3642. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 08:05:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB25677F.1DB9B%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 69792

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" writes:
>
>> So. You're thinking that people would have
>> actually made a conscious decision to stay
>> "verbally engaged" with you for hours, huh?
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I'm not so sure about that. In any case, I
> never allowed it to happen! Back in the days
> when I did regularly use HF phone, about 10
> minutes of listening to the same boring old
> bowel and bladder reports was all I could
> stand!

What? An actual conversation between Kim and Larry that didn't immediately degrade into attacks on her callsign choice followed by a long exchange of insults? I never thought I would live long enough to see this happen. :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3643. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 12:21:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F002B2C.9060802@psu.edu>
Source record: 69793

Steve Fleckenstein wrote:
>>Hey Steve, Thanks for the respectful reply.
>
>
> My pleasure.
>
>
>
>>1. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *before* the Morse test is
>>dropped?
>
>
> No
>
>
>>2. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *after* the Morse
>>Requirement is dropped?
>>
>
>
> Yes
>
> Why ?
>
> Because I have better things to do in life than study for a mode of
> operation (CW) that I will rarely if at all use.

There ya go!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3644. Re: Technicians on 5Mhz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 12:24:02 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vg0b1pa3phb4e4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69794

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0306292043.3ad83295@posting.google.com...
> Since Morse code is not an authorized mode on the 5MHz ham channels
> which open this week in the US, could a petition to allow
> non-morse-tested amateur radio licensees (Technicians) on these
> channels during FCC declared emergency communications be adopted by
> FCC? (Emergency comms being a prime reason advanced for the need for
> this allocation.)

I think they could if they wanted too. But, others argue that the license
is for amateur operators, therefore it must follow S25.5. The 5mHz
frequencies are not allocated by ITU to amateur use. My question is
"does S25.5 follow the person or the ITU amateur frequencies?"
I did not get anaswer, or I missed it.

> Since consideration of the removal of the ITU Morse
> test requirement may be delayed until a future WARC, this may issue
> may boil to the surface in coming months.

IARU reports that at WRC 2003 "no adminstration spoke in favor of
retaining S25.5". The concensus is to MOD S25.5 to:
"Administrations shall determine whether or not a person seeking a licence
to operate an amateur station shall prove the ability to send and receive
texts
in Morse code signals." I do not what the rule means.

IARU reports and supports that S25.5 will be deleted at WRC 2003,
which ends on Independance Day July 4.

> This would certainly open up a wider pool of available licensees
> during communications emergencies which might require HF operations
> (tropical storms, widespread floods, and similar "non-localized"
> emergency comm incidents).

The object is to keep to pool smaller. :-)

> Stow the flame-throwers for the moment, and comment dispassionately.

Not a chance Hans, this RRAP. Think all the good this newsgroup does
by keeping these discussion off the airwaves. :-)

> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Glad to read post, I was wondering where you were.

Larry, KC8EPO

3645. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 12:30:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F002D77.6000103@psu.edu>
Source record: 69795

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
> news:0_qLa.1016$jC.583@news02.roc.ny...
>
>>>Hey Steve, Thanks for the respectful reply.
>>
>>My pleasure.
>>
>>
>>
>>>1. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *before* the Morse test is
>>>dropped?
>>
>>No
>>
>>
>>>2. Will you get your General or Extra ticket *after* the Morse
>>>Requirement is dropped?
>>>
>>
>>Yes
>>
>>Why ?
>>
>> Because I have better things to do in life than study for a mode of
>>operation (CW) that I will rarely if at all use.
>>
>
>
>>Steve
>>N2UBP
>>
>>
>
>
> I have NEVER understood how someone can make a statement like that. How do
> you KNOW you won't like it if you do learn it?
>
> Don't you see your cutting yourself off from a major part of ham radio based
> on what?

Why don't we apply that mode to everything? This can fit in with the
new education initiatives

People just decide what they *don't* want to learn, and then set forth to not learn it.

Why should anyone have to learn history? That stuff is all in the past. Why should anyone learn math functions at all? As long as the calculator has batteries, you can look the formula up somewhere and plug tha numbers in. Why should I learn *anything* about car repair, I'll always be able to have someone else do it. The list goes on and on.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3646. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:17:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F0037AE.1AEC662E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69796

Steve Fleckenstein wrote:

>...communications solution to Nextel and Blackberry laden county officials.

Shouldn't that be "Blackberry bin Laden".

Dave K8MN

3647. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:21:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F00389A.1EFA5B4B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69797

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Why are you so concerned about COMMERCIAL radio broadcasting
> practices? Such practices don't involve any amateur radio activity
> anywhere. By definition, US amateur radio is prohibited from any
> pecuniary compensation (that's why the word "amateur" is there).

Why are you so concerned about AMATEUR radio? You aren't in the least
bit involved in it.

You don't regulate. You don't participate. You just pontificate.

Dave K8MN

3648. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:26:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F0039BC.DD7D2433@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69798

Len Over 21 wrote:

> BTW, I made my own PC back in 1976, laying out and etching
> the boards, soldering in the components, programming my own
> monitor chip (what is now referred to as a "BIOS"). Motorola
> 6800 microprocessor, sort of a "QRP CW rig" equivalent. Do I
> insist that all others emulate me? NO.

When was the computer use exam put in place, Leneoard?

Dave K8MN

3649. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:39:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F003CB4.758B5601@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69799

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EFC435B.1050509@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <hockeypuck@psu.edu> writes:

> > Can Len or Brian B be gruntled?

> > Len:
> >
> > Here is a person who thrives on his disgruntlement, a veritable master
> >of discontent with the Amateur Radio world.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Mike is striking to become the fifth wheel in the Gang
> of Four who wish to take over this newsgroup (by any means possible).
>
> My only discontent is of two things: Morse code testing for a license;
> the self-righteous, self-important "superiors" who think they Must
> rule on ethics, mores, the "ham community" group think.

I fear that you're becoming forgetful in your dotage. You left out the
part about a minimum age for licensing. As far as the "ham community",
you aren't a part of it so that shouldn't be your concern.

> > Having perfected his
> >trolling art here, (although I fear at great personal self-damage) he
> >waves his banner of disgruntlement with great pride.
>
> Not at all, hockeypucker.
>
> This isn't "personal abuse," it is merely a newsgroup. Mostly it is
> a waste of time considering the regulars and their insistence on
> "regulating" all content not to their liking. Because of that terrible
> need for others to Fight in here, I don't bother looking in daily.

...but you show up nonetheless as if you have something to do with
amateur radio. No one has asked you to waste your time, to be an
advocate or to volunteer your services as an expert in amateur radio.

> If I had a need to fight, I'd go to the Golden Gloves or something
> like that. :-)

I'd almost be willing to pay to see the Vintage Pirhana take on all
comers.

> Mike is getting down to the nitty-gritty of Personal Insult tactics
> when he can't justify his morse code views or claims of amateur
> radio "superiority." Any day now Mike will hop on Larrah's big
> superior ham bus beeping its way through ancientville. :-)

How do you justify your personal insults toward others? With regard to your non-involvement in amateur radio, what justifies your peculiar attraction to this particular newsgroup?

Dave K8MN

3650. L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R dddddddddddddddddddddddd ddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddbbbbbbbbb 2931 [315/7]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:42:08 UTC
From: jefodp@yhd65.com
Message-ID: <3f003e30$1$294$ba620e4c@reader0.news.skynet.be>
Source record: 69801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fan.joe-baptista,alt.alien.visitors

```
L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R

Want to watch Sporting Events?--Movies?--Pay-Per-View??

*This is the Famous R-O Shack TV D.e.s.c.r.a.m.b.l.e.r
You can assemble it from R,a,d,i,o S,h,a,c,k parts for about $12 to $15.

We Send You:
1, E-Z To follow Assembly Instructions.
2. E-Z To read Original Drawings.
3. Total Parts List.

**** PLUS SOMETHING NEW YOU MUST HAVE! ****
Something you can't do without.

THE UP-TO-DATE 6 PAGE REPORT:
USING A D-E-S-C-R-A-M-B-L-E-R LEGALLY

Warning: You should not build a T.V D.e.s.c.r.a.m.b.l.e.r
without reading this report first.

You get the complete 6 page report "Using a D-e-s-c-r-a-m-b-l-e-r LEGALLY",
the instruction plans and theeasy to follow diagram all for just--$10.00

Fill out form below and send it, along
with your $10.00 payment to:

SMG PUBLISHING INC
1340 East Vine Str #218
Kissimmee Fl 34744

(Cash, Check or Money Order.)

(Florida residents include 7% Florida State Sales Tax)

(All orders outside the U.S.A. add $5.00)

PRINT YOUR:

NAME______________________________________________________

ADDRESS___________________________________________________

CITY/STATE/ZIP____________________________________________

E-MAIl ADDRESS____________________________________________

We are NOT ASSOCIATED in any way with R-A-D-I-O S-H-A-C-K.
```

4rwerwer24534ty5tgertrwetertertretrtre

3r345345345435435345435345435

ygery35346346yhryhdtryeryteryery56345634534

5635y45hyy45y45y45yery454545y45y45y45y45y45y45rtytrytry

56y5465464564565637u56eu56erue56rtueyruytuytuty

r67y46747747457457
sdafasfsafsafasf

POST
From: jefodp@yhd65.com
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fan.joe-baptista,alt.alien.visitors
Subject: L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R
ddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddbbbbbbbbb 2931 [316/7]

L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R

Want to watch Sporting Events?--Movies?--Pay-Per-View??

*This is the Famous R-O Shack TV D.e.s.c.r.a.m.b.l.e.r

3651. L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R ddddddddddddddddddddddd ddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddbbbbbbbb 2931 [317/7]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:42:10 UTC
From: jefodp@yhd65.com
Message-ID: <3f003e32$0$294$ba620e4c@reader0.news.skynet.be>
Source record: 69800
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fan.joe-baptista,alt.alien.visitors

L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R

Want to watch Sporting Events?--Movies?--Pay-Per-View??

*This is the Famous R-O Shack TV D.e.s.c.r.a.m.b.l.e.r
You can assemble it from R,a,d,i,o S,h,a,c,k parts for about $12 to $15.

We Send You:
1, E-Z To follow Assembly Instructions.
2. E-Z To read Original Drawings.
3. Total Parts List.

**** PLUS SOMETHING NEW YOU MUST HAVE! ****
Something you can't do without.

THE UP-TO-DATE 6 PAGE REPORT:
USING A D-E-S-C-R-A-M-B-L-E-R LEGALLY

Warning: You should not build a T.V D.e.s.c.r.a.m.b.l.e.r
without reading this report first.

You get the complete 6 page report "Using a D-e-s-c-r-a-m-b-l-e-r LEGALLY",
the instruction plans and theeasy to follow diagram all for just--$10.00

Fill out form below and send it, along
with your $10.00 payment to:

SMG PUBLISHING INC
1340 East Vine Str #218
Kissimmee Fl 34744

(Cash, Check or Money Order.)

(Florida residents include 7% Florida State Sales Tax)

(All orders outside the U.S.A. add $5.00)

PRINT YOUR:

NAME____

ADDRESS____

CITY/STATE/ZIP____

E-MAIl ADDRESS____

We are NOT ASSOCIATED in any way with R-A-D-I-O S-H-A-C-K.

4rwerwer24534ty5tgertrwetertertretrtre

3r34534534543543534543534543 5

ygery35346346yhryhdtryeryteryery56345634534

5635y45hyy45y45y45yery454545y45y45y45y45y45y45rtytrytry

56y5465464564565637u56eu56erue56rtueyruytuytuty

r67y46747747457457
sdafasfsafsafasf

df2u3yr81308r321r4234

wjfdqowrewqwqe

POST
From: jefodp@yhd65.com
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fan.joe-baptista,alt.alien.visitors
Subject: L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R
ddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddbbbbbbbbb 2931 [318/7]

L.EGAL C.A.B.L.E TV DE-S.C.R.A.M.B.L.E.R

Want to watch Sporting Events?--Movies?--Pay-Per-View??

*This is the Famous R-O Shack TV D.e.s.c.r.a.m.b.l.e.r
You can assemble it from R,a,d,i,o S,h,a,c,k parts for about $12 to $15.

We Send You:
1, E-Z To follow Assembly Instructions.
2. E-Z To read Original Drawings.
3. Total Parts List.

**** PLUS SOMETHING NEW YOU MUST HAVE! ****
Something you can't do without.

THE UP-TO-DATE 6 PAGE REPORT:
USING A D-E-S-C-R-A-M-B-L-E-R LEGALLY

Warning: You should not build a T.V D.e.s.c.r.a.m.b.l.e.r
without reading this report first.

You get the complete 6 page report "Using a D-e-s-c-r-a-m-b-l-e-r LEGALLY",
the instruction plans and theeasy to follow diagram all for just--$10.00

Fill out form below and send it, along
with your $10.00 payment to:

SMG PUBLISHING INC
1340 East Vine Str #218
Kissimmee Fl 34744

(Cash, Check or Money Order.)

(Florida residents include 7% Florida State Sales Tax)

(All orders outside the U.S.A. add $5.00)

PRINT YOUR:

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY/STATE/ZIP_____

E-MAIl ADDRESS_____

We are NOT ASSOCIATED in any way with R-A-D-I-O S-H-A-C-K.

4rwerwer24534ty5tgertrwetertertretrtre

3r34534534543543534543534543 5

ygery35346346yhryhdtryeryteryery56345634534

5635y45hyy45y45y45yery454545y45y45y45y45y45y45rtytrytry

56y5465464564565637u56eu56erue56rtueyruytuytuty

r67y46747747457457
sdafasfsafsafasf

df2u3yr81308r321r4234

wjfdqowrewqwqe

epq-eq eq e qe qe qe qe qe

3652. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:43:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F003DD5.5E18823C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69802

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Well, you and I both know that one MUST subscribe to what the
> self-styled Rules of US hamdom decree...morse code ability is at
> the very heart of being a "real" radio amateur. That is a prime
> requirement.

Actually, the heart of being a "real" radio amateur is the amateur radio license. The sooner you obtain one, the sooner you'll achieve neophyte status in amateur radio.

> Morse code ability assures the ham of being primo, grade A, the
> "superiority" measured by his morse skill.

You've repeatedly demonstrated that you have a problem with anyone who might hold superiority to you in any area. When and if you ever obtain an amateur radio license, there'll be those who have more knowledge of amateur radio than you and there'll be those who are more skilled operators regardless of mode.

> It's all about working DX on HF with CW.

That's what you keep telling us.

> Anything else is for snit. :-)

Doesn't matter. I don't give a snit :-) :-)

Dave K8MN

3653. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:48:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F003ED9.519BE98@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69803

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Superradioman, able to leap tall pileups in a single keystroke.
>
> Up, up, and awayyyyy....
>
> Beep, beep.

This from one whose involvement in amateur radio consists of talking about it, reading about it or playing SWL. How is it that you have a role, Leonard?

Dave K8MN

3654. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 13:59:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F004204.9C4825AD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69804

Len Over 21 wrote:

> There's still a bunch of anal retentive amateurs in here who, never
> having done a single bit of military communications, profess to be
> absolute, self-righteous "experts" on How Things Are Done.

There are any number of radio amateurs here who have participated in
military or government communications and who have done so more recently
than you. You hold the title as being the only non-radio amateur who
presumes to tell us how amateur radio should be regulated.

> They
> are unable emotionally to come to grips with change or any
> challenge to their very important amateur titles, rank, status
> obtained a rather long time ago...

When did you last wear the uniform of the military? How recently did
you post your Army serial number and your rank?

> ...and they keep on demanding that
> all others DO AS THEY DID by working hard, knuckling under to
> demands of seniors of that time, and following some fairyland
> concepts of "proper radio operation" in an advanced age well
> beyond the standards and practices of the pre-WW2 times.

Well, it's a cinch that YOU don't knuckle under. You're NOT going to
allow any "superior" type to tell YOU what to do. Of course you don't
hold an amateur radio license of any class.

> The Living Museum of Amateur RadioTelegraphy is still
> around, still kicking but now twitching in the onset of rigor > mortis and refusing to
give in.

By "Living Museum of Amateur RadioTelegraphy", I can only assume that
you mean those who use morse code. Why should those individuals give up
the use of a mode they enjoy? Why should they "give in" to someone who
isn't even involved in amateur radio in any way?

> We will have to crowbar their keys from
> their cold, dead fingers.

"We"? How are you involved?

> There are lots and lots of crowbars out
> there. Attrition is slowly reducing the beepers' numbers.
>
> Bye bye morsie.

I think it would be a safe bet to say that it'll be "Bye-Bye, Lennie"
before we say farewell to morse code in the ham bands.

Dave K8MN

3655. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 14:16:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306300616.442d4c4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69805

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030629153742.14458.00000710@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> OOK CW is very gentlemanly, calm, everyone in fine health,
> upstanding, righteous, and never ever rude to anyone while
> maintaining the Living Museum of Radiotelegraphy arts, the
> spirit of the last millennium's state of the art, and the American
> Way!

For once Lennie is close to the truth, and he didn't even try!

Very rarely have I had QSO's on CW that involve description of
bowel/bladder dysfunction, I've never heard anyone use profanity, and
I've never had a QSO that didn't end with kind exchanges.

If living in a "living museum" is what it takes to experience
civility, then so be it.

Lennie's pretty well made the case for not finding it on USENET.

Thanks, Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3656. FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 14:31:42 UTC
From: thomas <word_pass@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <bdphkn$uuomf$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69807
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi,

there have been a lot flames about the topic of the license issue of
FRS/GMRS. i don't want to be part of it. hence i opened a new thread.

i have just got a formal response from FCC. quote as follows, fyi ONLY!
==========

if you use only the FRS side of the radio, then you would not be required
to obtain a license. On the other hand, if you switch to the GMRS side of
the radio and transmit, you would at that point be in violation of FCC
rules.

Representative Number : ????? (marked out)

==========
bingo
thomas

3657. Re: License for 2-way radio supporting both GMRS/FRS???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 14:36:00 UTC
From: Daniel Martin <dwmartin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <vg0i0f4lsuou4b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69806
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I beleive it's 1/3.7ths of a gallon. The large bottle of pop/soda.

Dan

"Barry OGrady" <god_fre_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:hah0gvonb2qadtbcnj3keb155imiagkqqm@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 19:28:30 GMT, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
> >On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 01:16:02 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> >
> >>> Although you "actually have no plan to use the GMRS channels at all".
Why
> >>> not get the license and make full use of your radio ??? Comes the day
you
> >>> may want or need it.
> >>
> >>....Maybe he doesn't want to pay $75 every 5 years....
> >
> > The cost of a large soda at a fast-food place or a 2-liter bottle at
> > the supermarket once a month......
>
> What's a liter?
>
> > I was surprised how much spare change I had in my pocket when I
> > stopped buying my daily yoghurt or ice cream a while ago. And my
> > waistline appreciated it, too.....
> >
> >--
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
>
>
> -Barry
> ========
> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
> Voicemail/fax number +14136227640

3658. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 15:10:50 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <_pYLa.85334$Pc5.18123@fed1read01>
Source record: 69808
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hate to say I told you so -- but I will.

Best get an answer from the horse's mouth and ignore OPINIONS.

But then OPINIONS cost nothing and worth about as much

BINGO

--

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:bdphkn$uuomf$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de...
> Hi,
>
> there have been a lot flames about the topic of the license issue of
> FRS/GMRS. i don't want to be part of it. hence i opened a new thread.
>
> i have just got a formal response from FCC. quote as follows, fyi ONLY!
> ==
>
>
> if you use only the FRS side of the radio, then you would not be required
> to obtain a license. On the other hand, if you switch to the GMRS side of
> the radio and transmit, you would at that point be in violation of FCC
> rules.
>
>
> Representative Number : ????? (marked out)
>
> ==
> bingo
> thomas
>
>
>
>

3659. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141343.15462.00001278@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69814

In article <3F00389A.1EFA5B4B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You don't regulate. You don't participate. You just pontificate.

YOU don't regulate. [your regulator is broken, by the way...]

YOU participate. [your ham license keeps getting renewed]

YOU don't pontificate. YOU shout ORDERS! YOU demand
obedience to your superiority! NO ONE can tell you what to
do! Ever!

Sieg Heil and gruss gott, herr robust.

3660. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141344.15462.00001279@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69809

In article <3F004204.9C4825AD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> There's still a bunch of anal retentive amateurs in here who, never
>> having done a single bit of military communications, profess to be
>> absolute, self-righteous "experts" on How Things Are Done.
>
>There are any number of radio amateurs here who have participated in
>military or government communications and who have done so more recently
>than you.

I'm sure there are. The ones who post in here are exactly as I described.

>You hold the title as being the only non-radio amateur who
>presumes to tell us how amateur radio should be regulated.

NOBODY can tell the great and superior Dave Heil how to run
ham radio! Nossir! He GIVES orders, doesn't take them!

>When did you last wear the uniform of the military? How recently did
>you post your Army serial number and your rank?

What has that to do with AMATEURISM, superior being?

Why are you acting so despicably against US military veterans
BECAUSE of their military service? I didn't serve in the SS.

>Well, it's a cinch that YOU don't knuckle under. You're NOT going to
>allow any "superior" type to tell YOU what to do. Of course you don't
>hold an amateur radio license of any class.

No problem to me. Obviously to you since you seem to NEED the
"superiority" status. If you don't get reverence for being so damn
superior in everything amateur, you turn churlish, mean, and
spiteful...

Offhand, I'd say you just can't tolerate any viewpoints other than
your own superior ones.

>By "Living Museum of Amateur RadioTelegraphy", I can only assume that
>you mean those who use morse code.

No, those who go overboard in their quest to promote, venerate, and
show their superiority in a mode which a majority don't give a damn
about. The Gang of Four are such and in here.

>Why should those individuals give up the use of a mode they enjoy?

Why should they "give up using" a mode which is allowed?

I've never demanded or asked anything of the sort. You are starting
in on character assassination again, herr robust. Not nice.

>Why should they "give in" to someone who
>isn't even involved in amateur radio in any way?

:-) NO ONE at the FCC is required to hold or be granted any US
amateur radio license. The FCC can damn well cause ANY ham
to "give in" to what the FCC says. :-)

>I think it would be a safe bet to say that it'll be "Bye-Bye, Lennie"
>before we say farewell to morse code in the ham bands.

That's possible.

Of course Dave Heil is an IMMORTAL. He, like other members of
the Gang of Four, will never die. :-)

My advocacy is simply for the elimination of a morse code test for
any US radio license. I'm not after the elimination of morse code
use. You are, as usual, confused on that issue. Your problem, not
mine.

Members of the Living Museum of the Ancient Radiotelegraphy
Service will be beeping long after I'm gone. They refuse to go. :-)

3661. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141345.15462.00001280@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69813

In article <3F003ED9.519BE98@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>This from one whose involvement in amateur radio consists of talking
>about it, reading about it or playing SWL. How is it that you have a
>role, Leonard?

Poor baby, still pissed over not being recognized as a "superior
amateur?" Tsk, tsk.

I was doing big-leagues HF communications a half century ago. I've
been on more of the EM spectrum, used more modes of
communications in the last half century than herr robust has,
including is "service to the country" in State Department.

I MIGHT be interested in getting an AMATEUR radio license to add
to my hobbies...I've had a commercial radio license (more than just
an operator's) since 1956. But, seeing the wonderful cross-section
of "representatives" from US amateur radio in this newsgroup early
on, the thought has less and less appeal.

The prevailing thought among the wonderful "representatives" from
US amateur radio is that all MUST pass a morse code test AND
achieve a license grant in order to even talk about ham radio. Herr
robust is adamant about that...so much so that he regards opponents
to his viewpoints as well beneath his contempt. However, his
contempt for NCTAs shines in many words, is archived in many
Google posts.

Not being required in any way to use any morse code modes in the
last half century doesn't make anyone "inferior" to those who had to
test for same. Yet herr robust insists on that morse code test, if for
no other reason than his being a "superior" to "neophytes." That
is herr robust's problem, not mine.

GODI GOTA!

CW gets through when anything else will...

3662. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141346.15462.00001281@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69810

In article <3F003DD5.5E18823C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Well, you and I both know that one MUST subscribe to what the
>> self-styled Rules of US hamdom decree...morse code ability is at
>> the very heart of being a "real" radio amateur. That is a prime
>> requirement.
>
>Actually, the heart of being a "real" radio amateur is the amateur radio
>license. The sooner you obtain one, the sooner you'll achieve neophyte
>status in amateur radio.

Your Word is LAW, herr robust. Sieg Heil!

>You've repeatedly demonstrated that you have a problem with anyone who
>might hold superiority to you in any area.

Nein, herr robust. I have a problem with those of you who claim
"superiority" in radio when you are clearly NOT superior. That's in
all radio services, not just amateur.

>When and if you ever obtain
>an amateur radio license, there'll be those who have more knowledge of
>amateur radio than you and there'll be those who are more skilled
>operators regardless of mode.

You are NOT one of them, herr robust. :-)

GODI GOTA!

CW gets through when everything else will....

3663. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141350.15462.00001282@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69815

In article <3F003CB4.758B5601@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I fear that you're becoming forgetful in your dotage. You left out the
>part about a minimum age for licensing. As far as the "ham community",
>you aren't a part of it so that shouldn't be your concern.

There is NO age requirement in US amateur radio.

Little pre-schoolers can get amateur radio licenses here. Didn't you?

>...but you show up nonetheless as if you have something to do with
>amateur radio. No one has asked you to waste your time, to be an
>advocate or to volunteer your services as an expert in amateur radio.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you show up in here as ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY
in amateur radio and demand all others agree with your opinions.

NO ONE asked you to participate.

>I'd almost be willing to pay to see the Vintage Pirhana take on all
>comers.

Like all members of the Gang of Four, you have a strong preference
for violence and fighting. Why is that? What made you so angry?

>How do you justify your personal insults toward others?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, how do you justify your personal insults leveled to
anyone not agreeing with your holy words?

You don't make any US radio regulations...you don't regulate or
enforce any US radio regulations...yet you act the complete
arrogant official as if your word was law!

>With regard to
>your non-involvement in amateur radio, what justifies your peculiar
>attraction to this particular newsgroup?

Activity towards removal of the morse code testing for any US radio
license.

Gruss gott, herr robust...

3664. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141351.15462.00001283@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69812

In article <BB2564B8.1DB97%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> The "31M" MOS is still used in the US Army.
>
> I believe MOS 31M (Radio Relay Operator) has been replaced by another MOS.
>Off the top of my head, I don't remember what the number of that new MOS is.

You can find ALL the job descriptions of US Army Military Occupation
Specialties via www.goarmy.com. Click the "Jobs" button at the top, do
the search using keywords. "Radio" keyword unrolls a lot of brief
descriptions of MOSs involving radio.

I checked and you are correct. The "31" is still there with lots of
suffixes but 31M seems to have been split up to 31P, microwave
specialist, and 31R, multi-channel communications specialist.

I can't talk much more about it since the Gang of Four DEMANDS I
be an "active participant" in something in order to talk about it. :-)
My Honorable Discharge was received in April, 1960...some in here
never served but discharge all over the newsgroup. :-)

GODI GOTA!

Morse code gets through when everything else will!

3665. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141352.15462.00001284@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69811

In article <20030629202255.25815.00001038@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>>> Don't you remember the line from the film "Gladiator"
>>> in which the victorious Maximus shouts to the crowd
>>> "ARE YOU ENTERTAINED?!" or something like that?
>
>> Well, I suppose it could get worse - someone could start shouting about
>>releasing the lions.
>>
>I thought they used tigers in that movie.

Don't tell us...you were actually behind the camera during that shoot while filming 48 frames per second? :-)

3666. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:13:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030630141354.15462.00001285@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 69816

In article <20030629154657.14837.00001059@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY),
refusing ever to give up his sacred outputs in here, writes:

>In article <20030628171750.04554.00000755@mb-m20.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030628062304.14837.00001026@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <KI0La.2796$Vx2.1441910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>Flint"
>>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>Morse sent visually must be sent at a slow speed or the eye runs it all
>>>>together as one light. Remember that is how "motion" pictures work, a
>>>>series of still frames sent at a speed that causes them to blend.
>>>>
>>>>Anyway, Morse at 5wpm is definitely possible with lights. At 18wpm, it is
>>>>not possible. I don't know whether 13wpm is possible or not. I read
>about
>>>>it years ago but can't remember where the break point was for the visual
>>>>blending.
>>>>
>>>Let's take a look at dit times:
>>>
>>>At 5 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 12/50 seconds, or 240 milliseconds.
>>>That's a little more than 2 dits per second.
>>>
>>>At 13 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 4.615/50 seconds, or 92
>>milliseconds.
>>>That's a little more than 5 dits per second.
>>>
>>>At 20 wpm, the keydown time for a dit is 3/50 seconds, or 60 milliseconds.
>>>That's a little more than 8 dits per second.
>>>
>>>Visual blending depends on the individual, but is around 20 flashes (dits)
>>>per second.
>>
>> The correct term is "persistence of vision." :-)
>
>A term which is actually a misnomer:

Oh goodie, an "optical expert" you are now? :-)

When were you ever an "expert" in optics in addition to doing your "electrical engineering" thing? Just curious since I was directly involved in a rather large DoD contract at Rockwell on an interferometer. Had to work with lots of high-level optical physicist types.

Methinks you have a terrible "persistence of righteousness" about your output in here. :-)

>
>http://www.grand-illusions.com/percept.htm
>
>> The actual persistence threshold varies with individuals and can
>> go down to 15 "flashes" per second. That seems to be a combined
>> function of the retinal cells and cerebral visual cortex.
>>
>>>Motion picture speed is 24 frames per second, but to eliminate flicker ecah
>>>frame is flashed on the screen twice by means of a rotating shutter.
>>
>> Not quite.
>
>How "not quite"?
>
>Modern standard sound motion pictures run at 24 frames per second. But each
>frame is flashed on the screen twice, so there are 48 images per second on
>the screen. A two-bladed rotary shutter is usually used in the projector.

Back when I actually RAN a projector in a cinema, the film rate was 24 frames per second. Back when I was actually running a 16mm projector, the film rate was 24 frames per second. Once, when I rented an 8mm projector to see some home movies of family, the film rate was 24 frames per second. While I never got a Masters in Optics, I can't ever recall any projectors that flashed on an image twice or any other multiples. All the mechanisms I've seen had the simple pawl and shutter arrangement to blank the projected image during the frame pull-down time.

The eye sees 24 frames per second and the eye-brain combination perceives motion on a frame-to-frame basis. It doesn't make any difference if the SAME frame is flashed on twice, thrice, or quadruple times. What you and everyone else sees is those 24 frames per second. The rate doesn't vary more than allowed by the internal projector rate controls.

Feel free to post your American Cinematographer's association card membership number.

>In the early silent film era, a speed of 16 frames per second was common, and
a
>three-bladed shutter was usually used in the projector. Again, 48 images per
>second.

The last time I saw any "silent films" was at the Rosenwald Museum
of Science and Industry in Chicago some time around 1950. I have
NO idea of the projector mechanism used in their "Gay 90s" section
which featured a nickelodeon.

In the "early silent film era" morse code was king for electrical
communications, having been used first for commercail communications
in 1844. There was no cinema in 1844...but I'm am absolutely positive
you are going to come up with all sorts of reducto ad absurdum
"corrections" involving camera obscuras and the famous series of
running horse photographs. All that in an attempt to prove me "wrong"
and you absolutely "right." :-) :-) :-)

>> The shutter is there to blank the "pull-down" time when
>> the geneva mechanism and pawl yank down the next frame.
>
>That's not the only thing the shutter does. It also blanks the screen halfway
>between pulldown intervals so that each frame is flashed on the screen twice.

...and you can send morse code in between the dits and dahs of
your solid-state break-in T/R switch. Of course you can. You SAY
so therefore you are absolutely correct.

>> The
>> intermittent movement requires a free loop of film before and after
>> the shutter mechanism so that the supply and take-up reels can
>> move at an approximate constant rate. Note: A geneva wheel may
>> not be used in cheaper projectors but was standard in cinema
>> projectors for decades; there are other, simpler pull-downs.
>>
>Irrelevant to the discussion.

So is the subject of motion picture projection and your "48 per second"
frame rate.

So has been your messages in other threads about trains and Chinese
adoptions and many other things which are definitely NOT about radio,
let alone amateur radio.

>> Motion picture frame rate standards are still 24 per second and that
>> is what nearly everyone sees. That's a comporomise between the
>> maintenance of persistence of vision and length of film needed for a
>> given time.
>
>48 images per second. See:
>
>http://www.bbctv-ap.freeserve.co.uk/supfr3.htm
>
>or any reliable reference on motion picture projection.

Go for it...DEMAND to be recognized now also as an optical
expert.

As far as I'm concerned, the acquaintences I have in the motion
picture industry don't agree with you. Of course, they aren't
amateurs so they "don't count" in discussions on this newsgroup.
:-)

>> For nearly all film projectors and editors, it is still 24 per second.
>
>Incorrect.

:-) Check with the motion picture standards folks. Since before WW2
the motion picture frame rate has been 24 images per second.

>You're simply wrong on this, Len. 24 frames per second, 48 images per second.
>
>Be a big boy and admit it.

What is a "big boy?" In here is would seem to be anyone who agrees
wholeheartedly with your statements. You have difficulty with accepting
corrections, being a devout morseodist.

Got your ASC card handy to prove membership in the American
Society of Cinematographers? Can you really and truly prove that
motion picture frame rate is "other" than 24 frames per second?

The eye-brain combination senses motion at the FRAME rate, not
how many times the same image blinks on during that ONE frame
still period.

The hot sun must have fried your visual cortex software during Field
Day...reboot.

3667. WRC update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:22:45 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93AA923CF8100elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69817

Here's the latest:

http://www.iaru.org/rel030630.html

Everything looks pretty much settled except 40m. It now looks like phase 2
of realignment will be bumped to another conference, but phase 1 (i.e.
7100-7200 kHz) will probably squeak through, although we may not know
until the last minute. Keep your fingers crossed!

3668. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:36:14 UTC
From: Baby Doc <5150eminem.news.invalid@web2news.net>
Message-ID: <46148N774@web2news.com>
Source record: 69818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Twistedhed wrote:
> From: n7zzt@hotmail.com (Eric=A0Oyen=A0-=A0N7ZZT)
> On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 23:41:07 +0000, Frank Gilliland wrote:
> In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric
> Oyen - N7ZZT"
> <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
> .... federal rules and regulations
> (those being policy, and thus according to the US
> supreme court, have
> the affact and power of law).
> _
> That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section
> aren't vegetables
> because the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the
> characteristics of a vegetable -only- because they are sold in the
> vegetable isle. I don't know about you, but I think
> turnips are sold in
> the veggie isle not because they are -like- vegetables,
> but because they
> ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
> ordinances, acts,
> codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.
> _
>
>>why are you comparing apples and tomatoes
>
>>then?
>
> Why did you stop crossposting, Eric? Did you finally wake
> up and realize
> you were had by one of your own with a troll forge?
>
>>the rules are clear, unless you have a license
>>to operate in the section from 27.405 - 28.000
>>(which I KNOW for a fact no one here does),
>
> This is not a USA-only forum,,the FCC has no jurisdiction
> over the rest of the world. Arrogance that some Americans
> possess is illustrated by yourself by the feeling that the entire
> world revolves around them and their "rules."
>
>>you open yourself up to litigation from the FCC,
>

> And this is of concern to yourself why?
>
>>any commercial concern that may have
>>operating privileges there or even the military
>>(which does have some allocated spectrum
>>there) this applies also for any frequency
>>below 26.965 clear down to 12 meters (mostly
>>commercial and marine band HF stuff).
>
> No, it doesn't apply to any frequency down to 12 meter.
> Many of those frequencies are abandoned and not in use.
> Again, your claim holds only slight merit when referring to the
> US,,this forum is worldwide and so is cb. These "commercial"
> interests you speak of, IF they are to be found
> and IF they were to be interfered with, have no recourse
> against any ops outside the US and there exist plenty of those...
>
>>you don't have the letter from the FCC saying
>>you can operate there, its the same as not
>>having a license to drive a car on any street in
>>america (radio operations are a privilege, not
>>a right and onyone spouting otherwise really
>>doesn't know what they are talking about).
>
> No, it's not the same at all,,you are comparing apples and
> tomatoes,,one has the possibility and probability to maim,
> injure and even kill when operated in a reckless and
> dangerous manner,,,,,,,,spouting otherwise when one really
> doesn't know what they are talking of is a two way
> street, Mr. Oyen.
>
>>if you want to show me where in the fcc rules
>>it states that you can operate there, be my
>>guest.
>
> If you want to show me where in the FCC rules it governs foreign
> stations, be my guest.
>
>> otherwise, stick to 11 meters (the class D
>>channels if you please) or get your ticket
>>(amateur radio) and rgchew with a bunch of us
>>on bands you only dreamed of operating.
>
> Ahh,,another hammie with a power-hungry jones that needs
> to tell others
> what to do in order to feel better about himself.
> Stick to hammie radio, better yourself, and clean
> your own backyard
> prior to attempting another how to operate.
>

>
>>DE N7ZZT
>>Phoenix, Arizona
>
> That explains it,,...555 is locked up in Phoenix and s
> free-for-all... Perhaps the fact that all that lawlessness
> on 555 in your own back yard that has been going on for years
> has angered you to the point of no return,,no wonder you
> have a hard-on for freebanders. Buy a better
> radio, prehaps something with better rejection, perhaps a
> beam,,or maybe, give it up altogether if it makes you so
> upset,,a hoby is suppoosed to be enjoying and relaxing,,
> yet, you seem to fit the stereotypical mold of a lid harassing
> all that he fails to comprehend. Trust me, the majority of
> those in here want nothing to do with these "dream"
> frequencies you speak of, if you are the example of
> what to expect.

Speaking of dreams, who made you the spokesman for freebanders?

--
Posted via http://web2news.com the faster web2news on the web

3669. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:52:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hhawpx1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 69819
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 30 Jun 2003 08:10:50 -0700, AMHAM73 wrote:

>Hate to say I told you so -- but I will.

That was the answer knowlegeable folks here came up with from the
very beginning.
>
>Best get an answer from the horse's mouth and ignore OPINIONS.

You would be surprised at the list of WRONG replies from the
Commission that has been assembled over the years, primarily caused
by the person who replied not understanding what the answer should
have been to a legal or technical question because s/he was neither
a lawyer nor an engineer.

And the Supreme Court of the US has ruled that in spite of what
oral or written advice one gets from a government office, if the
law is otherwise, the oral or written advice is of no value and
cannot be relied upon.

The moral of the story: ask the right question and know the answer
before you ask it.

>But then OPINIONS cost nothing and worth about as much

I'll be glad to charge you for legal and technical opinions which
will hold up under all professsional scrutiny, then.

Others get it for free under the ARRL member assistance program.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel
ARRL Volunteer Consulting Engineer

3670. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 18:52:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hhawys2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 69820

On Mon, 30 Jun 2003 13:17:27 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>Steve Fleckenstein wrote:
>
>>...communications solution to Nextel and Blackberry laden county officials.
>
>Shouldn't that be "Blackberry bin Laden".

Some like blackberries in a bowl, others like them in a bin.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3671. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 19:49:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F009457.1050009@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 69821

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>Back in the days when I did regularly use HF phone, about 10 minutes
>of listening to the same boring old bowel and bladder reports was all
>I could stand!
>
>
"Image" comes to mind: "My bowel report is a solid 5-9, QSL?" :-)

3672. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 19:58:08 UTC
From: thomas <word_pass@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <bdq4os$ucoss$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 69822
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This is not true in the case of the federal tax. I saw it clearly on one IRS pub, that if you filed tax incorrectly based on a response from an IRS agent, you will not be charged the penalty, even if you have to pay the right amount later.

Applying the same principle here, you **may** be right that I may still need to pay a license fee if I get caught. But I won't be fined $10000, given that I have the print-out of the official FCC email.

We need common sense other than "certificates or professionals" on what is good and bad to do. The legal and policy systems are based on common sense eventually.

Thomas

>> And the Supreme Court of the US has ruled that in spite of what oral or written advice one gets from a government office, if the law is otherwise, the oral or written advice is of no value and cannot be relied upon.

3673. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 20:03:21 UTC
From: Scott Seidman <namdiesttocs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93AAA34FA45C8ScottSeidmanmindspri@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69823
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in
news:bdq4os$ucoss$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de:

> Applying the same principle here, you **may** be right that I may
> still need to pay a license fee if I get caught. But I won't be fined
> $10000, given that I have the print-out of the official FCC email.
>
>

I'm not sure that anyone, anywhere, had the $10000 fine assessed. Anyone
know of any cases?

--
Scott
Reverse first field of address to reply

3674. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 20:12:34 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <RQ0Ma.85500$Pc5.60639@fed1read01>
Source record: 69824
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

See URL:
http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/01/18/3/?nc=1

FCC Affirms $10,000 Fine in Amateur Pirate Case

May be some more at Google.com
Type in "fcc $10,000 fine"

"Scott Seidman" <namdiesttocs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93AAA34FA45C8ScottSeidmanmindspri@130.133.1.4...
> "thomas" <word_pass@hotmail.com> wrote in
> news:bdq4os$ucoss$1@ID-170256.news.dfncis.de:
>
> > Applying the same principle here, you **may** be right that I may
> > still need to pay a license fee if I get caught. But I won't be fined
> > $10000, given that I have the print-out of the official FCC email.
> >
> >
>
> I'm not sure that anyone, anywhere, had the $10000 fine assessed. Anyone
> know of any cases?
>
> --
> Scott
> Reverse first field of address to reply

3675. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 20:25:59 UTC
From: Scott Seidman <namdiesttocs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93AAA726C9EDEScottSeidmanmindspri@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69825
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> wrote in
news:RQ0Ma.85500$Pc5.60639@fed1read01:

> http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/01/18/3/?nc=1

This was for a guy was causing "intentional interference", and he seemed
real destructive "to get attention". How about your man on the street who
just uses a GMRS for normal communication?

--
Scott
Reverse first field of address to reply

3676. Re: The Freeband Hobby

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 20:42:01 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0306301242.4316b339@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.06.30.03.57.54.98315@hotmail.com>...
> On Fri, 27 Jun 2003 23:41:07 +0000, Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
> > In <pan.2003.06.28.05.30.19.362119@hotmail.com>, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
> > <n7zzt@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >
> >>..... federal rules and regulations
> >>(those being policy, and thus according to the US supreme court, have the
> >>affact and power of law).
> >
> > That's like saying the turnips in the veggie section aren't vegetables because
> > the sign only says 'turnips'. Or that turnips have all the characteristics of a
> > vegetable -only- because they are sold in the vegetable isle. I don't know about
> > you, but I think turnips are sold in the veggie isle not because they are -like-
> > vegetables, but because they ARE vegetables. And rules, regulations, statutes,
> > ordinances, acts, codes and charters are not just -like- laws, they ARE laws.
> why are you comparing apples and tomatoes then?
>
> the rules are clear, unless you have a license to operate in the section
> from 27.405 - 28.000 (which I KNOW for a fact no one here does), you open
> yourself up to litigation from the FCC, any commercial concern that may
> have operating privileges there or even the military (which does have some
> allocated spectrum there) this applies also for any frequency below 26.965
> clear down to 12 meters (mostly commercial and marine band HF stuff).
>
> you don't have the letter from the FCC saying you can operate there, its
> the same as not having a license to drive a car on any street in america
> (radio operations are a privilege, not a right and onyone spouting
> otherwise really doesn't know what they are talking about).
>
> if you want to show me where in the fcc rules it states that you can
> operate there, be my guest. otherwise, stick to 11 meters (the class D
> channels if you please) or get your ticket (amateur radio) and rgchew with
> a bunch of us on bands you only dreamed of operating.
>
> DE N7ZZT
> Phoenix, Arizona
>
> p. field day was a blast. I made several contacts on 6 meters from here to
> south texas and even florida (on 25 watts and a homebuilt 2 element beam!)

you know.......why is it this newsgroup seems to have such problems with guys whose call letters start with n7 ???? anyways eric you win the limp wrist award today for bragging about your homebuilt bullshit 2 element beam and your lousy freekin 25 watts.........bang , bang!!!!!!!!!

3677. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 20:44:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F00A058.B7303F97@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69827

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F00389A.1EFA5B4B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You don't regulate. You don't participate. You just pontificate.
>
> YOU don't regulate. [your regulator is broken, by the way...]

No, I don't. I am involved, however, in amateur radio.

> YOU participate. [your ham license keeps getting renewed]

Yes, I participate. Not only do I keep submitting my license for
renewal, I use the privileges it grants on a daily basis. I am an
active participant.

> YOU don't pontificate.

No, I don't.

> YOU shout ORDERS!

No, I don't. Why don't you point to an example where I've issued you an
order, Foghorn?

> YOU demand
> obedience to your superiority!

No, I don't. Can you point to an example where I've done so, Windy?

> NO ONE can tell you what to
> do! Ever!

Not much since my retirement. I can grant you some advice without
charge, Leonard: You won't make a dent in what goes on in amateur radio
until and unless you become a radio amateur or get a part-time job with
the FCC. Those things aside, you're simply irrelevant to amateur radio.

> Sieg Heil and gruss gott, herr robust.

You're still a horse's ass.

Dave K8MN

3678. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 21:08:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F00A65D.EAACE180@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69828

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F004204.9C4825AD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> There's still a bunch of anal retentive amateurs in here who, never
> >> having done a single bit of military communications, profess to be
> >> absolute, self-righteous "experts" on How Things Are Done.
> >
> >There are any number of radio amateurs here who have participated in
> >military or government communications and who have done so more recently
> >than you.
>
> I'm sure there are. The ones who post in here are exactly as I described.

You missed the mark. You described those who have not had military
radio experience.

> >You hold the title as being the only non-radio amateur who
> >presumes to tell us how amateur radio should be regulated.
>
> NOBODY can tell the great and superior Dave Heil how to run
> ham radio! Nossir! He GIVES orders, doesn't take them!

You missed the mark. I was writing of the only non-radio amateur here
who attempts to tell radio amateurs how the game should be regulated.
I haven't given orders, but I thank you for pointing out that in the
world of amateur radio, I am superior to any non-participant.

> >When did you last wear the uniform of the military? How recently did
> >you post your Army serial number and your rank?
>
> What has that to do with AMATEURISM, superior being?

It has to do with comments you made in your last post, Foghorn Lenhorn.
If you're going to bray about others experience in military radio, your
experience is going to be up for discussion.

> Why are you acting so despicably against US military veterans
> BECAUSE of their military service? I didn't serve in the SS.

Against US military veterans? I AM a US military veteran. I'm not
required to like you because you served in the military. I find you to
be difficult to like.

> >Well, it's a cinch that YOU don't knuckle under. You're NOT going to
> >allow any "superior" type to tell YOU what to do. Of course you don't
> >hold an amateur radio license of any class.
>
> No problem to me.

...only if you want to be involved in amateur radio. You must want to be involved because you've haunted this group for years.

> Obviously to you since you seem to NEED the
> "superiority" status.

Need superiority status? Not likely. I'm sure that my knowledge and experience in amateur radio are quite superior to someone who is not and who has never been involved in amateur radio, let's say to a guy like you.

> If you don't get reverence for being so damn
> superior in everything amateur, you turn churlish, mean, and
> spiteful...

You're churlish, mean and spiteful and you aren't a radio amateur.

> Offhand, I'd say you just can't tolerate any viewpoints other than
> your own superior ones.

You believe that morse code testing in amateur (in which you are not a participant) should be done away with. You believe that there should be a minimum age for licensing in amateur radio (in which you are not a participant). You don't tolerate viewpoints at odds with your own on these issues. You believe you know more about how amateur radio should be regulated than those who have decades of experience in amateur radio. I can't believe your superior attitude.

> >By "Living Museum of Amateur RadioTelegraphy", I can only assume that
> >you mean those who use morse code.
>
> No, those who go overboard in their quest to promote, venerate, and
> show their superiority in a mode which a majority don't give a damn
> about. The Gang of Four are such and in here.

A majority of whom? Please define overboard. Please define "Gang of Four". I guess everything looks like an attempt at superiority if you can't play in the big game. Looks like you're the kid wearing a baseball uniform during football season.

> >Why should those individuals give up the use of a mode they enjoy?
>
> Why should they "give up using" a mode which is allowed?

That doesn't make sense.

> I've never demanded or asked anything of the sort. You are starting
> in on character assassination again, herr robust. Not nice.

There'd have to be a first time in order for there to be an "again".
All of your words here have been archived so you haven't a prayer of
looking like an innocent party now.

> >Why should they "give in" to someone who
> >isn't even involved in amateur radio in any way?
>
> :-) NO ONE at the FCC is required to hold or be granted any US
> amateur radio license. The FCC can damn well cause ANY ham
> to "give in" to what the FCC says. :-)

I didn't write of the FCC. I wrote of you. You don't work for the FCC.
You aren't a radio amateur. You're involved in no way with amateur
radio. :-) :-)

> >I think it would be a safe bet to say that it'll be "Bye-Bye, Lennie"
> >before we say farewell to morse code in the ham bands.
>
> That's possible.

I'm banking on "inevitable".

> Of course Dave Heil is an IMMORTAL. He, like other members of
> the Gang of Four, will never die. :-)

That'd be another error on your part. Everyone dies. If you're banking
on morse code preceeding you, you'll likely be quite disappointed.

> My advocacy is simply for the elimination of a morse code test for
> any US radio license. I'm not after the elimination of morse code
> use. You are, as usual, confused on that issue. Your problem, not
> mine.

You can understand my confusion because that isn't at all what you
wrote. If you meant something else, you didn't put any effort into
conveying it. It looks as if you created the confusion.

No one asked you to become an advocate for anything. Your "advocacy" is
self-generated in an endeavor in which you are not involved in the
slightest way.

> Members of the Living Museum of the Ancient Radiotelegraphy
> Service will be beeping long after I'm gone. They refuse to go. :-)

You can bank on the fact that radio amateurs will be using morse code
long after you're gone.

Dave K8MN

3679. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 21:17:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F00A8AF.995ECC7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69829

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F003ED9.519BE98@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >This from one whose involvement in amateur radio consists of talking
> >about it, reading about it or playing SWL. How is it that you have a
> >role, Leonard?
>
> Poor baby, still pissed over not being recognized as a "superior
> amateur?" Tsk, tsk.

The guy who received his license this afternoon is superior in amateur
radio to you, Len. You aren't a radio amateur.

> I was doing big-leagues HF communications a half century ago.

Tell us about your amateur radio experiences, Len.

> I've
> been on more of the EM spectrum, used more modes of
> communications in the last half century than herr robust has,
> including is "service to the country" in State Department.

You'd have no way of knowing that. You're simply blowing smoke.
Tell us about your experience in amateur radio.

> I MIGHT be interested in getting an AMATEUR radio license to add
> to my hobbies...I've had a commercial radio license (more than just
> an operator's) since 1956. But, seeing the wonderful cross-section
> of "representatives" from US amateur radio in this newsgroup early
> on, the thought has less and less appeal.

If the thought had ANY appeal at all, you could have obtained a license
in the seven or eight years you've been jawing here.

> The prevailing thought among the wonderful "representatives" from
> US amateur radio is that all MUST pass a morse code test AND
> achieve a license grant in order to even talk about ham radio.

You don't even need to pass a morse test to obtain at least one class of
amateur radio license. The test for other classes is only a piddling
five words per minute. You've talked and talked for seven or eight
years and you've admitted to a decades-long interest. You've done
diddly squat.

> Herr robust is adamant about that...so much so that he regards
> opponents
> to his viewpoints as well beneath his contempt.

No, Len. I regard you as worthy of my contempt.

> However, his
> contempt for NCTAs shines in many words, is archived in many
> Google posts.

Piffle.

> Not being required in any way to use any morse code modes in the
> last half century doesn't make anyone "inferior" to those who had to
> test for same. Yet herr robust insists on that morse code test, if for
> no other reason than his being a "superior" to "neophytes." That
> is herr robust's problem, not mine.

I have no feeling of superiority toward neophytes. Become a neophyte
and see.

> GODI GOTA!

Ibby dibby.

> CW gets through when anything else will...

...especially if anything else is all you have. From your perspective,
I suppose the telephone looks like a suitable alternative. Call me
sometime, Len and we can have a LL QSO. Try the phone book instead of
the Callbook.

Dave K8MN

3680. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 21:21:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F00A998.817811F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69830

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F003DD5.5E18823C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Well, you and I both know that one MUST subscribe to what the
> >> self-styled Rules of US hamdom decree...morse code ability is at
> >> the very heart of being a "real" radio amateur. That is a prime
> >> requirement.
> >
> >Actually, the heart of being a "real" radio amateur is the amateur radio
> >license. The sooner you obtain one, the sooner you'll achieve neophyte
> >status in amateur radio.
>
> Your Word is LAW, herr robust. Sieg Heil!

No, my word isn't law. The FCC requires radio amateurs to hold
licenses. You can't participate without one.

> >You've repeatedly demonstrated that you have a problem with anyone who
> >might hold superiority to you in any area.
>
> Nein, herr robust. I have a problem with those of you who claim
> "superiority" in radio when you are clearly NOT superior. That's in
> all radio services, not just amateur.

We aren't discussing ALL radio services, just amateur radio. Any and
all radio amateurs are superior to you in amateur radio. You aren't
involved in any capacity.

> >When and if you ever obtain
> >an amateur radio license, there'll be those who have more knowledge of
> >amateur radio than you and there'll be those who are more skilled
> >operators regardless of mode.
>
> You are NOT one of them, herr robust. :-)

As a matter of fact, I AM one of the many, Foghorn. I have more
knowledge of amateur radio than you and am a more skilled operator than
you. Just suck it up and live with the knowledge.

> GODI GOTA!

Ibby dibby.

> CW gets through when everything else will....

How would you know?

Dave K8MN

3681. Re: Latest News - Morse Code Test May Not "Die" at ITU Conference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 21:33:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F00AC51.5A7C29B5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 69831

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F003CB4.758B5601@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I fear that you're becoming forgetful in your dotage. You left out the
> >part about a minimum age for licensing. As far as the "ham community",
> >you aren't a part of it so that shouldn't be your concern.
>
> There is NO age requirement in US amateur radio.

See, you are becoming forgetful. Your comments to the FCC recommended a
minimum age.

> Little pre-schoolers can get amateur radio licenses here. Didn't you?

No, but I was years under your proposed minimum.

> >...but you show up nonetheless as if you have something to do with
> >amateur radio. No one has asked you to waste your time, to be an
> >advocate or to volunteer your services as an expert in amateur radio.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you show up in here as ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY
> in amateur radio and demand all others agree with your opinions.

Nope. I've made no demands of you Leonard. I don't care whether you
become a ham or not.

> NO ONE asked you to participate.

This is an amateur radio newsgroup. I am a radio amateur. Tell us
about your relationship to amateur radio.

> >I'd almost be willing to pay to see the Vintage Pirhana take on all
> >comers.
>
> Like all members of the Gang of Four, you have a strong preference
> for violence and fighting. Why is that? What made you so angry?

I enjoy watching boxing, Len. I boxed in my youth. When you issued your
comments regarding the Golden Gloves, it piqued my interest. You made
the comments. I think you'd be a hit as the Vintage Pirhana.

> >How do you justify your personal insults toward others?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, how do you justify your personal insults leveled to
> anyone not agreeing with your holy words?

This is where I came in. You already leveled your charge of personal insults. I asked how you justified your personal insults. I'll try it again:

Tsk, tsk, tsk, how do you justify your personal insults leveled to anyone not agreeing with your holy words?

> You don't make any US radio regulations...you don't regulate or
> enforce any US radio regulations...yet you act the complete
> arrogant official as if your word was law!

Wrong. I abide by Part 97 regulations in my radio operations. I'm licensed as a radio amateur. You aren't involved as a participant or a regulator.

> >With regard to
> >your non-involvement in amateur radio, what justifies your peculiar
> >attraction to this particular newsgroup?
>
> Activity towards removal of the morse code testing for any US radio
> license.

What's it to you?

> Gruss gott, herr robust...

Non calor sed umor est qui nobis incommodat.*

Dave K8MN

*It's not the heat, it's the humidity.

3682. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 22:16:31 UTC
From: AMHAM73 <amham73@connectnet.net>
Message-ID: <3F2Ma.85582$Pc5.44690@fed1read01>
Source record: 69832
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well I assume you really meant:

"How about your man on the street who just uses a GMRS for ABNORMAL
UNLICENSED communication?"

Well a radio shack page sez "The penalty for GMRS unlicensed operation is a
fine of up to $8,000".

http://support.tandy.com/support_electronics/doc31/31384.htm

Will they slap you with that much -- probably depends on the entire case and
severity thereof -- but I don't know.
But I sure wouldn't take a chance to find out.

GMRS licensed operators (like Hams) guard their spectrum jealously -- they
will and do turn in offenders.

Really want to know -- ask the FCC as they are the ones who levy the fine
!!!

Why flount the rules -- pay the $80 and don't worry about it.

You paid $___ for a driver license or did you.

"Scott Seidman" <namdiesttocs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93AAA726C9EDEScottSeidmanmindspri@130.133.1.4...
> "AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> wrote in
> news:RQ0Ma.85500$Pc5.60639@fed1read01:
>
> > http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/01/18/3/?nc=1
>
> This was for a guy was causing "intentional interference", and he seemed
> real destructive "to get attention". How about your man on the street who
> just uses a GMRS for normal communication?
>
> --
> Scott
> Reverse first field of address to reply

3683. Re: WRC-03 Opened In Geneva June 9

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 22:18:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0306301418.1a9ac12b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 69833

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message news:<20030630141343.15462.00001278@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Sieg Heil and gruss gott, herr robust.

Once again with the Nazi epithets.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3684. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 22:51:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hhb7wa0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 69834
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 30 Jun 2003 15:58:08 -0400, thomas wrote:

>>> And the Supreme Court of the US has ruled that in spite of what
> oral or written advice one gets from a government office, if the
> law is otherwise, the oral or written advice is of no value and
> cannot be relied upon.

Go read the case of _Richmond v Office of Personnel Management_
where Charlie Richmond relied on a written statement from the Navy
Personnel Office about what he could earn and not forfeit his
disability retirement payments, but on audit the retirement system
found that the Navy office had quoted a wrong figure, and the
penalty that poor Charlie had to pay was no pension payments for 6
months as the law specified.

This was upheld by the Supremes on the grounds that no government
agency official has the power to change what The Congress has
enacted.

>This is not true in the case of the federal tax. I saw it clearly on one
>IRS pub, that if you filed tax incorrectly based on a response from an IRS
>agent, you will not be charged the penalty, even if you have to pay the
>right amount later.

AFAIK IRS has been granted the power to waive the penalty in that case.
It's their decision, and good public relations, but they didn't have
to under the _Richmond_ decision unless The Congress ordered them to
do so.

Dieter ??

The FCC doesn't have to waive anything it doesn't want.
>
>Applying the same principle here, you **may** be right that I may still need
>to pay a license fee if I get caught.

That's locking the barn door after the horse has fled. You have to
pay it BEFORE you are caught to avoid the administrative or criminal
penalties for unlicensed operation. It doesn't take a graduate
degree in rocket science to figure that one out.

>But I won't be fined $10000, given
>that I have the print-out of the official FCC email.

If you are not in violation, no one will say anything. If you are
in violation, a "letter" won't help.

>We need common sense other than "certificates or professionals" on what is
>good and bad to do.

Common sense says that the world is flat. If you are dealing with
law or science, you need to listen to the professionals because they're
the ones who come up with, enforce, and interpret the law or the scientific
principles.

>The legal and policy systems are based on common sense eventually.

Boy, are you naive! How long have you been dealing with FCC Rules
and policy? Or even plain ol' traffic laws?

If FCC policy would have been based on common sense there would no
longer be a CB, let alone FRS or MURS or non-licensed wireless
devices, and there wuld have been adequate enforcement from the very
beginning to ensure that that was the case.

But no, certain bureaucrats 25+ years ago (and I do know the names
and faces) were looking for ways to do less work, and we spectrum
users are all paying the penalty and into the forseeable future.

<Don't get me started.>

--
73 de K2ASP / KAE8605 - Phil Kane

3685. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 23:15:16 UTC
From: Scott Seidman <namdiesttocs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93AAC3DAA4464ScottSeidmanmindspri@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 69835
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> wrote in
news:3F2Ma.85582$Pc5.44690@fed1read01:

> Well I assume you really meant:
>
> "How about your man on the street who just uses a GMRS for ABNORMAL
> UNLICENSED communication?"
>
>
> Well a radio shack page sez "The penalty for GMRS unlicensed
> operation is a fine of up to $8,000".
>
> http://support.tandy.com/support_electronics/doc31/31384.htm
>
>
> Will they slap you with that much -- probably depends on the entire
> case and severity thereof -- but I don't know.
> But I sure wouldn't take a chance to find out.
>
> GMRS licensed operators (like Hams) guard their spectrum jealously --
> they will and do turn in offenders.
>
> Really want to know -- ask the FCC as they are the ones who levy the
> fine !!!
>
> Why flount the rules -- pay the $80 and don't worry about it.
>
> You paid $___ for a driver license or did you.
>
> "Scott Seidman" <namdiesttocs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns93AAA726C9EDEScottSeidmanmindspri@130.133.1.4...
>> "AMHAM73" <amham73@connectnet.net> wrote in
>> news:RQ0Ma.85500$Pc5.60639@fed1read01:
>>
>> > http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/01/18/3/?nc=1
>>
>> This was for a guy was causing "intentional interference", and he
>> seemed real destructive "to get attention". How about your man on
>> the street who just uses a GMRS for normal communication?
>>
>> --
>> Scott
>> Reverse first field of address to reply

>
>

Actually, from all the stuff I've just read, the answer is a big NO!! Apparently, the FCC doesn't even fine FM pirates big time until they've a) asked them nicely to stop, and b) possibly charged a small fine.

I'm not paying the $75, largely because I have no GMRS and no plans to buy a GMRS. If I were to buy or use one, I'd most likely purchase the permit.

We all know that there is a fine for unlicensed GMRS use. Those of us who can read and who have read more than 20 posts in this group, while there's some bickering about shared FRS/GMRS units when you're not using the GMRS channels, all know this. Sometimes you obey the rules because they are there for a reason-- this has nothing to do with the fine.

Yes, GMRS repeater owners do guard their bandwidth, but I suspect the FCC will not even respond to a complaint unless the name and the address of the offender are provided by the stoolie--oops, I mean complainant.

There don't appear to be any teeth to this fine. I suspect the FCC will eventually tear up the rulebook on GMRS, at least with regard to non-repeater capable units. I think that when this happens, GMRS users, even repeater owners, will barely notice the difference.

--
Scott
Reverse first field of address to reply

3686. Re: FCC's response to my inquiry on license of FRS/GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 23:19:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hhb9el1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 69836
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 30 Jun 2003 20:25:59 GMT, Scott Seidman wrote:

>> http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/01/18/3/?nc=1
>
>This was for a guy was causing "intentional interference", and he seemed
>real destructive "to get attention". How about your man on the street who
>just uses a GMRS for normal communication?

The maximum penalty can be issued, but in real life it may be
reduced. If there is no other problem, the initial NAL amount
(see below) can very well be in the low four figures.

In issuing a Notice of Apparent Liability to monetary forfeiture,
the issuing official is guided by a set table of penalties for
various infractions and violations, with upward and downward
factors specified. Then the subject has the right to reply, stating
why the penalty should be reduced or eliminated. Finally, the
issuing official is required to consider several factors in the
reply, including ability to pay, severity of the offense, ignoring
prior warnings, and culpability and cooperation of the individual,
in setting the amount specified in the Notice of Forfeiture.

Of course, if the subject merely fails to reply or even worse,
tells the Commission to "buzz off", then the whole enchilada is
levied. One of the most significant cases in punishing a radio
broadcast pirate started when the subject told the inspector "****
you" and the rest is history. We went all the way.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3687. CW problems with arabs and ex-USSR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 23:35:30 UTC
From: Fritz Wuehler <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org>
Message-ID: <8ba305e2a035a6ba815b982d7b68180d@remailer.frell.eu.org>
Source record: 69837

The best thing to do IS to suppress
totally the S25.5 .
Who cares about arabs and ex-USSR ??
These are not civilized countries, so
its a great mistake to consider their
wills.

3688. Re: CW problems with arabs and ex-USSR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-06-30 23:57:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hhbbfw3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 69838

On Tue, 01 Jul 2003 01:35:30 +0200, Fritz Wuehler wrote:

>The best thing to do IS to suppress totally the S25.5 .
>Who cares about arabs and ex-USSR ?? These are not civilized
>countries, so its a great mistake to consider their wills.

They and the other 180-some-odd "not civilized countries" each have
one vote. The United States also has one vote.

Starting to see the picture?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane